

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE JPACTDATE 4/9/81 — 7:30 am

	NAME	AFFILIATION
	<i>Claudia Brown</i> / BOB BALLANTYNE	KPTV
✓	Ron Baker	KYXI
✓ M	LARRY COLE	CITY OF BEAVERTON
✓ M	Bob Bothman	ODOT
✓ M	Dick Pokorniewski	Vancouver City Council
✓ M	AL MYERS	MAYOR OF GRESHAM
✓ M	JOHN FRENING	TRI-MET
✓ M	Vern Veysey	Clark County
✓ M	ED FERGUSON	WSDOT
✓ M	ROBIN LINDQUIST	CITY OF GLADSTONE
✓ M	ERNE BONNER	METRO
✓ M	Charlie Williamson	"
✓ M	Walter Schuch	City of Portland
✓ M	Jim Tucker	Washington County
G	John Price	FHWA
G	Steve Dotterer	City of Portland
G	Bebe Rucker	Mult. County
G	Dave Peach	WDOT
G	Winston Kurth	Clackamas County
G	Gil Mallory	Clark Co. RPD
G	Sarah Salazar	Port of Portland
G	Anne Sylvester	Clark County RPD
G	John Rosenberger	

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE JPAC

DATE 4/9/81

NAME

AFFILIATION

Dave Hill

City of Portland

Elton Chang

Paul Bay

Tri-Met

James Kuttner

City of Portland

Lee Harnes

Tri-Met

A. Cotugno

Metro

R. Gustafson

"

K. Lawton

"

B. Petbi's

"

K. Thackston

"

L. Kaplan

"

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

TO: JPACT  
FROM: Executive Officer  
SUBJECT: Authorizing Federal Funds for 16(b)(2) Special  
Transportation Projects

### I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend Council adoption of the attached Resolution which would authorize \$223,440 of Federal 16(b)(2) funds to support the purchase of eight (8) lift equipped vehicles and related equipment to provide special transportation services in the Metro region.
- B. POLICY IMPACT: This action is consistent with the adopted Interim Regional Special Transportation Plan.
- C. BUDGET IMPACT: The approved Metro budget includes funds to monitor federal funding commitments.

### II. ANALYSIS:

- A. BACKGROUND: Section 16(b)(2) authorizes the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) to make capital grants to private, nonprofit organizations to provide transportation services for elderly and handicapped persons. Capital investments include purchase of conventional and paratransit vehicles and other equipment associated with providing local and regional (non-intercity) transportation services to the elderly and handicapped. Apportioned 16(b)(2) funds are not available for operating expenses. Transportation Improvement Programs and their Annual Elements must be amended to include new 16(b)(2) projects.

The adopted Interim Special Transportation Plan, in part, established plan objectives, service priorities and implementation strategies to be used in the regional evaluation of candidate 16(b)(2) applications. The Metro Council makes recommendations regarding the applications to the Oregon Department of Transportation based on these policies. Local providers have submitted two applications for the use of federal funds. The staff analysis concludes that these projects are consistent with the Interim Special Transportation Plan:



## Project 1

Applicant: Special Mobility Services, Inc.

Project Description: Special Mobility Services requests UMTA 16(b)(2) capital assistance to purchase five mini-buses (all lift equipped) and five mobile radios for special transportation services in Multnomah County. This project would constitute a portion of the region's special effort. This application is coordinated with Tri-Met.

<u>Project Cost:</u>	UMTA 16(b)(2)	\$139,650
	Local (20%)	<u>34,913</u>
	Total	\$174,563

## Project 2

Applicant: Special Mobility Services, Inc.

Project Description: Special Mobility Services requests UMTA 16(b)(2) capital assistance to purchase three mini-buses (all lift equipped) and three mobile radios for special transportation services in Washington County. This project would constitute a portion of the region's special effort. This application is coordinated with Tri-Met.

<u>Project Cost:</u>	UMTA 16(b)(2)	\$ 83,790
	Local (20%)	<u>20,948</u>
	Total	\$104,738

- B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: Inasmuch as these are nonduplicative services, the alternative would be to provide no special transportation services in these areas. This alternative is not acceptable.
- C. CONCLUSION: Based on Metro staff analysis, it is recommended that the attached Resolution funding the projects be approved.

BP:gl  
2881B/214



FOR THE PURPOSE OF AUTHORIZING       )  
FEDERAL FUNDS FOR 16(b)(2)       )  
SPECIAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS       )

WHEREAS, The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) has requested the Council to make recommendations regarding the allocation of Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) 16(b)(2) funds in the Metro region; and

WHEREAS, To comply with federal requirements the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) must be amended to include projects recommended for UMTA 16(b)(2) funds; and

WHEREAS, The adopted Interim Special Transportation Plan established regional policies and criteria for purposes of evaluating UMTA 16(b)(2) applications; and

WHEREAS, Local providers have submitted two projects for funding authorization involving \$223,440 in Federal 16(b)(2) funds; and

WHEREAS, The projects described in Attachments A and B were reviewed and found consistent with federal requirements and regional policies and objectives; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That \$223,440 of Federal 16(b)(2) funds be authorized for the purchase of special transportation vehicles and related equipment for the two projects.

2. That the TIP and its Annual Element be amended to reflect this authorization as set forth in the Attachments.

3. That the Metro Council finds the projects to be in accordance with the region's continuing, cooperative, comprehensive planning process and, hereby, gives affirmative A-95 Review approval.

# PROJECT INFORMATION FORM - TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

PORTLAND  
METROPOLITAN AREA

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

RESPONSIBILITY (AGENCY) Multnomah County Special Mobility  
LIMITS N/A LENGTH N/A  
DESCRIPTION Purchase of 5 mini-bus passenger vehicles and  
related equipment consisting of 5 wheelchair lifts and  
5 mobile radios.

PROJECT NAME Multnomah County  
Special Mobility Services  
ID No \_\_\_\_\_  
APPLICANT Special Mobility  
Services

## SCHEDULE

TO ODOT \_\_\_\_\_  
PE OK'D \_\_\_\_\_ EIS OK'D \_\_\_\_\_  
CAT'Y \_\_\_\_\_ BID LET \_\_\_\_\_  
HEARING \_\_\_\_\_ COMPL'T \_\_\_\_\_

RELATIONSHIP TO ADOPTED TRANSPORTATION PLAN  
LONG RANGE ELEMENT \_\_\_\_\_ TSM ELEMENT X

## FUNDING PLAN BY FISCAL YEAR

	FY 80	FY 81	FY 82	FY 83	FY 84	TOTAL
TOTAL		174,563				174,563
FEDERAL		139,650				139,650
STATE						
LOCAL		34,913				34,913

## APPLICANT'S ESTIMATE OF TOTAL PROJECT COST

PRELIM ENGINEERING \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
CONSTRUCTION \_\_\_\_\_  
RIGHT OF WAY \_\_\_\_\_  
TRAFFIC CONTROL \_\_\_\_\_  
ILLUMIN, SIGNS, \_\_\_\_\_  
LANDSCAPING, ETC \_\_\_\_\_  
STRUCTURES \_\_\_\_\_  
RAILROAD CROSSINGS \_\_\_\_\_

Capital Equip. 174,563  
TOTAL \$ 174,563

## LOCATION MAP

## SOURCE OF FUNDS (%)

### FEDERAL

FAUS (PORTLAND) \_\_\_\_\_  
FAUS (OREGON REGION) \_\_\_\_\_  
FAUS (WASH REGION) \_\_\_\_\_  
UMTA CAPITAL \_\_\_\_\_ UMTA OPRTG \_\_\_\_\_  
INTERSTATE \_\_\_\_\_  
FED AID PRIMARY \_\_\_\_\_  
INTERSTATE \_\_\_\_\_  
SUBSTITUTION \_\_\_\_\_  
16(b)(2) 80

### NON FEDERAL

STATE \_\_\_\_\_ LOCAL 20

# PROJECT INFORMATION FORM - TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

PORTLAND  
METROPOLITAN AREA

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

RESPONSIBILITY (AGENCY) Washington County Special Mobility  
LIMITS N/A LENGTH N/A  
DESCRIPTION Purchase of 3 mini-bus passenger vehicles and  
related equipment consisting of 3 wheelchair lifts and  
3 mobile radios.

PROJECT NAME Washington County  
Special Mobility Services

ID No \_\_\_\_\_  
APPLICANT Special Mobility  
Services

## SCHEDULE

TO ODOT \_\_\_\_\_  
PE OK'D \_\_\_\_\_ EIS OK'D \_\_\_\_\_  
CAT'Y \_\_\_\_\_ BID LET \_\_\_\_\_  
HEARING \_\_\_\_\_ COMPL'T \_\_\_\_\_

RELATIONSHIP TO ADOPTED TRANSPORTATION PLAN  
LONG RANGE ELEMENT \_\_\_\_\_ TSM ELEMENT X

## APPLICANT'S ESTIMATE OF TOTAL PROJECT COST

PRELIM ENGINEERING \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
CONSTRUCTION \_\_\_\_\_  
RIGHT OF WAY \_\_\_\_\_  
TRAFFIC CONTROL \_\_\_\_\_  
ILLUMIN, SIGNS, \_\_\_\_\_  
LANDSCAPING, ETC \_\_\_\_\_  
STRUCTURES \_\_\_\_\_  
RAILROAD CROSSINGS \_\_\_\_\_

Capital Equip. 104,738  
TOTAL \$ 104,738

## FUNDING PLAN BY FISCAL YEAR

	FY 80	FY 81	FY 82	FY 83	FY 84	TOTAL
TOTAL		104,738				104,738
FEDERAL		83,790				83,790
STATE						
LOCAL		20,948				20,948

## LOCATION MAP

## SOURCE OF FUNDS (%)

### FEDERAL

FAUS (PORTLAND) \_\_\_\_\_  
FAUS (OREGON REGION) \_\_\_\_\_  
FAUS (WASH REGION) \_\_\_\_\_  
UMTA CAPITAL \_\_\_\_\_ UMTA OPRTG \_\_\_\_\_  
INTERSTATE \_\_\_\_\_  
FED AID PRIMARY \_\_\_\_\_  
INTERSTATE \_\_\_\_\_  
SUBSTITUTION \_\_\_\_\_  
16(b) (2) 80

### NON FEDERAL

STATE \_\_\_\_\_ LOCAL 20



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

TO: JPACT  
FROM: Executive Officer  
SUBJECT: Approving the FY 1982 Unified Work Program (UWP)

### I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. ACTION REQUESTED: Approve the UWP containing the transportation planning work program for FY 1982. Authorize the submittal of grant applications to the appropriate funding agencies.
- B. POLICY IMPACT: Approval will mean that grants can be submitted and contracts executed so work can commence on July 1, 1981 in accordance with established Metro priorities.
- C. BUDGET IMPACT: The UWP matches the projects and studies reflected in the proposed Metro budget to be submitted to the Tax Supervisory and Conservation Commission.

### II. ANALYSIS:

- A. BACKGROUND: The FY 1982 UWP describes the transportation/air quality planning activities to be carried out in the Portland/Vancouver metropolitan region during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1981. Included in the document are federally funded studies to be conducted by Metro, Clark County Regional Planning Council (RPC), Tri-Met, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and local jurisdictions.

The Oregon portion of the UWP is divided into six major categories for FY 82:

Regional Transportation Plan - Long-Range Element -- focuses on studies which will provide policies setting the direction for the transportation system, projections of long-range travel demands and deficiencies in the system and identify capital and service improvements to the system.

Regional Transportation Plan - Short-Range Element -- studies to identify capital and service improvements to serve travel demands over the next five years, including air quality improvement actions and energy contingency plans.

Corridor Refinement Studies -- include studies necessary for implementation of proposed corridor transit improvements along the Banfield, Westside and McLoughlin corridors.

Transportation Improvement Program -- coordinates projects and programs of regionwide transportation improvements.

Technical Assistance -- allows Metro staff to respond to jurisdictional requests for data and special analysis.

Coordination and Management -- provides overall management to support the UWP and compliance with federal requirements.

- B. **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:** The alternative of not conducting the various studies was considered and rejected because of critical nature of issues to be addressed in solving the region's transportation problems.
- C. **CONCLUSION:** Adoption of the resolution will ensure application for federal funds will be made in a timely manner so as to continue transportation projects in FY 82.

KT:gl  
2842B/214

FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING THE     )  
FY 1982 UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM (UWP) )

WHEREAS, The Unified Work Program (UWP) describes all federally-funded transportation/air quality planning activities for the Portland/Vancouver metropolitan area to be conducted in FY 1982; and

WHEREAS, The FY 82 UWP indicates federal funding sources for transportation/air quality planning activities carried out by Metro, Clark County Regional Planning Council (RPC), the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), Tri-Met and the local jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS, The FY 82 UWP contains an agreement on interagency responsibilities between ODOT, Tri-Met and Metro; and

WHEREAS, Approval of the FY 82 UWP is required to receive federal transportation planning funds; and

WHEREAS, The FY 82 UWP is consistent with the proposed Metro budget submitted to the Tax Supervisory and Conservation Commission; and

WHEREAS, The FY 82 UWP has been reviewed and agreed to by the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT); now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the FY 82 UWP is hereby approved.
2. That the FY 82 UWP is consistent with the continuing, cooperative and comprehensive planning process and is hereby given positive A-95 Review action.



3. That the Metro Executive Officer is authorized to apply for, accept and execute grants and agreements specified in the UWP including the Metro/ODOT/Tri-Met Interagency Agreement.

KT:gl

2841B/214

COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT ON DUTIES  
AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT,  
OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
AND TRI-COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT OF OREGON  
IN PARTICIPATING IN THE METRO TRANSPORTATION  
PLANNING PROGRAM

THIS AGREEMENT made and entered into this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 1981, by and between the STATE OF OREGON, by and through its DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (ODOT), hereinafter called "STATE"; the TRI-COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT of OREGON, a public transit agency, acting by and through its Board of Directors, hereinafter called "TRI-MET," and the METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT, hereinafter called "METRO":

1. METRO is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) designated by the Governor of Oregon as the agency responsible for cooperative regional transportation planning pursuant to Section 134 of Title 23, U.S.C. and Sections 1601, et. seq. of Title 49 U.S.C. for the larger area of the Portland Area Urban Growth Boundary and the Federal Aid Urban Boundary. For the Metropolitan Service District boundary, METRO is also the regional planning district under the provisions of ORS Chapter 268.
2. METRO is eligible to receive Metropolitan Planning funds (PL) as authorized under title 23 U.S.C. Section 104 (f) for the continuing transportation planning process in the Portland metropolitan area.
3. METRO is the eligible recipient of funds authorized by Section 8 of Title 49 U.S.C. Urban Mass Transportation Act for the continuing transportation planning process and coordinated support activities.
4. TRI-MET is the transit agency for the Oregon portion of the Metro planning area under the provisions of ORS Chapter 267 and is the principal public transit operator eligible for Section 8 Coordinated Support funding through METRO for participation in the region's transportation planning process pursuant to State and federal law.
5. The ODOT is the statewide transportation planning and policy development agency under the provisions of ORS 184.610 to 184.640 and is the designated Oregon State agency under Title 23 U.S.C. 134 responsible for the cooperative transportation planning process in the Portland metropolitan area.

6. The STATE has funds available, in part from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to support Metro and to participate in the transportation planning process.
7. METRO, STATE and TRI-MET propose to continue to cooperatively conduct a continuing, comprehensive transportation planning process in the Portland metropolitan area as defined and mutually agreed to in each year's Unified Work Program (UWP).

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual responsibilities of the parties described herein below, it is agreed as follows:

#### ARTICLE I DUTIES OF THE PARTIES

- A. It is agreed that METRO is the lead transportation systems planning agency, and that TRI-MET and STATE will assign resources at their own expense to accomplish work mutually agreed upon in the annual UWP and that results such as reports, technical memoranda and data from tasks completed will be made available through METRO as part of the Metro Systems Planning Process. A Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) will be prepared using a process involving the public and in compliance with the State's Action Plan. The RTP is to contain a long-range element, special transportation element (describing actions to respond to the mobility needs of the elderly and handicapped) and a short-range element. The TIP will include an Annual Element. Both the RTP and TIP will conform to the State Air Quality Implementation Plan.
- B. It is agreed that the METRO Systems Planning Process will provide mutually agreed-upon products to be supportive of STATE and TRI-MET project development and operating responsibilities under both UMTA and FHWA regulations.
- C. It is agreed that it is the STATE'S intention to continue to participate in local match support for the FHWA Metropolitan Planning funds (PL) designated to METRO, as mutually determined by the parties to this agreement, for funding the annual UWP.
- D. It is agreed that it is TRI-MET'S intention to continue to participate in the local match support for federal (either from the FHWA or the UMTA) planning funds as mutually determined by the parties to this Agreement for funding the annual UWP.
- E. It is agreed that it is METRO'S intention to continue to have local jurisdiction service charges allocated to support the transportation program and continue to cooperatively work to finance TRI-MET'S Coordinated Support Planning with UMTA Section 8 funds as determined in the annual UWP.



ARTICLE II  
AMENDMENTS

This Agreement may be amended only by written agreement of all parties hereto.

ARTICLE III  
TERMINATION

In addition to any other remedy or right to withhold performance which may be provided by law, any party hereto may terminate this Agreement upon six (6) months written notice to all other parties in the event that local or federal funds, by which the activities set forth in the UWP are to be funded, are, in whole or in part, discontinued, withdrawn or suspended to a degree which renders that party substantially unable to proceed with performance hereunder.

Those provisions of State law required to be included in this Agreement are by this reference fully incorporated as if fully set forth herein.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, STATE, METRO AND TRI-MET have caused this Agreement to be executed in their respective names by their authorized representatives, all as of the date hereinabove first written.

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

By: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

TRI-COUNTY METROPOLITAN DISTRICT OF OREGON

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

KT/ga  
2092B/211A

## AGENDA MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

TO: JPACT  
FROM: Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee  
SUBJECT: Approval of 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.
- 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.



FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING THE )  
PROCESS AND GUIDELINES FOR )  
DEVELOPMENT OF THE TEN-YEAR INTER- )  
STATE TRANSFER PROGRAM )

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.

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.

- The projects, by category, are shown in Figure 1.
3. 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 . . . . .	*
	<hr/>
	\$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
	<hr/>
	\$ 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