

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: Amending the Interim Transportation Plan (ITP), The Functional Classification System, and the Federal Aid Urban System (FAUS)

I. RECOMMENDATIONS

- A. ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend Council adoption of the attached resolution amending the ITP and making the Functional Classification and Federal Aid Route Number of Highway 123 consistent with its alignment.
- B. POLICY IMPACT: This action will change the Functional Classification and Federal Aid Designation of certain streets in the St. Johns area requested by the City of Portland and Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT):
- Remove the FAU designation from N. Lombard St. between St. Louis and Richmond and from N. Philadelphia St. between Lombard and Ivanhoe, since they now function as a neighborhood collector.
 - Add as minor arterials, N. Richmond Avenue between Lombard and Ivanhoe; N. Ivanhoe St. between Richmond and Philadelphia. Also add as minor arterials, N. St. Louis and Philadelphia to complete the link between Lombard and Philadelphia as FAU 9956 and the designated truck route.
- C. BUDGET IMPACT: None.

II. ANALYSIS:

- A. BACKGROUND: The US 30 Bypass has been relocated to pass around rather than through the St. Johns Business District. This relocation was accomplished by the Portland Development Commission (PDC) and the Oregon State Highway Division through the use of special signing, signals and traffic diverters. This diversion was made so that mall type amenities could be constructed to encourage development of a pedestrian-oriented retail core.

As a result of this relocation, changes to the Functional Classification and Federal Aid Designation should be made as shown in Exhibit A.

- B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: Retain the existing classifications and designations. This would defeat the purpose of rerouting the Bypass, be inconsistent with actual traffic flow pattern, and make those streets under heavy traffic use ineligible for federal funding.
- C. CONCLUSION: Staff recommends adoption of the attached resolution based on the functions now being performed by the facilities and on the City of Portland's Arterial Street Classification Policy.

KT/jmk
2233B/214

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING)
THE INTERIM TRANSPORTATION)
PLAN (ITP), THE FUNCTIONAL)
CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM, AND)
THE FEDERAL AID URBAN SYSTEM)
(FAUS)

WHEREAS, The City of Portland and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) have formally requested that certain streets in the St. Johns Business District be reclassified and redesignated; and

WHEREAS, These requested changes have been brought about by the US 30 Bypass being relocated to pass around rather than through the St. Johns Business District; and

WHEREAS, This relocation was accomplished by the Portland Development Commission (PDC) and ODOT through use of special signing, signals and traffic diverters; and

WHEREAS, This diversion was made so that mall type amenities could be constructed to encourage development of pedestrian oriented retail core; and

WHEREAS, Staff analysis indicates that the proposed changes are consistent with the functions served and with the City of Portland's Arterial Street Classification Policies; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council amend the ITP to incorporate Exhibit A.
2. That the Metro Council amend the Functional Classification System to:

- a. Establish N. Lombard Street between St. Louis and Richmond as a local service street.
- b. Reclassify Ivanhoe St. between St. Louis and Richmond as a minor arterial.
- c. Reclassify St. Louis and Richmond St. segments between Lombard and Ivanhoe as minor arterials.

3. That Federal Aid Route numbers be assigned in accordance with Exhibit A.

4. That Metro staff be directed to coordinate the amendment with the Oregon Department of Transportation.

AC/BP/jmk

2233B/214

st. johns business district

AGENDA MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

TO: JPACT
FROM: TPAC
SUBJECT: Endorsing the 221st/223rd Project as a High Priority for any Remaining FY 81 Interstate Transfer Funds

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend Council adoption of the attached resolution endorsing the 221st/223rd Project as a high priority for any FY 81 Interstate Transfer funds which may become available in addition to, or as a result of, savings from projects on the first priority list.
- B. POLICY IMPACT: This action:
- o Will confirm Council action under Resolution No. 81-223 which, among other things, sets forth a Priority 2 array of projects (including the 221st/223rd project) eligible for use of supplementary Interstate Transfer funds should they become available for FY 81.
 - o Will convey to the city of Gresham and other East Multnomah County cities that the Metro Council reaffirms its commitment to implement the full Interstate Transfer program as soon as possible.
 - o Expresses the moral commitment to the 221st/223rd project as a high priority for funding.
- C. BUDGET IMPACT: None.

II. ANALYSIS:

- A. BACKGROUND: Metro Council by Resolution No. 80-223 endorsed four priority arrays of highway projects:
- 1) Priority 1 - projects eligible for use of the available \$21.0 million in FY 81.
 - 2) Priority 2 - projects eligible for use of supplementary funds in FY 81 if they become available and upon project review and prioritization by Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Subcommittee.
 - 3) Priorities 3 and 4 -- projects which are to form the preliminary FY 82 TIP, or to use unspent funds/appropriations if they become available.

Right-of-way for the 221st/223rd project was assigned to Priority 1, and construction to Priority 2.

The city of Gresham has expressed concern over the 221st/223rd project in relation to the established priorities. This has

been brought about by two important considerations:

- 1) The project has a significant amount of private funds committed to its implementation. Any delays may cause the private sector, with its fiscal commitments, to lose faith and withdraw support.
- 2) Other projects in East Multnomah County have been downscoped and their funds assigned to the 221st/223rd project. Delays on this project could call for a reassessment of the total East Multnomah County program in the matter of distribution of funds.

B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: The request sought by the city of Gresham was to specify the 221st/223rd project as a top priority for funding from any FY 81 reallocation and from the FY 82 appropriation. TPAC recommended endorsing the project as a high priority for FY 81 since it was included in the Priority 2 category in Resolution No. 80-223. However, TPAC did not recommend action on FY 82 priorities since the priority setting process for FY 82 is just starting and there have been no comparisons with other candidate projects.

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

BP/jmk
2252B/214

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORSING)
THE 221ST/223RD PROJECT AS A)
HIGH PRIORITY FOR ANY REMAINING)
FY 81 INTERSTATE TRANSFER FUNDS)

WHEREAS, The Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 80-186 which endorsed the FY 81 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), contingent upon receiving \$83 million in Federal Interstate Transfer funds; and

WHEREAS, The federal allocation of Interstate Transfer funds to the Portland region released in December 1980 was substantially less than the anticipated revenues, necessitating a revised 1981 program and the setting of priorities for use of the limited available funds; and

WHEREAS, The Metro Council has endorsed a list of Priority 1 projects as eligible for use of the available \$21.0 million of Interstate Transfer funding for highway projects; and

WHEREAS, Additional Interstate Transfer funding may become available in FY 81 through additional federal allocations, project delays, cancellations and cost savings; and

WHEREAS, Additional Interstate Transfer funding should be available in FY 82; and

WHEREAS, The 221st/223rd project is considered to be a high priority, regionally significant project; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council reaffirms its commitment to implement the full Interstate Transfer program.

2. That the 221st/223rd project will be listed as a high

priority project eligible for the use of any additional Interstate Transfer funding that may become available in FY 81 and is the East Multnomah County Transportation Committee's top highway priority.

BP/jk

2252B/214

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORSING)
THE 221ST/223RD PROJECT AS A)
HIGH PRIORITY FOR ANY REMAINING)
FY 81 INTERSTATE TRANSFER FUNDS)

WHEREAS, The Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 80-186 which endorsed the FY 81 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), contingent upon receiving \$83 million in Federal Interstate Transfer funds; and

WHEREAS, The federal allocation of Interstate Transfer funds to the Portland region released in December 1980 was substantially less than the anticipated revenues, necessitating a revised 1981 program and the setting of priorities for use of the limited available funds; and

WHEREAS, The Metro Council has endorsed a list of Priority 1 projects as eligible for use of the available \$21.0 million of Interstate Transfer funding for highway projects; and

WHEREAS, Additional Interstate Transfer funding may become available in FY 81 through additional federal allocations, project delays, cancellations and cost savings; and

WHEREAS, Additional Interstate Transfer funding should be available in FY 82; and

WHEREAS, The 221st/223rd project is considered to be a high priority, regionally significant project; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the East County Transportation Committee reaffirms its commitment to implement the full Interstate Transfer program.
2. That the 221st/223rd project will be listed as a high priority project eligible for the use of any additional Interstate

Transfer funding that may become available in FY 81 and is Multnomah County's top highway priority.

BP/jk

2252B/214

DRAFT

March 10, 1981

To: TPAC

From: Ted Spence

Subject: Interstate Transfer Program Development Process Meeting
March 11, 1981

I. Objective:

TPAC was directed to develop and recommend to JPACT an Interstate Transfer Program based upon the current and anticipated shortfall in funding. The program must be adopted by September 1981 (before FY 1982 federal fiscal year beginning October 1). The objective of today's meeting is to:

1. Recommend a general process and schedule for consideration by JPACT at its March 12, 1981 meeting.
2. Agree on and recommend to JPACT several basic assumptions required to develop the program (3/12/81 JPACT meeting).
3. Discuss and begin development of evaluation criteria to be recommended to JPACT and the council at a future date.

II. Suggested Process and Schedule for JPACT Discussion:

1. General proposal of recommended process and funding assumptions to JPACT for discussion on March 12, 1981.
2. Develop and recommend evaluation criteria for JPACT and council review in April.

3. Document previous MSD/CRAG commitments by project for JPACT information in April.
4. Application of draft criteria for JPACT information in April (No recommendations on program scheduling etc.)
5. Identification of recommended program schedule by City of Portland, Multnomah, Clackamas and Washington counties to JPACT in May.
6. JPACT recommendations of regional program with clear identification of unresolved issues to JPACT in June.
7. Review and discussion by JPACT in June, July and perhaps August.
8. Council review, discussion and action in August/September.

III. Suggested Assumptions for Program Schedule and Funding Levels for TPAC Discussion:

1. Propose that the program developed cover ten fiscal years - FY 1982 through FY 1991.
2. Propose for planning purposes, the following funding levels for projects other than the Banfield Transitway (based on region receiving a minimum of \$60 million per year for ten years).

	FY 82	FY 83	FY 84	FY 85	FY 86	FY 87-91
Projects other than Banfield	\$21 M	\$21 M	\$21 M	\$21 M	\$21 M	\$60 M

IV. Project Information and Evaluation Criteria - Discussion

1. General description of the project problem to be solved and objectives of the project.
2. Identification, by project, of previous regional commitment and priority.
3. Estimated project costs.
4. Status and current schedule of project.
5. Possible "breakdown" of right-of-way and construction phases, i.e., build by small segments.
6. Regional significance of project, i.e., (a) proposed improvement to major regional corridors (regional objective to be accomplished); (b) support of existing or developing major job centers (description of how it supports the job center); (c) support of existing or major developing residential area (description of how it supports residential development); (d) implementation of current regional and local comprehensive planning (land use distribution and projections).
7. Relationship of project to documented (committed) private and public investments: (a) local agency and private participation financing a project; (b) related committed investments, i.e., public agency investments, sewers, other transportation, public buildings, etc., and private investments, commercial and transportation and other facilities.

V. Content and Nature of Status Report to JPACT - Discussion:

- A. Overview of proposed process?
- B. Assumptions?
- C. Unresolved issues?
- D. Possible criteria?
- E. Other?

TAS:PE
OSHD
31081