

---

C O U N C I L

**Metropolitan Service District**  
527 SW Hall Portland, Oregon 97201 503/221-1646

## *Agenda*

---

**Date:** May 10, 1979

**Day:** Thursday

**Time:** 7:00 p.m.

**Place:** Conference Room "C"

CALL TO ORDER (7:00 )

1. INTRODUCTIONS
2. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS TO COUNCIL
3. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO COUNCIL ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS
4. CONSENT AGENDA (7:10)\*
  - 4.1 Minutes of Meeting of April 12 and 26, 1979.
  - 4.2 A-95 Review
5. REPORTS
  - 5.1 Report from Executive Officer (7:15)\*
  - 5.2 Council Committee Reports (7:35)

PUBLIC HEARING (8:00)

6. Ordinance No 79-71, Adopting MSD's Portion of Oregon Clean Air Implementation Plan (SIP Revisions, Sections 4.2 and 4.3) (First Reading)
7. OLD BUSINESS
  - 7.1 Ordinance No. 79-70, Amending Budget Ordinance No. 60 to Transfer Appropriations Within Funds (Second reading) (8:30)\*
8. NEW BUSINESS

PUBLIC HEARING (8:45)

- 8.1 Resolution No. 79-47, Transmitting Proposed FY 1980 Budget to Tax Supervisory and Conservation Commission

MSD Council Agenda  
May 10, 1979

Page 2

8.2 Resolution No. 79-46, Assigning Oregon City Bypass as  
Highest Priority Regional Project to Receive New State  
Matching Fund Commitment (9:15)\*

9. ANNOUNCEMENTS

ADJOURNMENT (9:30)\*

\* Times proposed are suggested - actual time for consideration of  
agenda items may vary.

mec

---

C O U N C I L

**Metropolitan Service District**  
527 SW Hall Portland, Oregon 97201 503/221-1646

## *Agenda*

---

*Date:* May 10, 1979

*Day:* Thursday

*Time:* 7:00 p.m.

*Place:* Conference Room "C"

### C O N S E N T   A G E N D A

The following business items have been reviewed by the staff and an officer of the Council. In my opinion, these items meet the Consent List Criteria established by the Rules and Procedures of the Council.

  
Executive Officer

4.1 Minutes of Meeting of April 12, 1979

Action Requested: Approve Minutes as circulated.

4.2 A-95 Reviews

Action Requested: Concur in staff findings

mec

A-95 REVIEW SUMMARY

The project applications described below have been processed by MSD staff and recommendations have been made as indicated.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	FEDERAL \$	STATE \$	LOCAL \$	OTHER \$	TOTAL \$
<p>1. <u>Project Title:</u> Rivergate Sewage Pumping Station (#793-26)  <u>Applicant:</u> City of Portland  <u>Project Summary:</u> Funds to construct a sewage pumping station in the Rivergate Industrial District with capacity to serve 2,200 acres of industrial land.  <u>Staff Recommendation:</u> Approval</p>	<p>\$486,000  (Economic Development Administration)</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>\$270,000</p>	<p>\$324,000  (Port of Portland)</p>	<p>\$1,080,000</p>
<p>2. <u>Project Title:</u> Industrial Transportation and Parking Technical Assistance (#793-25)  <u>Applicant:</u> City of Portland  <u>Project Summary:</u> Project to develop solutions to transportation access problems of the major employment centers and industrial districts within the City of Portland.  <u>Staff Recommendation:</u> Approval</p>	<p>150,000  (Economic Development Administration)</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>150,000</p>
<p>3. <u>Project Title:</u> Planning Assistance for Development of Local Noise Control Programs (#794-4)  <u>Applicant:</u> Oregon Department of Environmental Quality  <u>Project Summary:</u> Funding for DEQ to provide technical assistance to cities and counties in the development of comprehensive noise control programs and development of guidelines for noise source identification and abatement.  <u>Staff Recommendation:</u> Approval</p>	<p>38,902  (Environmental Protection Agency)</p>	<p>3,663</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>42,565</p>
<p>4. <u>Project Title:</u> Genetics Counseling Program (#794-2)  <u>Applicant:</u> University of Oregon  <u>Project Summary:</u> continuation grant to provide genetic counseling to families and individuals who have identified high risk for developing genetic disorders.  <u>Staff Recommendation:</u> Approval</p>	<p>110,161  (Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare)</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>15,485</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>125,646</p>

A-95 REVIEW SUMMARY

The project applications described below have been processed by MSD staff and recommendations have been made as indicated.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	FEDERAL \$	STATE \$	LOCAL \$	OTHER \$	TOTAL \$
<p>5. <u>Project Title:</u> Washington County Community Action Organization Operating Grant (#793-23)  <u>Applicant:</u> Washington County Community Action Organization  <u>Project Summary:</u> Continuation funding for administration of community action agency.  <u>Staff Recommendation:</u> Approval</p>	<p>\$162,000 (Community Services Administration)</p>	<p align="center">-</p>	<p>\$40,000</p>	<p align="center">-</p>	<p>\$202,000</p>
<p>6. <u>Project Title:</u> Mt. Hood Recreational Corridor Sewage Facilities (#793-21)  <u>Applicant:</u> Clackamas County  <u>Project Summary:</u> Construction of a sludge treatment plant near Welches to serve the Mt. Hood recreational area.  <u>Staff Recommendation:</u> Approval</p>	<p>2,360,000</p>	<p align="center">-</p>	<p>1,250,000</p>	<p align="center">-</p>	<p>3,610,000</p>
<p>7. <u>Project Title:</u> FY 1979-80 Comprehensive Employment and Training Program (#793-18)  <u>Applicant:</u> City of Portland  <u>Project Summary:</u> Funding for training and employment services to unemployed and/or economically disadvantaged residents of Portland, who experience significant barriers in the labor market.  <u>Staff Recommendation:</u> Approval</p>	<p>13,139,138 (Dept. of Labor)</p>	<p align="center">-</p>	<p align="center">--</p>	<p align="center">-</p>	<p>13,139,138</p>
<p>8. <u>Project Title:</u> Flippen Castle Acquisition (#793-15)  <u>Applicant:</u> City of Clatskanie  <u>Project Summary:</u> Request for funding to purchase the Flippen Castle for use as a Senior Center  <u>Staff Recommendation:</u> Approval</p>	<p>20,000 (Dept. of Interior)</p>	<p align="center">-</p>	<p align="center">-</p>	<p>105,000</p>	<p>125,000</p>

---

SOLID WASTE/PUBLIC FACILITIES  
COUNCIL COMMITTEE

**Metropolitan Service District**  
527 SW Hall Portland, Oregon 97201 503/221-1646

---

## *Agenda*

---

*Date:* May 15, 1979

*Day:* Tuesday

*Time:* 3:00 p.m.

*Place:* Council Conference Room

- I. Resource Recovery Energy Agreement
- II. Short-Term and Long-Term Work Programs
- III. Progress Report on Johnson Creek

---

# Metropolitan Service District


527 SW Hall Portland, Oregon 97201 503/221-1646

## Memorandum

---

Date: May 1, 1979

To: Mike Burton

From: Craig Berkman, Chairman   
Council Solid Waste/Public Facilities Committee

Subject: Appointments to Johnson Creek Task Force

At their May 1, 1979, meeting the Council Solid Waste/  
Public Facilities Committee received the names of five  
people who have volunteered for service on the Johnson  
Creek Task Force. The following people have volunteered:

James Hoyt	Representing the business community in the Johnson Creek Basin.
Ruby Alvord	Representing residents of the basin.
Lou Bowerman	Alternate for Ruby Alvord
Billy Bee Bradfield	Representing creek frontage residents.
John Tupper	Legislative Aide to Sue Pisha.

We are requesting that the Council confirm the appointments  
of these people as members of the Johnson Creek Task Force.

TW:pj

COUNCIL TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE/  
JOINT POLICY ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

**Metropolitan Service District**  
527 SW Hall Portland, Oregon 97201 503/221-1646

## Agenda

Date: MAY 10, 1979  
Day: THURSDAY  
Time: 7:30 AM  
Place: RIVERWAY INN \*\*  
6439 SW Macadam

### PROPOSED AGENDA:

1. Voting Procedures for JPACT.
2. Tri-Met Radios - TIP Amendment - Action
3. Work Trips & Air Quality Levels Analysis - Information
4. Air Quality State Implementation Plan - Action
5. FY 1980 Unified Work Program - Action
6. Priority for the Oregon City Bypass - Action
7. Criteria for Identifying and Selecting Projects to Use the Interstate Transfer Reserve Account - Draft
8. Emergency Energy Planning - Information
9. Coordination of Computers - Information
10. Description of Interstate Transfer Contingency Accounts - Information

\*\* Please RSVP by May 8, 1979 to Karen Thackston - 221-1646



---

# Metropolitan Service District

527 SW Hall Portland, Oregon 97201 503/221-1646

## Memorandum

---

**Date:** May 8, 1979  
**To:** MSD Council  
**From:** Metropolitan Development Department  
**Subject:** Plan Review Progress Report

The attached "MSD Plan Review Manual" was completed last week and mailed to all MSD jurisdictions. A meeting is being scheduled for May 15 to explain the manual to state agencies (e.g. DEQ, ODOT). Other plan review activities are as follows:

Reviews in progress: Rivergrove, Cornelius

Upcoming reviews: A meeting was held May 10 to explain the plan review manual and "self-evaluation" process to jurisdictions with plan drafts ready for review. The following jurisdictions were invited: Beaverton, Tigard, Washington County, Milwaukie, Portland, and Forest Grove.

JH:lz

Attachment

# Metropolitan Service District

527 SW Hall Portland, Oregon 97201 503/221-1646

## Memorandum

Date: May 3, 1979  
To: Mike Burton  
From: Charlie Williamson *cw*  
Subject: Elected Officials Appointment to JPACT

As we discussed at the last Council meeting, the Transportation Committee has decided that they would like to include representatives of implementing agencies and elected representatives of local jurisdictions in policy discussions of transportation/air quality matters. The Committee intends to meet monthly with these representatives as part of a Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT).

Letters were sent to the region's implementing agencies requesting appointment of a person able to speak on policy matters concerning their agency.

As a result of the letters, the following people have been named to represent their agency on the JPACT:

William Young	Director, DEQ
Bob Bothman	Administrator, ODOT-Metro
Richard Carroll	Administrator, WSDOT-Vancouver
John Frewing	Tri-Met Board of Directors
Lloyd Anderson	Director, Port of Portland
Ken Lewis, Alternate	Commissioner, Port of Portland

We are requesting that the Council confirm the appointment of these people to meet as part of the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation.

---

WAYS AND MEANS  
COMMITTEE

**Metropolitan Service District**  
527 SW Hall Portland, Oregon 97201 503/221-1646

## *Agenda*

---

*Date:* May 15, 1979

*Day:* Tuesday

*Time:* 5:00 p.m.

*Place:* Conference Room "B"

1. Report on Status of FY 1980 Budget Process
2. Discussion of Long Range Financing Options for MSD
3. Discussion of Use of Consultant to Assist Council at Scheduled July Retreat
4. Progress Report on Personnel Task Force

DUK:mec

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

TO:           MSD Council  
FROM:         Executive Officer  
SUBJECT:      Adoption of State Air Quality Implementation Plan  
              (SIP) Revisions

BACKGROUND: On March 28, 1979, the Council Committee on Transportation released the draft of MSD's portion of the Oregon SIP Revisions for public review and comment. The Committee's release of MSD's SIP Revisions was the first step in an adoption process that runs through June 8, 1979, at which time the Oregon Environmental Quality Commission (EQC) is scheduled to adopt SIP Revisions for the entire state.

At the May 10, 1979, Council meeting, a hearing will be held for the purpose of taking testimony on MSD's SIP Revisions, i.e., SIP Sections 4.2 and 4.3, copies of which have been sent to Council members, to cities and counties and to members of the MSD Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) and the AQMA Advisory Committee (AQMAAC).

By May 10, 1979, several forums will have been held to provide opportunities for discussing proposed SIP Revisions. They include the following:

1.    PSU Institute for Policy Studies discussion of air quality constraints on growth (April 19)
2.    TPAC SIP Revisions Review Subcommittee meeting (April 24)
3.    AQMAAC Agenda Subcommittee (April 26)
4.    EQC hearing (with MSD staff attending)    May 4
5.    TPAC meeting (May 8 agenda item)
6.    JPACT meeting (May 10)

At the May 10 Council meeting the recommendations of the Council Transportation Committee and other JPACT members will be reported to the Council.

There is no action requested of the Council at the May 10 meeting. However, a hearing is scheduled for the first reading of Ordinance No. 79-71, which is proposed for adoption at the Council's following meeting, on May 24, 1979. Adoption by Ordinance is a federal requirement. The purpose of the Ordinance is Council adoption of MSD's portion of the SIP Revision (which applies to the Oregon portion of the Portland-Vancouver Air Quality Maintenance Area) and

referral of the SIP Revision document to EQC for adoption as part of the statewide SIP.

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS: The proposed SIP Revisions include commitments by MSD to perform the functions of the lead planning agency for carbon monoxide (CO) and ozone (O<sub>3</sub>). These functions are programmed in the FY 1979 UWP and budget, and the proposed FY 1980 UWP and budget and are supported by federal and state grant funds.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS: There are few, if any, policy implications associated with MSD's portion of the proposed SIP Revisions. MSD's portion of the revisions merely sets forth a work program for the development of CO and O<sub>3</sub> control measures within the deadlines mandated by Congress. No new control measures are included in these proposed SIP revisions.

However, several important policy-related issues and concerns have been raised by participants in the forums referred to earlier in this Management Summary. These issues and MSD staff responses to them are summarized in Attachment "A".

In addition, the SIP Revision document for the entire state of Oregon has policy implications in the Portland metropolitan area and throughout the rest of the state. Although the statewide policy implications of the SIP Revisions are not discussed here, Council members may wish to review the statewide policies before taking action on MSD's portion of the SIP on May 24. Copies of the statewide SIP Revisions are available from the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality offices in Portland.

ACTION REQUESTED: No action is requested until the May 24, 1979, Council meeting.

TW/gl  
3432A  
0033A 4/10/79

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE  
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING )  
MSD'S PORTION OF THE OREGON )  
CLEAN AIR IMPLEMENTATION PLAN )  
(SIP REVISIONS, SECTIONS )  
4.2 AND 4.3) )

ORDINANCE NO. 79-71  
Introduced by  
Councilor Williamson

WHEREAS, The Metropolitan Service District (MSD) is the designated lead agency for transportation/air quality planning in the Oregon portion of the Portland/Vancouver Air Quality Maintenance Area (AQMA) for carbon monoxide (CO) and ozone (O<sub>3</sub>); and

WHEREAS, The MSD, in cooperation with the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), has prepared revisions to the Oregon Clean Air Implementation Plan (SIP) to meet requirements of the Federal Clean Air Act, as amended; and

WHEREAS, Said revisions are contained in Sections 4.2 and 4.3 of the proposed statewide SIP Revisions published by DEQ April 5, 1979; and

WHEREAS, Said revisions must be approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency by June 30, 1979;

THE COUNCIL OF THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Sections 4.2 and 4.3 of the proposed SIP Revisions, copies of which are attached as Exhibit "A", are hereby adopted and endorsed by the Council for inclusion in the statewide SIP Revisions prepared by DEQ;

Section 2. Sections 4.2 and 4.3 shall be referred to the Oregon Environmental Quality Council for adoption in the statewide SIP;

Section 3. Neither the contents of Sections 4.2 and 4.3 nor the projections referenced therein shall be construed by MSD as a regulation of development in the AQMA nor as an absolute limit on growth in the AQMA.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this \_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 1979.

---

Presiding Officer

ATTEST:

---

Clerk of the Council

TW/gl  
3440A  
0033A

EXHIBIT "A"

ISSUES AND CONCERNS RELATED TO THE PROPOSED SIP REVISIONS

1. What will Tri-Met's involvement be in terms of manpower requirements, scheduling, etc.?

MSD Staff Response: Although this kind of information is not contained in the SIP Revisions, it is in the FY 1980 Unified Work Program and will be described in more detail in a forthcoming update of the air quality planning Prospectus (work program). Tri-Met must be involved in certain key stages of the air quality planning effort, as must other implementation agencies, for the area to meet its air quality objectives. MSD is coordinating with the implementation agencies on the update of the Prospectus to insure that their involvement is programmed appropriately. A preliminary schedule for the O<sub>3</sub> control strategy planning has been drafted and is being circulated now for review and comment.

2. Where will Tri-Met's funding come from to support the planning? Are EPA Section 175 funds available? Are there additional EPA monies available?

MSD Staff Response: Tri-Met's funding support for transportation planning is included in the Unified Work Program. If it is determined that Tri-Met's currently-programmed funding support is insufficient, it may be possible to find additional funds or reprogram some of the existing funds. However, it does not appear likely that EPA 175 funds will be available for Tri-Met's use. MSD will investigate other sources of funds and will welcome any suggestions from Tri-Met or the other implementing agencies as to ways of reducing the burden of the air quality planning program.

3. Will operation and maintenance costs be estimated for planned control strategies? If Tri-Met is required to institute new services, who will fund such services?

MSD Staff Response: Yes, operation and maintenance costs will be estimated. (Tri-Met should have a major role in estimating these costs.) In some cases, information may already be available from past or current planning efforts. If new Tri-Met bus services are required, funding sources must be identified before any commitments are made to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency or others for implementation of the services.

4. Why is transportation the overwhelming center of attention in the SIP? There is a need to emphasize VOC rules already instituted, etc.

MSD Staff Response: Transportation is the center of attention only in MSD's portion of the SIP. The complete SIP, the docu-



ment that the State of Oregon will be adopting, has several chapters describing the rules, regulations, and control measures pertaining to stationary sources. The document that is being circulated by MSD in the Portland metropolitan area consists of only two sections of the entire SIP (Section 4.2 and 4.3), the sections on carbon monoxide and ozone, respectively.

Mobile sources are responsible for 98% of the CO in the AQMA. Thus, there is little discussion of stationary sources in this segment. Stationary sources are responsible for 37 percent of volatile organic compound emissions. This may account for the lesser emphasis placed on this source in the section on control of ozone. However, there is discussion of stationary sources in Sections 4.3.2.1, 4.3.2.3, 4.3.3.2, 4.3.4, and 4.3.7.1 of the SIP.

It is MSD staff's intention to review the section on control of ozone in the draft SIP to determine if additional discussion of stationary source controls should be included in the SIP.

There are discussions in Sections 4.2.3.3. and 4.3.3.3 of factors to be analyzed in the future, including costs and policy implications.

In the future attainment control plans there will be an in-depth discussion of tradeoffs between transportation and industry.

5. Should transportation and industry be assigned targets for reduction or should all strategies be evaluated and then selected?

MSD Staff Response: The work program that MSD and DEQ are now formulating takes the approach of analyzing all control measures that appear to have the highest potential for solving air quality problems. Since non-air quality impacts will also be analyzed, decision makers will then be able to adopt control measures based on a thorough consideration of all relevant criteria.

6. Can more air quality monitors be instituted?

MSD Staff Response: Air quality monitoring is a DEQ responsibility. There is no funding in DEQ's biennium budget for additional air quality monitoring in Portland at this time. The possibility of more monitors will be examined, however, to see if it is warranted compared to monitoring needs elsewhere in the State.

7. Tri-Met suggests that employment projections for downtown Portland are 20 percent too low for the year 2000.

MSD Staff Response: Population, employment, and growth alloca-

tion projections were made for the year 2000 based on two CRAG Technical Memoranda, A Regional Employment, Population and Household Forecast and Second Round Regional Growth Allocation for the CRAG Transportation Study Area Year 2000. Initial comments have been that employment projections for the year 2000 may be low. However, a 20 percent adjustment in the year 2000 forecast would be far less significant for 1982 or 1987, the target years for air quality planning. Revised population and employment projections are to be used in the next round of SIP planning, however.

8. There should be more coordination of the air quality planning process with TPAC.

MSD Staff Response: A monthly air quality progress report will be submitted to TPAC.

9. MSD should emphasize that emission factors, population and employment projections, and other assumptions used are from the best available information, but are subject to change.

MSD Staff Response: This has not been emphasized enough in the SIP. A paragraph will be added making this point.

TW/gl  
3432A  
0033A

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE  
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

For the purpose of )  
amending Budget Ordinance No. 60 )  
to transfer appropriations )  
within funds )

ORDINANCE NO. 79-70  
At the request of  
Rick Gustafson

THE COUNCIL OF THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT ORDAINS  
AS FOLLOWS:

1. Section 4 of Ordinance No. 60 is hereby amended for  
the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1978, as shown in the revised  
schedule of appropriations, Exhibit A, attached hereto and by refer-  
ence made a part of this ordinance.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service  
District this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 1979

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

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Clerk of the Council

DUK:bc  
2652A  
0033A

EXHIBIT A  
 METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT  
 REVISED BUDGET  
 FOR FISCAL YEAR 1978-79

	<u>Revised Budget Ord #69</u>	<u>Supplemental Budget</u>	<u>Revised Budget</u>
<u>General Fund</u>			
Resources:			
Net Working Capital	120	5,200	5,320
Miscellaneous	50	0	50
Transfer From Solid Waste Fund	41,893	5,623	47,516
Transfer From Zoo Fund	192,580	0	192,580
Transfer From Planning Fund	8,103	30,565	38,668
Interest	0	1,200	1,200
<b>TOTAL RESOURCES</b>	<u>242,746</u>	<u>42,588</u>	<u>285,334</u>
Requirements:			
Personal Services	121,540	25,288	146,828
Materials & Services	119,336	17,300	136,636
Capital Outlay	1,345	0	1,345
Contingency	0	0	0
Unappropriated Balance	525	0	525
<b>TOTAL REQUIREMENTS</b>	<u>242,746</u>	<u>42,588</u>	<u>285,334</u>
<u>Planning Fund</u>			
Resources:			
Net Working Capital	100,000	261,684	361,684
Grants - Federal	317,000	0	317,000
Grants - State	433,333	0	433,333
Grants - Subcontractee	867,500	0	867,500
Dues	262,675	(50,000)	212,675
Miscellaneous	54,595	0	54,595
<b>TOTAL RESOURCES</b>	<u>2,035,103</u>	<u>211,684</u>	<u>2,246,787</u>
Requirements:			
Personal Services	733,000	(6,575)	726,425
Materials & Services	1,219,000	(16,900)	1,202,100
Capital Outlay	5,000	0	5,000
Contingency	70,000	201,794	271,794
Transfer To General Fund	8,103	30,565	38,668
Transfer To Solid Waste Fund	0	2,800	2,800
<b>TOTAL REQUIREMENTS</b>	<u>2,035,103</u>	<u>211,684</u>	<u>2,246,787</u>

	Revised Budget Ord #69	Supplemental Budget	Revised Budget
<b><u>Solid Waste Fund</u></b>			
<b>Resources:</b>			
Net Working Capital	411,870	37,089	448,959
Interest	4,000	0	4,000
User Fees	775,000	0	775,000
Transfer From Drainage Fund	3,000	0	3,000
Transfer From Planning Fund	0	2,800	2,800
Sale of Publications	100	0	100
PRT Admin Fees	670	0	670
Miscellaneous	100	0	100
CETA Reimbursement	20,295	0	20,295
<b>TOTAL RESOURCES</b>	<u>1,215,035</u>	<u>39,889</u>	<u>1,254,924</u>

<b>Requirements:</b>			
Personal Services	201,879	(5,623)	196,256
Materials & Services	252,565	0	252,565
Capital Outlay	3,110	0	3,110
Contingency	57,202	(8,840)	48,362
Transfer To Gen Fund	41,893	5,623	47,516
Transfer To S W Debt Serv	422,210	0	422,210
Unappropriated Balance	233,516	0	233,516
Reserve for Vehicles	2,660	0	2,660
Transfer to S W Cap Imp Fund	0	47,729	47,729
<b>TOTAL REQUIREMENTS</b>	<u>1,215,035</u>	<u>39,889</u>	<u>1,254,924</u>

**Solid Waste Capital Improvement Fund**

<b>Resources:</b>			
Beginning Balance	1,275,000	0	1,275,000
DEQ Grant	3,417,300	0	3,417,300
DEQ Loan	5,998,700	0	5,998,700
Fed Grants	0	400,000	400,000
Transfer From S W Fund	0	47,729	47,729
Interest	186,000	0	186,000
<b>TOTAL RESOURCES</b>	<u>10,877,000</u>	<u>447,729</u>	<u>11,324,729</u>

<b>Requirements:</b>			
Transfer To S W Debt Serv Fund	186,000	0	186,000
Projects	10,691,000	447,729	11,138,729
<b>TOTAL REQUIREMENTS</b>	<u>10,877,000</u>	<u>447,729</u>	<u>11,324,729</u>

ORDINANCE NO. 79-70

TITLE AMENDING BUDGET ORDINANCE  
NO. 60 TO TRANSFER APPROPRIATIONS  
WITHIN FUNDS

DATE INTRODUCED 4/26/79

FIRST READING 4/26/79

SECOND READING 5/10/79

DATE ADOPTED \_\_\_\_\_

DATE EFFECTIVE \_\_\_\_\_

ROLLCALL

	Yes	No	Abst.
Burton			
Stuhr			
Williams			
Berkman			
Kirkpatrick			
Deines			
Rhodes			
Schedeen			
Miller			
Banzer			
Peterson			
Kafoury			

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

TO:           MSD Council  
FROM:         Executive Officer  
SUBJECT:      Prioritization of the Oregon City Bypass for New State  
              Matching Commitments

**BACKGROUND:** The Oregon City Bypass has long been considered one of the highest priority regional projects. A significant amount of federal funds (\$15,578,000 of Interstate Transfer Funds as of December 30, 1978) have been allocated to complete the Bypass. In addition, the Bypass project was designated by the CRAG Board as the third highest regional priority (behind the projects on Powell Boulevard/Front Avenue and the interchange between Hwy 217 and 72nd Avenue) to receive State Bond funds. Of the State Bond funds, nearly \$638,000 is reserved for use as matching funds on the Bypass.

The most recent cost estimate for the Bypass is \$13,850,000 (in 1979 dollars). This would inflate to \$16,290,000 (assuming 10 percent per year inflation and obligation of federal funds for right-of-way acquisition in FY 1980 and construction in FY 1980). Based on this cost estimate, \$2,444,000 is needed to match the federal funds supporting the Bypass project. This is some \$1,806,000 above the amount available from the sale of State Bonds.

Several policy-level discussions have recently focused on locating a source of funds to cover the matching fund deficit. The Oregon Department of Transportation is willing to recommend to the Oregon Transportation Commission that \$1,500,000 of the matching fund deficit come from state gas tax revenues if: (1) the state receives additional revenues from new sources for highway purposes, (2) the MSD Council designates the Oregon City Bypass as the highest regional project to receive new state matching fund commitments (beyond those to be pledged as part of the I-505 package), and (3) the necessary agreements concerning the realignment of the state highway system in Oregon City are entered into between ODOT and the affected local jurisdictions.

The MSD staff have inventoried all proposed projects having federal funding commitments to determine if there is a basis for establishing the Oregon City Bypass project as the highest regional priority to receive new state funding commitments. To date, 47 projects (listed on Attachment A) have received commitments of Interstate Transfer funds through construction (not counting projects where construction funds have already been obligated). This list does not include projects which were originally to be funded with Federal Aid Urban and Federal Aid Primary funds, but now will receive Interstate Transfer funding, because matching funds have already been committed for these projects.

Of the 47 projects, nine address major regional corridor problems (along the full extent of the corridor) by adding significant capacity to move people. Of these, three (Banfield Transitway, I-505 Alternative, Hwy. 212 between the I-205 and Hwy. 224) will have a state funding commitment as part of the I-505 package. The remaining six projects include: (1) the Westside Corridor Project, (2) the Oregon City Bypass, (3) the McLoughlin Corridor Project, (4) Hwy 212 East of Hwy 224, (5) selected regional projects to be funded as part of the MSD Reserve (to be defined), and (6) selected regional projects to be funded as part of the City Reserve (to be defined).

Of the six candidate priority regional projects, only one (the Oregon City Bypass) is in a position to use state matching funds in the near future. Project activities are far along on the Bypass project and additional state matching funds could well be used in the next year to year and a half. While federal funds have been reserved for projects in the other five categories, planning efforts have not progressed to a point of defining specific projects.

On the basis of the analysis described above, it is the opinion of the MSD staff that as the MSD Council has adequate justification for the designation of the Oregon City Bypass project as the first regional project to receive new state funding commitments. Recommendations to the Council on this designation will be considered by TPAC on May 8 and by JPACT on May 10.

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS: The approved MSD Budget covers staff planning activities involved in establishing priorities.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS: Prioritization of the Oregon City Bypass as the first priority project to receive new state matching funds commitments responds to the request of the ODOT. This designation is one of the steps required to bring about adequate matching funds for this project, thus allowing the project to proceed into construction.

ACTION REQUESTED: Adopt Resolution No. 79-46 subject to recommendation by TPAC and JPACT.

CWO:bc  
3452A  
0033A  
5/10/79



# Metropolitan Service District

527 SW Hall Portland, Oregon 97201 503/221-1646

## Memorandum

Date: May 4, 1979

To: Council of the Metropolitan Service District

From: Denton U. Kent, Chief Administrative Officer

Subject: Revision of Proposed FY 1980 Budget (Agenda Item 8.1)

I am sorry to inform you that the day after presentation of the proposed FY 1980 Budget to the Council, it was brought to my attention that there was an error in the revenue figures as they appeared in the Planning Fund section. In constructing the planning fund revenues, I misread a chart laying out funding for the Transportation Department. This caused a double counting of \$164,000 in revenue. As a result of this error, staff has worked to recast the general and planning funds (both funds are affected due to inter-fund transfers). Also, because of adjustments within transportation to reflect downward adjustments of overhead support service costs, an additional \$41,100 was adjusted out of transportation revenues. These reductions total \$205,100.\*\*

The attached fund summaries trace the changes that had to be made in order to balance the two funds.

The most significant change in the adjustment occurs in the contingency and salary adjustment components of the Planning Fund. As you will note on the planning fund sheet, a total of \$255,186 was shown in the original proposed budget for these accounts. As a result of the adjustments, the total for the combined previous accounts is \$100,656. This means that, if the Council made a decision to grant a 10% salary adjustment for all personnel for the entire year, the contingency fund would be exhausted. (This is the same situation as was previously proposed for the General Fund).

Since the Planning Fund will begin FY 1980 with a larger than normal beginning fund balance, the protection of a contingency to protect a FY 1981 beginning fund balance is very important.

\*\*This reduction is offset by a \$6,638 increase in EPA revenues. The net result of these changes in grant revenue indicated on the attached chart is \$198,462.

Budget Revision  
May 4, 1979

Page 2

If we had no prospects for improving that contingency situation during the FY 1980 budget year, I could not in good conscience recommend that MSD proceed with release of the proposed budget revision. However, prospects for improvement of the contingency fund are good. The staff feels that, after the audit of the FY 1979 financial transactions, the beginning fund balance will be greater than can currently be reflected. Also, the historic expenditure patterns show that from \$15,000 to \$20,000 per quarter of funds budgeted for salaries are not expended, due to turnover. Further, we expect to receive "bonus" 701 funds as a result of our successful Housing Opportunity Plan. These would be used to free up 100% local funds which are currently budgeted for the Goals and Objectives and the Market Level Housing programs included in the Planning Fund. Staff also feels that an aggressive fund investment program (which is contemplated to be implemented in FY 1980) will result in additional revenues of at least \$20,000. Finally, securing of any additional grants which could be conducted in line with programs currently proposed could provide additional revenue to the fund.

Considering these items, it is not unrealistic to conservatively assume that a minimum of \$100,000 in additional funding could be available for contingency by the end of FY 1980.

If the Council is of the opinion that a contingency amount greater than that shown for the General Fund and the Planning Fund is necessary prior to adoption of the FY 1980 Budget, it is requested that the Executive Officer be given a target figure that would be acceptable to the Council. The Executive Officer and staff would then prepare recommended program cuts to reduce expenditures, thereby creating a larger contingency fund.

Regardless of the approach taken, it is recommended that the Council take action at the meeting of May 10 to release the proposed revision for TSCC review and hearing.

If the Council is satisfied with accumulating an unappropriated cash balance to carry into next year, no additional

Budget Revision  
May 4, 1979

Page 3

action is required. If the Council wants to establish a contingency to be used to fund unexpected expenditures during the year, additional cuts will be required to appropriate a larger contingency.

One other budget item should be brought to your attention. The budgeting of pass through funds was discussed briefly at the April 26 Council meeting. It is the recommendation of the Executive Officer that two additional funds be established in the MSD budget - the Transportation Assistance Fund and the Criminal Justice Assistance Fund. These funds would appear in the officially adopted MSD budget, thereby providing full public disclosure of the "pass through" grants handled by the agency.

In closing, I am most distressed that I made an error which, at this late date in the budget process, has severely complicated the Council's decision on the proposed FY 1980 Budget. To say that I am sorry does not adequately express my feelings.

DUK:mec

39,40

cc: Budget Task Force

Council and Executive Management  
General Fund Summary

Revenues		<u>Adjustment</u>	<u>Balance</u>
Net Working Capital	525	0	525
Dues	538,132	0	538,132
Transfers for Support Services			
from Planning	607,541		
from Zoo	221,267		
from Solid Waste	<u>129,998</u>		
Subtotal	958,806	0	958,806
Transfers from Local Government and Community Involvement			
from Planning	136,939	(18,932)	
from Solid Waste	<u>14,000</u>		
Subtotal	150,939		132,007
CETA Grant	<u>13,600</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>13,600</u>
Total Revenues	1,662,002	(18,932)	1,643,070
Expenses			
Council	58,851	0	58,851
Executive Management	539,450	(10,000)	529,450
Management Support Services	835,834	(13,000)	822,834
Grant Match Transfer to Planning	139,858	12,900	152,758
Salary Adjustment Contingency	<u>88,004</u>	<u>(8,837)</u>	<u>79,177</u>
Total Expense	1,662,002	(18,932)	1,643,070

PLANNING

Planning Fund Revenues

		Change	Result
Beginning Fund Balance	340,000		0 340,000
Grants			
DHUD	106,000	0	106,000
EPA-Water	122,294	6,638	128,932
EPA-Air	264,915	0	264,915
DLCD (est.)	100,000	0	100,000
LEAA			
Planning	100,000	0	100,000
Juvenile Justice	23,674		23,674
Coordination	30,000		30,000
Urban Mass Transportation	130,000	(26,000)	104,000
ODOT-Planning Funds	150,000	(30,000)	120,000
Interstate Transfer Funds	242,000	(44,900)	197,100
Transition Quarter Funds	361,000	(104,200)	256,800
EDA Economic Development	100,000	0	100,000
Sub-total	1,729,883	(198,462)	1,531,421
Transfer from General Fund for Match	139,858	12,900	152,758
Revenue from other jurisdictions for planning services			
City of Portland		10,000	10,000
Clark County Regional Planning Council	55,000	0	55,000
Oregon Department of Transportation	66,000	(3,900)	62,100
Tri-Met	46,200	6,000	52,200
Combined Local Jurisdictions- Johnson Creek	<u>100,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>100,000</u>
TOTAL REVENUES	2,476,941	(173,462)	2,303,479

Planning Fund Expenditures

	<u>Proposed</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Result</u>
Public Facilities			
Direct Services	484,933	0	484,933
Support Services	77,765	23,087	100,852
Local Government			
Community Involvement	<u>16,239</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>16,277</u>
Total	578,937	23,125	602,062
Metro. Development			
Direct Services	484,818	0	484,818
Support Services	256,990	(5,468)	251,522
Local Government			
Community Involvement	<u>70,687</u>	<u>(21,901)</u>	<u>48,786</u>
Total	812,495	(27,369)	785,126
Transportation			
Direct Services	507,524	0	507,524
Support Services	272,786	(17,619)	255,167
Local Government			
Community Involvement	<u>50,013</u>	<u>2,931</u>	<u>52,944</u>
Total	830,323	(14,688)	815,635
Contingency	<u>255,186</u>	<u>(154,530)</u>	<u>100,656</u>
Fund Total	2,476,941	(173,462)	2,303,479
<u>Drainage Fund Reviews</u>			
Local Agency	3,400	0	3,400
<u>Drainage Fund Expenditures</u>			
Public Facilities	<u>3,400</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3,400</u>
Total Planning Program	2,480,341	173,462	2,306,879

Resolution No. 79-47

Transmitting FY 1980 Budget to Tax  
Supervisory and Conservation Commission

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE  
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF	)	
TRANSMITTING FY 1980	)	Resolution No. 79-47
BUDGET TO TAX SUPERVISORY	)	At the request of
AND CONSERVATION COMMISSION	)	Rick Gustafson

WHEREAS, The Council Ways and Means Committee of the Metropolitan Service District formed a Budget Task Force for the purpose of reviewing and discussing the FY 1980 Budget proposals provided by the Executive Officer and staff, and

WHEREAS, The Budget Task Force found the proposed budget to be balanced without requiring an increase in taxes, assessments or fees in FY 1980, and

WHEREAS, The Budget Task Force, after several meetings found the budget proposals to be in order and was unanimous in its support of the proposed FY 1980 Budget, and

WHEREAS, The FY 1980 Budget was presented to the Council at the meeting of April 26, 1980, and

WHEREAS, Pursuant to Oregon Budget Law, the FY 1980 Budget must be transmitted to the Tax Supervisory and Conservation Commission (TSCC) for public hearing and review; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

(1) That the FY 1980 Budget, which is on file in the MSD offices, is hereby approved for submission to the TSCC.



(2) That the Executive Officer is hereby directed to submit the FY 1980 Budget to the TSCC for public hearing and review.

ADOPTED By the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this 10th day of May, 1979.

Presiding Officer

DUK:bc  
3482A  
0033A

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

TO:           MSD Council  
FROM:         Executive Officer  
SUBJECT:      Prioritization of the Oregon City Bypass for New State  
              Matching Commitments

**BACKGROUND:** The Oregon City Bypass has long been considered one of the highest priority regional projects. A significant amount of federal funds (\$15,578,000 of Interstate Transfer Funds as of December 30, 1978) have been allocated to complete the Bypass. In addition, the Bypass project was designated by the CRAG Board as the third highest regional priority (behind the projects on Powell Boulevard/Front Avenue and the interchange between Hwy 217 and 72nd Avenue) to receive State Bond funds. Of the State Bond funds, nearly \$638,000 is reserved for use as matching funds on the Bypass.

The most recent cost estimate for the Bypass is \$13,850,000 (in 1979 dollars). This would inflate to \$16,290,000 (assuming 10 percent per year inflation and obligation of federal funds for right-of-way acquisition in FY 1980 and construction in FY 1980). Based on this cost estimate, \$2,444,000 is needed to match the federal funds supporting the Bypass project. This is some \$1,806,000 above the amount available from the sale of State Bonds.

Several policy-level discussions have recently focused on locating a source of funds to cover the matching fund deficit. The Oregon Department of Transportation is willing to recommend to the Oregon Transportation Commission that \$1,500,000 of the matching fund deficit come from state gas tax revenues if: (1) the state receives additional revenues from new sources for highway purposes, (2) the MSD Council designates the Oregon City Bypass as the highest regional project to receive new state matching fund commitments (beyond those to be pledged as part of the I-505 package), and (3) the necessary agreements concerning the realignment of the state highway system in Oregon City are entered into between ODOT and the affected local jurisdictions.

The MSD staff have inventoried all proposed projects having federal funding commitments to determine if there is a basis for establishing the Oregon City Bypass project as the highest regional priority to receive new state funding commitments. To date, 47 projects (listed on Attachment A) have received commitments of Interstate Transfer funds through construction (not counting projects where construction funds have already been obligated). This list does not include projects which were originally to be funded with Federal Aid Urban and Federal Aid Primary funds, but now will receive Interstate Transfer funding, because matching funds have already been committed for these projects.

Of the 47 projects, nine address major regional corridor problems (along the full extent of the corridor) by adding significant capacity to move people. Of these, three (Banfield Transitway, I-505 Alternative, Hwy. 212 between the I-205 and Hwy. 224) will have a state funding commitment as part of the I-505 package. The remaining six projects include: (1) the Westside Corridor Project, (2) the Oregon City Bypass, (3) the McLoughlin Corridor Project, (4) Hwy 212 East of Hwy 224, (5) selected regional projects to be funded as part of the MSD Reserve (to be defined), and (6) selected regional projects to be funded as part of the City Reserve (to be defined).

Of the six candidate priority regional projects, only one (the Oregon City Bypass) is in a position to use state matching funds in the near future. Project activities are far along on the Bypass project and additional state matching funds could well be used in the next year to year and a half. While federal funds have been reserved for projects in the other five categories, planning efforts have not progressed to a point of defining specific projects.

On the basis of the analysis described above, it is the opinion of the MSD staff that as the MSD Council has adequate justification for the designation of the Oregon City Bypass project as the highest priority regional project to receive new state funding commitments. Recommendations to the Council on this designation will be considered by TPAC on May 8 and by JPACT on May 10.

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS: The approved MSD Budget covers staff planning activities involved in establishing priorities.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS: Prioritization of the Oregon City Bypass as the highest regional priority project to receive new state matching funds commitments responds to the request of the ODOT. This designation is one of the steps required to bring about adequate matching funds for this project, thus allowing the project to proceed into construction.

ACTION REQUESTED: Adopt Resolution No. 79-46 subject to recommendation by TPAC and JPACT.

CWO:bc  
3452A  
0033A  
5/10/79

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE  
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF )  
PRIORITIZING THE OREGON CITY )  
BYPASS AS THE HIGHEST )  
PRIORITY REGIONAL PROJECT )  
TO RECEIVE NEW STATE MATCHING )  
FUND COMMITMENT .

Resolution No. 79-46  
At the request of  
Rick Gustafson

WHEREAS, Preliminary engineering on the Oregon City Bypass Project is proceeding with a final public hearing scheduled for July, 1979; and

WHEREAS, Significant Mt. Hood Interstate Transfer funds have been reserved for right-of-way acquisition and construction of the Oregon City Bypass project; and

WHEREAS, Nearly \$638,000 in State Bond funds have been reserved to match the Oregon City Bypass project; and

WHEREAS, The reserved State Bond funds are not sufficient to match the Interstate Transfer funds necessary for the accomplishment of this project; and

WHEREAS, the Oregon Department of Transportation is willing to recommend that additional state funds be authorized for use as matching funds to construct the Oregon City Bypass if (1) the Metropolitan Service District Council designates the Bypass as the highest priority regional project to receive new state funding commitments, and (2) the state receives additional revenues from new sources for highway purposes, and (3) the necessary agreements concerning the realignment of the state highway system in Oregon City are entered into between ODOT and the affected local jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS, MSD staff has evaluated all projects allocated from Mt. Hood and I-505 Interstate Transfer funds through construction for the purpose of determining regional priorities as set forth in Exhibit "A"; and

WHEREAS, of the projects having federal funding commitments but no state matching commitments, six involve the addition of significant people-moving capacity along the extent of major regional corridors and are therefore candidates for designation as priority regional projects to receive state funding commitments; and

WHEREAS, Of the six projects appearing to be candidates as priority regional projects to receive new state funding commitments, only the Oregon City Bypass is in a position to use state matching funds in the near-term future; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, That the MSD Council hereby designates the Oregon City Bypass project as the highest priority regional project to receive new state funding commitments.

ADOPTED By the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this 10th day of May, 1979.

---

Presiding Officer

CWO:bc  
3453A  
0033A

EXHIBIT "A"

Ongoing Projects Having Mt. Hood or I-505  
Interstate Transfer Funds Allocated or  
Reserved Through Construction.

Adds Significant Capacity  
to Move People Over the  
the Full Extent of a Major  
Major Transp. Corridor

Banfield Transitway	Yes	
Westside Corridor	Yes	
Powell Blvd-Bridge to I-205	No	
McLoughlin Blvd Underpass	No	
Grand Avenue at Morrison	No	
33rd at Broadway	No	
39th Avenue Improvement	No	
39th at Stark	No	
Curb Extension Program	No	
Curb Corner Modification Program	No	
Actuated Signals	No	
Signal Modification and Replacement	No	
McLoughlin/Milwaukie Connection	No	
SE Division Corridor	No	
Transit Street Improvements	No	
39th Avenue Corridor Improvement	No	
Union Avenue Improvement	No	
Basin/Going Interchange	No	
Greeley to I-5	No	
Macadam Avenue Project	No	
Sellwood Bridge Construction	No	
221st/223rd Improvement	No	
Boones Ferry Road	No	
Oregon City Bypass	Yes	
TV Highway at 185th	No	
Hwy 217/72nd Avenue Interchange	No	
238th Avenue Improvement	No	
Fairview Avenue Signalization	No	
Pacific Hwy TSM Project	No	
Canyon/TV Hwy TSM Project	No	
Farmington Road Corridor TSM Project	No	
Hall Blvd Corridor TSM Project	No	
Cedar Hills at Walker Road TSM Project	No	
NW Couplet TSM Program	No	
Beaverton-Hillsdale Hwy TSM Project	No	
Sandy Blvd Corridor TSM Project	No	
State Street Corridor TSM Project	No	
Gladstone/Milwaukie TSM Project	No	
McLoughlin Corridor	Yes	
Hwy 212-East of Hwy 224	Yes	
Regional Transit and Highway Projects Outside the City of Portland	Yes	(selected projects)

Alternative to I-505	Yes	
NW Portland Improvements	No	
Hwy 217/Sunset Interchange	No	
190th/Powell Interchange	No	
Hwy 212-I-205 to Hwy 224	Yes	
Regional Transit and Highway Projects within the City of Portland	Yes	(selected projects)

CWO:bc  
3454A  
0033A

MSD COUNCIL  
ROLL CALL ROSTER

AGENDA ITEM

MEETING DATE

Rollcall

5-10-79

	<u>AYE</u>	<u>NAY</u>
<u>DISTRICT 11</u> Marge Kafoury	<u>X</u>	<u><del>X</del></u>
<u>DISTRICT 12</u> Mike Burton	<u>X</u>	<u>_____</u>
<u>DISTRICT 1</u> Donna Stuhr	<u>X</u>	<u>_____</u>
<u>DISTRICT 2</u> Charles Williamson	<u>X</u>	<u>_____</u>
<u>DISTRICT 3</u> Craig Berkman	<u>X</u>	<u>_____</u>
<u>DISTRICT 4</u> Corky Kirkpatrick	<u>_____</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>DISTRICT 5</u> Jack Deines	<u>X</u>	<u>_____</u>
<u>DISTRICT 6</u> Jane Rhodes	<u>X</u>	<u>_____</u>
<u>DISTRICT 7</u> Betty Schedeen	<u>_____</u>	<u><del>X</del></u>
<u>DISTRICT 8</u> Caroline Miller	<u>X</u>	<u>_____</u>
<u>DISTRICT 9</u> Cindy Banzer	<u>X</u>	<u>_____</u>
<u>DISTRICT 10</u> Gene Peterson	<u>X</u>	<u>_____</u>
Total		