CHARLES R. WILLIAMSON
ATTORNEY AT LAW
1001 PACIFIC BUILDING
520 S. W. YAMHILL STREET
PORTLAND, OREGON 97204

TELEPHONE (503) 227-6784

May 19, 1980

To JPACT Members:

Enclosed is a letter from Bob Bothman addressing a serious problem we have had at JPACT with our lack of attendance. I would like to discuss at our next meeting ways this situation might be remedied. Some suggestions are:

1. Appointing an alternate for all JPACT members who can attend in the event the committee member is unable to do so. The alternate, of course, must be an elected official.

2. Requiring a two-thirds quorum as Mr. Bothman suggests. This would make it impossible for federal projects funded in the region until a quorum of JPACT members attended a meeting.

I hope that you will all attend the next JPACT meeting so that we can consider these and other proposed solutions to our serious attendance problem.

Very truly yours,

Charles R. Williamson

CRW:lm
Enclosure

VICTOR ATIYEH
GOVERNOR

Department of Transportation
METROPOLITAN BRANCH
5821 N.E. GLISAN, PORTLAND, OREGON 97213

Telephone 238-8226

May 9, 1980

Charles Williamson, Chairman
JPACT
700 Yeon Building
522 Southwest Fifth Avenue
Portland, OR 97204

We really need to improve attendance at JPACT meetings. I feel we should have a quorum at future meetings before we take action on transportation issues.

My concern is that we gain a consensus in the transportation-planning process, which is the Metropolitan Service District's responsibility as the designated MPO. MSD utilizes JPACT as the vehicle to satisfy that requirement. If, as has been the case during the last two months, we only have two local jurisdictions represented, we certainly are not gaining a consensus. I believe the assumption that they approve of all actions by virtue of their absence is an unrealistic one. I know of instances where we have gone down the line with a project which gained consensus at the regional level, only to find out we did not have a consensus half way through the process. JPACT is the vehicle that should ensure that we have the proper consensus in moving a particular program or project.

My concern is reinforced by the specific comments outlined during the FHWA certification review, which specifically points out the need to include the City of Portland, as the major city in the region, in the JPACT decision-making process. My recollection is that the City of Portland has been represented at JPACT only once in the last year and a half.

Perhaps, the best approach would be to require a quorum for any JPACT meeting. Perhaps even better would be to require a 2/3's attendance and a majority of that attendance to represent a consensus at JPACT. Another alternative would be to require at least 50 percent of the total membership (nine out of eighteen, if that is the correct number) voting affirmatively before any recommendation is passed onto MSD. The Metropolitan Service District Council should require a quorum before taking action on a program or project.

My whole intent is to maintain the cooperative-planning process, the consensus-building process, and the success which we have enjoyed in the region over the last five years.

Robert N. Bothman
Administrator

RNB:ke

JPACT Members by Organization

Metro Council

Charles Williamson
Ernie Bonner

Elected Officials

Don Clark, County Executive, Multnomah County
Connie McCready, Mayor, Portland
Jim Fisher, Commissioner, Washington County
Larry Cole, Councilman, Beaverton
Stan Skoko, Commissioner, Clackamas County
Al Myers, Mayor, Gresham
Allen Manuel, Mayor, Milwaukie
Connie Kearney, Commissioner, Clark County
Rose Besserman, Councilwoman, Vancouver

Implementing Agencies

Richard Carroll, WSDOT
Robert Bothman, ODOT
William Young, DEQ
Lloyd Anderson, Port of Portland
John Frewing, Tri-Met

KT:pj
5/28/80

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 Aid Interstate Funds to Remodel the Willamette Falls Safety Rest Area

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

A. ACTION REQUESTED: Council adoption of the attached Resolution authorizing $35,880 of Federal Aid Interstate funds to remodel the Willamette Falls Safety Rest Area to make it accessible for the handicapped.

B. POLICY IMPACT: This action will result in improved accessibility of this rest area by the physically handicapped.

C. BUDGET IMPACT: The approved Metro budget funds staff involvement in establishing project priorities and monitoring project implementation.

II. ANALYSIS:

A. BACKGROUND: State legislation requires that rest area facilities be accessible to the physically handicapped by providing handrails, ramps, provisions for accommodating wheelchairs, etc. The Willamette Falls Rest Area is not so equipped, and in order to comply with legislative requirements will require modification.

B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: 1) Do nothing and close the area for non-compliance, or 2) implement corrective actions necessary to achieve compliance.

C. CONCLUSION: Metro staff recommends authorization of funding for this project based on the favorable benefits to the handicapped.

BP:bk
8230/118

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AUTHORIZING)
FEDERAL AID INTERSTATE FUNDS TO)
REMODEL THE WILLAMETTE FALLS)
SAFETY REST AREA)

WHEREAS, Through Resolution No. 79-80 the Metro Council adopted the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and its annual element; and

WHEREAS, From time to time new projects must be entered into the TIP upon approval of Metro Council; and

WHEREAS, The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) has requested that $35,880 in Federal and Interstate Highway funds be authorized in the TIP to cover modification of the Willamette Falls Safety Rest Area; and

WHEREAS, The purpose of this modification is to make the rest area accessible to the handicapped and, thereby, bring it into compliance with State requirements; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That $35,880 of Federal Aid Interstate Highway funds be authorized to remodel the Willamette Falls Safety Rest Area to make it accessible to the handicapped.

2. That the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) be amended to reflect this authorization as set forth in Exhibit "A."

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

BP:bk
8232/118

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 $282,240 of Federal 16 (b) (2) funds to support the purchase of eleven (11) 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 when existing mass transportation services are inaccessible, insufficient or inappropriate. Capital investments, including purchase of conventional and paratransit vehicles and other equipment and the construction or renovation of buildings and related fixed facilities associated with providing local and regional (non-intercity) transportation services to the elderly and handicapped are eligible for 16 (b) (2) funds. 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.

In December, 1977, the CRAG Board of Directors adopted the Interim Special Transportation Plan which, 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 available federal funds. The staff analysis concludes that these projects are consistent with the Interim Special Transportation Plan.

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 CRAG Board of Directors adopted the Interim Special Transportation Plan which 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 $282,240 in Federal 16 (b) (2) funds; and

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

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That $282,240 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 Attachment A.

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.

JG:ss

B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: In as much as these are non-duplicative 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.

5/23/80
JG:ss
7932/118

ATTACHMENT B

Project 1

Applicant: Special Mobility Services, Inc.

Project Description: Special Mobility Services request UMTA 16 (b) (2) capital assistance to purchase seven vans and five mobile radios for special transportation services in western Multnomah County and North/Northeast Portland. This provider will be assuming a larger service area (through a contract with Tri-Met) as a result of the discontinuance of Tri-Met's Lift Service. This project would constitute a portion of the region's special effort. This application is coordinated with Tri-Met.

Project Cost:		
	UMTA 16 (b) (2)	$200,340
	Local (20%)	50,085
	Total	$250,425

Project 2

Applicant: Special Mobility Services, Inc.

Project Description: Special Mobility Services requests UMTA 16 (b) (2) cpaital assistance to purchase two vans, two mini-buses (all lift equipped) and one mobile radio 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.

Project Cost:		
	UMTA 16 (b) (2)	$81,900
	Local (20%)	20,475
	Total	$102,375

JG:ss
7934/118

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 FY 1981 Unified Work Program to Include the Detailed Work Program for the Bi-State Transportation Study

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

A. ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend Council adoption of the attached Resolution amending the Unified Work Program to include a detailed work program for the Bi-State Transportation Study.

B. POLICY IMPACT: The purpose of the Bi-State Transportation Study is to generate information which would be used by the Bi-State Task Force in formulating policy recommendations concerning transportation solutions in the Northern Corridor. These policy recommendations would be considered by the Metro Council for incorporation in the Regional Transportation Plan and other policy documents.

C. BUDGET IMPACT: Metro will apply for and distribute a special federal grant to support the work program. The grant will be funded in two parts: $100,000 of federal funds will be initially awarded. The remaining $152,600 are to be awarded about October 1, 1980. A portion of the grant funds ($60,800) are to be used by Metro to support work proposed in the FY 1981 Metro budget.

II. ANALYSIS:

A. BACKGROUND: The Governors of Oregon and Washington established the Bi-State Task Force to address transportation issues which affect both states. The Task Force was specifically charged with developing policy recommendations for:

- a multi-modal program for implementing projects to correct the North Corridor transportation problems.
- institutional mechanisms for officials of both states to address the corridor transportation problems.
- financing of the improvements.

A detailed work program for a study which would support the efforts of the Bi-State Task Force in meeting this charge has been prepared and approved by the Task Force. This work program would supersede the generalized work program included in the approved FY 1981 Unified Work Program.

B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: The proposed work program represents the minimum effort needed to allow the Task Force to respond to the charge by the Governors of Oregon and Washington.

C. CONCLUSION: It is recommended that the detailed work program be amended into the Unified Work Program.

CWO:ss
8252/118

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING)
THE FY 1981 UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM)
TO INCLUDE THE DETAILED WORK)
PROGRAM FOR THE BI-STATE)
TRANSPORTATION STUDY)

WHEREAS, The Governors of Oregon and Washington have created a Bi-State Task Force; and,

WHEREAS, The Bi-State Task Force has the responsibility of studying and recommending solutions in the I-5 North Corridor; and

WHEREAS, The Bi-State Task Force has approved a work program for a Bi-State Transportation Study which further details the region's FY 1981 Unified Work Program; and

WHEREAS, The Bi-State Task Force has agreed that Metro should apply for and distribute the federal funds which support the work program; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council hereby amends the FY 1981 Unified Work Program to include the detailed work program for the Bi-State Transportation.

2. That the Metro Council finds the work program to be consistent with the continuous, coordinated and comprehensive transportation planning process and, therefore, grants positive A-95 Review action.

3. That the Metro Council hereby authorizes the Executive Officer to take all adminstrative actions to apply for, accept and execute necessary grants and agreements.

CWO:ss
8253/118

DETAILED WORK PROGRAM
FOR THE
BI-STATE TRANSPORTATION STUDY

PORTLAND, OREGON -- VANCOUVER, WASHINGTON
METROPOLITAN AREA

FINAL DRAFT
May 12, 1980

Produced by the
Bi-State Technical Subcommittee
for the
Bi-State Task Force

DETAILED WORK PROGRAM
BI-STATE TRANSPORTATION STUDY

I. INTRODUCTION

THE NEED FOR A BI-STATE TRANSPORTATION STUDY

The Governors of the States of Oregon and Washington have established a Bi-State Task Force to address metropolitan transportation issues affecting the two states. The specific charge to the Task Force is to develop policy recommendations concerning:

- An acceptable multi-model program for project implementation which will adequately correct outstanding corridor transportation problems.
- Institutional mechanisms necessary for elected and appointed officials of the two states to appropriately address corridor transportation problems.
- Financing to implement the recommended improvement program.

To responsively carry out this charge, the Task Force will need a large amount of quality information. The Bi-State Transportation Study will be used to generate much of the needed information.

STUDY OBJECTIVES

The study's primary purpose is to provide objective and analytically sound information which, when combined with information generated by the Corridor Study financed by the State of Washington, can be used as a basis for policy recommendations of the Task Force. This combined information base will be used by the Task Force to answer a number of issues concerning the Portland-Vancouver Corridor:

1. Will currently committed transportation improvements adequately meet interstate corridor transportation needs over the next two decades?

2. What types of public policies and additional improvements appear to be appropriate to address the underlying causes of outstanding corridor transportation problems?

3. What are the long-range implications of these possible policies and actions on mobility, air quality, energy consumption, economic development and other important factors affecting the liveability of the overall region?

4. Which of the polices and actions should be implemented?

5. What type of decision-making mechanisms should be pursued and responsibilities assigned to ensure implementation of the recommended policies and actions?

6. How are the necessary funds to be raised and distributed?

RELATIONSHIP TO THE WASHINGTON STATE CORRIDOR STUDY

The major purpose of the Washington State Corridor Study is to evaluate the feasibility of major options available to eliminate the congestion and other transportation problems in the Portland/Vancouver Corridor. At least four alternative concepts are to be evaluated: 1) No Build (except committed projects), 2) optimum use of existing facilities, 3) a new highway bridge, and 4) a new transit-only bridge. In addition, the analysis may include two other options: 1) other appropriate alternatives identified by the Bi-State Task Force, and 2) a combination of the basic options. Evaluation of the options involving new bridges will include the feasibility of potential corridors. The analysis of all of the options will concentrate on measures necessary to reduce travel time, conserve energy, optimize the use of available resources and enhance environmental and economic conditions in the area. The Bi-State Transportation Study will complement this effort by: (1) determining how these findings would change under differing policy assumptions and (2) responding to institutional and financial issues.

RELATIONSHIP TO ONGOING METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ACTIVITIES

Regional transportation planning is carried out in the Portland/Vancouver Urbanized Area by two Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) - The Metropolitan Service District (Metro) and the Clark County Regional Planning Council. The Bi-State Task Force's efforts will complement these regional efforts by focusing on specific issues in the I-5/I-205 Northern Corridor. While a number of corridor improvements have been recommended in the plans produced by the MPO's, there continues to be a question about the adequacy of these improvements over the longer-range future. The Bi-State Task Force will specifically address this question. If additional corridor improvements are found to be needed, the Task Force will prepare recommendations to be considered by the MPOs for inclusion in regional plans and improvement programs. The basic technical information on urban growth and travel patterns used in the Bi-State Study is produced by Metro, the MPO for the Oregon portion of the urbanized area. Clark County RPC is involved in the production and review of this basic information base. The staff from Metro and Clark County RPC will be directly involved in the Bi-State Study carrying out various technical tasks. In addition, the MPOs are represented on both the Bi-State Technical Subcommittee and the Bi-State Task Force.

II. WORK PROGRAM NARRATIVE

SUMMARY OF WORK PROGRAM

Three major work elements are to be undertaken in the Bi-State Transportation Study to support the activities of the Bi-State Task Force. Work Element I - Analysis of Alternatives will directly complement the tasks to be undertaken in the Washington State Corridor Study. The Corridor Study will estimate the future implications of several alternative concepts for providing transportation services across the Columbia River. These estimates will assume specific population/employment growth projections, traffic conservation measures, approach facilities, transit services and traffic management techniques. These assumptions will no doubt dictate the magnitude of travel demand and the resulting level of service for the river crossing concepts. It is, therefore, critical that a full-scale evaluation of the sensitivity of the findings to these factors be conducted. The Bi-State Transportation Study will assess how changes in these assumptions would affect the impacts and cost-effectiveness of the alternative river crossing concepts. This analysis will indicate policy changes needed to support each alternative. Based on these analyses, a program of improvements for correcting corridor transportation problems will be recommended.

Work Element II - Institutional Arrangements: will involve an evaluation of current institutional arrangements to resolve transportation issues of interstate significance and propose modifications, if needed. A critical concern of this work element is that adequate institutions exist to implement the recommended program of improvements.

Work Element III - Funding Options: will involve an analysis of alternative ways to raise and allocate funds needed to implement the recommended program of improvements.

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM ELEMENTS

I. Analysis of Alternatives

This work element will complement the analysis of the alternative river crossing concepts being undertaken in the Washington State Corridor Study. The Corridor Study will evaluate the cost-effectiveness of at least four alternative concepts: 1) No Build, 2) No Build with Traffic Management (meters and information system to divert I-5 traffic to I-205), 3) New Highway Bridge, and 4) New Transit-Only Bridge.[1]

---

[1] To carry out this evaluation, several tasks are to be undertaken by the Washington Department of Transportation (WDOT). These are gathering and reviewing basic information and future traffic projections provided by Metro, formulating corridor problems, defining alternatives and estimating the impacts of the alternatives.

Several assumptions which directly affect travel demand levels are common to all of the alternatives analyzed in the Corridor Study. These are:

Highway System -- Under construction and committed improvements will be assumed to be built. In the Northern Corridor, these would primarily involve completion of I-205, completion of the I-5 upgrading in Clark County and construction of the I-5 Slough Bridge Project.

Traffic Management Techniques -- Ramp metering on the I-5 on-ramps (with preferential treatment for buses and car-pools) in Oregon will be assumed. The I-5 traffic management project (involving the removal of several bottlenecks south of the Slough Bridge) would also be assumed.

Traffic Conservation Techniques -- Vehicular travel will be assumed to respond to energy prices and availability in a manner resulting in no more fuel consumed in the year 2000 than in 1977 (this assumes a significant increase in the fuel efficiency of automobiles allowing a 50 percent increase in regional vehicle-miles-of-travel).

Transit Services -- The transit services recommended in the Transit Development Programs in both states would be implemented.

Population/Employment Growth Patterns -- The growth projections known as Interim II are to be assumed. These projections reflect the land use patterns in local comprehensive plans (except in Clark County where changes have been made to the comprehensive plan since the projections were made). If time permits, the Interim II projections will be updated to reflect the Clark County land use plan.

It is recognized that in many cases these assumptions are critical to the amount of travel demand and the resulting level of travel service for a particular alternative. It is, therefore, important to vary many of these assumptions to determine if the findings would change under differing assumptions. This type of analysis will indicate which policies should be pursued to support a particular river crossing concept. For each river crossing concept, those factors which are considered to be most important to the effectiveness of a particular concept will be varied and the ramifications of changing the factors will be estimated.

This analysis will be used to answer the following questions for each alternative:

No Build Alternatives (With or Without Traffic Management)

1. What additional traffic management and traffic conservation techniques[2] are available to reduce corridor travel problems? Would travel conditions be acceptable if the techniques were successfully applied? What would be the cost-effectiveness of these measures?

2. Would expanded and/or restructured bus services (beyond those recommended in the Transit Development Programs) alleviate corridor problems? What are the problems of operating buses in mixed traffic? What is the cost-effectivenss of this option?

3. What population/employment growth patterns could result which would bring about a reduction in the number of trips crossing the river? Would this reduction result in an acceptable level of traffic service on I-5 as well as on arterial roads in Clark and Multnomah Counties?

New Highway Bridge Alternative

4. How should approach roads and traffic management techniques be varied to maximize the effectivenss of a new river crossing while minimizing negative environmental impacts? What are the implications of the changes? What is the cost-effectivenss?

New Transit-Only Bridge Alternative

5. What population/employment growth patterns and feeder bus improvements could be supportive of a new transit crossing? What are the implications? What is the cost-effectiveness?

To answer these questions, five variations of the alternative concepts are to be evaluated in this work element. These variations are:

Alt. 1A Traffic Management/Traffic Conservation (Modified No Build Alt.) -- Responds to question 1.

Alt. 1B Expanded/Restructured Bus Service (Modified No Build Alt.) Responds to question 2.

---

[2]A number of options are possible including: parking controls (either through price or availability), flexible hours, carpool/vanpool incentive programs, ramp closures in peak hours and gasoline price surcharges.

Alt. 1C Modified Population/Employment Patterns (Modified No Build Alt.) -- Responds to question 3.

Alt. 2A Expanded Approach Roads (Modified New Highway Bridge Alt.) -- Responds to question 4.

Alt. 3A Transit-Supportive Population/Employment Patterns (Modified New Transit-Only Bridge Alt.) -- Responds to question 5.

Table 1 shows the basic assumptions for each of the alternatives to be evaluated in both the Washington State Corridor Study and the Bi-State Transportation Study.

TABLE 1

NORTHERN CORRIDOR ALTERNATIVES TO BE EVALUATED

FACTOR	ALTERNATIVE								
	NO-BUILD					NEW HIGHWAY BRIDGE		NEW TRANSIT-ONLY BRIDGE	
	CORRIDOR STUDY	NO-BUILD	BI-STATE STUDY			CORRIDOR STUDY	BI-STATE STUDY 2A--(Approach Roads)	CORRIDOR STUDY	BI-STATE STUDY 3A--(Supportive Pop./Employ.)
	NO-BUILD	WITH TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT	1A (Traffic Manage and Conservation)	1B (Bus Service)	1C (Pop. 1 Employ.)				
Highway	Committed Improvements	Committed Improvements	Same as Corridor Study	Same as Corridor Study	Same as Corridor Study	Committed Improvements Plus New Bridge Tied Into Existing Streets	Same Plus Expanded Approach Roads	Committed Improvements	Same as Corridor Study
Transit Services	Transit Development Program	Transit Development Program	Same as Corridor Study	Expanded/ Restructured Bus Service	Same as Corridor Study	Transit Development Program	Same as Corridor Study	Transitway With Feeder Buses	Same as Corridor Study
Traffic Management	I-5 Ramp Metering/ I-5 Manage. Project	Ramp Meters in Wash./ Tech. to Redistribute Traffic to I-205	Same as Corridor Study	TSM to Expedite Bus Service	Same as Corridor Study	I-5 Ramp Metering/ I-5 Manage. Project	Tech. to Redistribute Traffic to I-205 and New Bridge	I-5 Ramp Metering/ I-5 Manage. Project	Same as Corridor Study
Traffic Conservation	Travel Constrained To Existing Energy Use	Travel Constrained To Existing Energy Use/ Expanded Carpool/ Vanpool	Package of New Conservation Measures	Same as Corridor Study	Same as Corridor Study	Travel Constrained To Existing Energy Use	Same as Corridor Study	Travel Constrained To Existing Energy Use	Same as Corridor Study
Population/ Employment	Interim II Projection	Interim II Projection	Same as Corridor Study	Same as Corridor Study	Revised to Reduce River Crossings	Interim II Projection	Same as Corridor Study	Interim II Projection	Revised to Increase Transit Use

CWO:bk
8043/126

To accomplish this work element, a number of tasks are proposed. These are:

Task 1 Develop Highway Networks

The New Highway Bridge Alternative network used for the Corridor Study will assume that the new bridge is directly tied into existing streets in as expeditious and environmentally acceptable manner as possible (location analyses are to be conducted by WDOT). An adjusted network will be developed in this task which assumes a more extensive access road system. These roads would increase the attractiveness of a new bridge while still respecting environmental factors.

Task 2 Develop Transit Networks

The transit network reflecting the recommendations of the Transit Development Program is to be modified so as to represent a significantly upgraded transit system in the Northern Corridor. It is anticipated that these modifications will involve increasing bus service headways for some routes and adding new bus services which appear to respond to the diffused patterns of the travel crossing the Columbia River.

Task 3 Define Additional Traffic Management Measures

This task involves an examination of techniques to supplement the I-5 ramp meters which could be used to bring about a redistribution of traffic from I-5 to either I-205 or a new bridge.

Task 4 Define Traffic Conservation Measures

The travel demand projected in the Corridor Study for the various concepts assumes a level of conservation which would result in no more fuel being consumed in the year 2000 than in 1977. An investigation of additional conservation measures is currently underway as part of the preparation of the Regional Transportation Plan. The evaluation of these measures should be completed by September, 1980. The purpose of this task is to determine specifically how the most promising conservation measures could be applied in the Northern Corridor in both Washington and Oregon. Procedures are to be established for adjusting travel demand estimates in response to these conservation measures.

Task 5 Prepare Alternative Population/Employment Projections

Travel forecasts used in the Corridor Study will assume the Interim II growth projections developed by Metro[3]. These projections reflect land use patterns contained in local plans (except for Clark County where the projections were prepared before the Clark County comprehensive plan was adopted). This task involves two reallocations of the basic population/employment growth projection. The first reallocation will represent a balanced projection which appears to result in fewer river crossings. The second will be structured to support an assumed transit system in the Northern Corridor.

Task 6 Estimate Cost of the Alternative Improvements

For each improvement being considered,[4] estimate the capital, operating and maintenance cost.

Task 7 Analyze the Implications of the Five Options

Initially, the transportation, air quality and energy implications of the five options will be simulated. The impacts of the options will be estimated in the same manner as used in the Washington State Corridor Study for the basic options. Likewise, a cost-effectiveness analysis of the options will be conducted. The options to be analyzed are:

1A Traffic Management/Traffic Conservation (Modified No Build Alt.)

1B Expanded/Restructured Bus Service (Modified No-Build Alt.)

1C Modified Population/Employment Patterns (Modified No Build Alt.)

2A Expanded Approach Roads (Modified New Highway Bridge Alt.)

3A Transit-Supportive Population/Employment Patterns (Modified New Transit-Only Bridge Alt.)

---

[3] The cost of building, operating and maintaining a new highway bridge and approaches is being estimated in the Washington State Corridor Study.

[4] The Interim II projections are currently being reviewed by Clark County Regional Planning Council (RPC). If time permits, they will be updated to account for Clark County RPC concerns before alternatives are simulated in the Washington State Corridor Study.

Task 8 Estimate the Reliability of the Traffic Forecasts

This task involves an effort to estimate the reliability of the various travel forecasts and related impacts. The underlying models and projections will be reviewed and the likelihood of the resulting forecasts will be estimated in terms of the probability that future conditions will correspond with the forecasts.

Task 9 Review of Analysis Results by the Bi-State Task Force

The results of the analyses undertaken in Task 7 will be formatted in a manner to complement the findings of the Washington State Corridor Study. Committee efforts to reach agreement on which alternative should be pursued and to formulate a program of corridor transportation improvements will be assisted. The recommendation of the Task Force will be documented and incorporated with the recommendation produced in the other two work elements.

Work Element II. Institutional Arrangements

This work element involves an effort to evaluate alternative institutional structures for making decisions on transportation improvements having interstate significance. In addition, alternative mechanisms for implementing transportation improvements and providing transit services are to be investigated. The information generated by this task is to be used by the Bi-State Task Force in formulating a recommendation on future institutional arrangements.

A number of tasks are involved in performing this work element:

Task 1 Define and Evaluate Alternative Ways to Make Decisions

The pros and cons of maintaining two Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) for the Bi-State region will be enumerated. Alternative arrangement (such as a single MPO) will be evaluated. The findings will be reviewed with the Task Force, the two MPOs and other key officials from both Oregon and Washington.

Task 2 Define and Evaluate Alternative Implementation Mechanisms

Four types of transportation improvements and services likely to be included in the recommended program of projects will be addressed: highway facilities, transit services, traffic management systems and traffic conservation measures. For each type, alternative ways to implement projects and services will be defined. The administrative and operational advantages and disadvantages of each alternative will be described. The alternatives will then be reviewed with the various governmental organizations responsible for implementing transportation projects and services.

Task 4 Formulate Institutional Recommendations

This task involves efforts to format and present the information prepared in Tasks 1 and 2 to the Bi-State Task Force. Questions of members of the Task Force will be responded to. The recommendations of the Task Force will be documented for incorporation with the recommendations produced in the other two work elements.

Work Element III. Funding Options

Included are activities to support the Bi-State Task Force in formulating a recommendation for funding the preferred program of corridor improvements. Alternative funding sources will be investigated. Procedures for prioritizing corridor projects in relation to other regional and local needs will also be investigated. The following tasks are proposed:

Task 1 Define Alternative Funding Sources

An inventory of existing and projected federal, state and local funding sources will be made. Possible new sources of funding will be described. An assessment of the appropriateness and probability of obtaining the potential revenue sources will be made.

Task 2 Define Alternative Funding Allocation Approaches

Alternative methods for allocating existing and potential funds are to be proposed. The rationale for each alternative will be described. The alternative formula and underlying rational will be reviewed with affected governments.

Task 3 Formulate Funding Recommendations

This task involves efforts to format and present the information prepared in Tasks 1 and 2 to the Bi-State Task Force. Questions of Task Force members will be responded to. The recommendation of the Task Force will be documented and incorporated with the recommendations produced in the other two work elements.

STUDY TIME FRAME

The study is expected to begin in the month of June, 1980. The basic information base will be available by April 1, 1980, allowing final recommendations by the Task Force by the end of June, 1981. This will allow the Task Force to have their recommendation finalized by Jun, 1981. The following schedule is proposed for the various tasks:

WORK ELEMENT I - ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

Task 1 - Develop Highway Networks: July 1 - September 1
Task 2 - Develop Transit Networks: July 1 - September 15
Task 3 - Define Additional Traffic Management Measures: August 15 - September 30
Task 4 - Define Traffic Conservation Measures: September 1 - October 1
Task 5 - Develop Alternative Population/Employment Projections: June 30 - November 15
Task 7 - Analyze the Implications of the Five Options: September 15 - January 15
Task 8 - Review of Analysis Results by the Bi-State Task Force: November 15 - February 1

WORK ELEMENT II - INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

Task 1 - Define and Evaluate Alternative Ways to Make Decisions: December 1 - March 30
Task 2 - Define and Evaluate Alternative Implementation Mechanisms: January 1 - March 30
Task 4 - Formulate Institutional Recommendations: April 1 - June 30

WORK ELEMENT III - FUNDING OPTIONS

Task 1 - Define Alternative Funding Sources: December 1 - March 30
Task 2 - Define Alternative Funding Allocation Approaches - December 1 - March 30
Task 3 - Formulate Funding Recommendations: April 1 - June 30

Based on the schedule for the production of information, key milestone dates for the Task Force would be:

- Recommend a program of projects - February 1
- Recommend institution arrangements - June 30
- Recommend funding package - June 30

FUNDING

Table 2 shows the estimated costs for the various tasks to be undertaken in the study. The table shows the use of the initial $100,000 grant from USDOT. Also shown is the entity responsible for carrying out the task. A Project Manager is needed to ensure overall coordination, respond to the needs of the Technical Subcommittee and the Task Force, ensure quality control and manage to work to ensure achievement of the schedule.

CWO:bk/ss
8043/126

TABLE 2
BI-STATE TRANSPORTATION STUDY
STUDY BUDGET

WORK ELEMENT/TASK	METRO Person-Weeks Total	METRO $ (000) Initial Grant	TRI-MET Person-Weeks Total	TRI-MET $ (000) Initial Grant	CLARK COUNTY RPC Person-Weeks Total	CLARK COUNTY RPC $ (000) Initial Grant	PROJECT MANAGER Person-Weeks Total	PROJECT MANAGER $ (000) Initial Grant	CONSULTANT Person-Weeks Total	CONSULTANT $ (000) Initial Grant	TOTAL Person-Weeks Total	TOTAL $ (000) Initial Grant
Work Task 1 - Develop Hwy. Network	4	1.7 1.7					1	0.7 0.7			5	2.4 2.4
Task 2 - Develop Transit Network	6	2.6 2.6	6	2.6 2.6			2	1.3 1.3			14	6.5 6.5
Task 3 - Define Alternative Traffic Management Measures	2	0.9 0.9	2	0.9 0.9			3	2.0 2.0			7	3.8 3.8
Task 4 - Define Traffic Conservation Measures	4	1.7 1.7	1	0.4 0.4			2	1.3 1.3			7	3.4 3.4
Task 5 - Develop Alternative Population/ Employment Projections	10	4.3 3.7			4	1.7 1.7	4	2.7 2.4			18	8.7 7.8
Task 6 - Estimate Cost of Improvements							2	1.3 1.3	6	4.2 4.2	8	5.5 5.5
Task 7 - Simulate the Implementations of the Five Options	12	27.7* 27.7									12	27.7 27.7
Task 8 - Estimate the Reliability of the Traffic Forecasts									6	4.2 0	6	4.2 0
Task 9 - Review of Analysis Results by the Bi-State Task Force	6	3.2 0	1	0.4 0	3	1.6 0	10	6.7 3.4			13	11.9 3.4
Subtotal	44	$42.1 $38.3	9	$4.3 $3.9	7	$3.3 $1.7	24	$16.0 $12.4	12	8.4 4.2	76	$74.1 $60.5
WORK ELEMENT II - INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS												
Task 1 - Define and Evaluate Alt. Ways to Make Decisions							4	2.7	8	5.6	12	8.3
Task 2 - Define and Evalute Alt. Implementation Mechanisms							3	2.0	8	5.6	11	7.6
Task 3 - Formulate Institutional Recommendations							6	4.0	8	5.6	14	9.6
Subtotal							13	$8.7 0	24	$16.8 0	37	$25.5 0

*Includes $22,500 computer charges

WORK ELEMENT TASK	METRO Person-Weeks Total	METRO $ (000) Initial Grant	TRI-MET Person-Weeks Total	TRI-MET $ (000) Initial Grant	CLARK COUNTY RPC Person-Weeks Total	CLARK COUNTY RPC $ (000) Initial Grant	PROJECT MANAGER Person-Weeks Total	PROJECT MANAGER $ (000) Initial Grant	CONSULTANT Person-Weeks Total	CONSULTANT $ (000) Initial Grant	TOTAL Person-Weeks Total	TOTAL $ (000) Initial Grant
WORK ELEMENT III - FUNDING OPTIONS												
Task 1 - Define Alternative Funding Sources							2	1.3	4	2.8	6	4.1
Task 2 - Define Alternative Funding Allocation Approaches							6	4.0	6	4.2	12	8.2
Task 3 - Forumlate Funding Recommendations							8	5.4	10	7.0	18	12.4
Subtotal							16	$10.7	20	$14.0	36	$24.7
								0		0		$0
Total Direct Charges	44	$42.1	9	$4.3	7	$3.3	53	$35.4	50	$39.2	157	$124.3
		$38.3		$3.9		$1.7		$12.4		$4.2		$60.5
Indirect Charges		18.7		4.0		3.1		33.7		68.8		128.3
		15.0		3.7		1.6		11.8		7.4		39.5
GRAND TOTAL		$60.8		$8.3		$6.4		69.1		$108.0		$252,600
		$53.3		$7.6		$3.3		$24.2		$11.6		$100.0

CWO:ss
8059/126

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: 504 Transit Accessibility Transition Plan

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

A. ACTION REQUESTED: Council adoption of the attached Resolution endorsing a transit accessibility plan in accordance with United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) requirements and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

B. POLICY IMPACT: This action will enable submittal of the 504 Transition Plan to the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) for its approval, thus allowing continuing flow of funds for transit operations and improvements. It will support regional policies to develop public mass transportation facilities and services which can effectively be utilized by elderly and handicapped persons.

C. BUDGET IMPACT: The approved Metro budget funds staff planning activities involved in establishing priorities and monitoring project implementation.

II. ANALYSIS:

A. BACKGROUND: Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicap in any program receiving federal assistance. USDOT regulations require that accessibility of mass transportation facilities, equipment and services be provided to handicapped individuals in compliance with Section 504 (see Exhibit A) .

Rules and regulations to carry out transportation accessibility have been developed and call for the preparation of a Transition Plan which defines a staged, multi-year program for ensuring accessibility for the handicapped. The purpose of the plan is to (1) identify transportation improvements and policies needed to achieve program accessibility, and (2) to provide interim accessible transportation prior to achievement of program accessibility.

Tri-Met has developed a 504 Transition Plan, summarized in Exhibit B, for meeting requirements of Section 504. This plan incorporates elements of Tri-Met's recently adopted Transit Development Program which, among others, sets forth an objective to improve mobility for the disadvantaged:

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORSING)
THE 504 TRANSITION PLAN)

WHEREAS, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicap in any program receiving federal assistance; and

WHEREAS, The United States Department of Transportation regulations have established standards of accessibility to public mass transportation facilities and services by the handicapped; and

WHEREAS, These regulations require a 504 Transition Plan which will identify transportation improvements and policies needed to achieve program accessibility and to provide interim accessible transportation prior to its achievement; and

WHEREAS, Tri-Met has prepared such a 504 Transition Plan as an outgrowth of its ongoing activities in planning public mass transportation facilities and services; and

WHEREAS, This 504 Transition Plan sets forth a recommended strategy (Exhibit B) to achieve program accessibility by FY 1986 subject to its further development and periodic reappraisal and refinement; and

WHEREAS, Metro staff review has found that the Plan incorporates suitable courses of action to fulfill requirements of the United States Department of Transportation regulations; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the 504 Transition Plan is consistent with local and regional transportation objectives and plans.

"Develop required "Transition Plan" for meeting requirements of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; procure wheelchair accessible equipment on all new transit buses and light rail vehicles purchased so that at least 35 percent of the fleet is accessible by 1985; ensure that all new facilities constructed by or for Tri-Met are wheelchair accessible; provide interim accessible transportation, as direct provider and/or service contractor, to maximum extent possible within existing resources and to a minimum of two percent of Tri-Met's Section 5 funds."

One of the major barriers to accessibility is that most urban transit vehicles cannot accommodate persons in wheelchairs. To overcome this barrier, all new buses purchased by Tri-Met will include a lift feature that will allow persons in wheelchairs to utilize fixed-route bus service. Since Tri-Met does not at this time have any wheelchair accessible fixed-route buses, the rate that the Tri-Met fleet becomes accessible depends upon the schedule of acquisition of new buses.

The 504 Program accessibility requirements must be met by 1989. The recommended option, the Major Services Improvement Plan, would meet this requirement. In this option, emphasis would be placed on fleet expansion with Tri-Met purchasing 742 accessible buses between 1981 and 1990. Program Accessiblity would be reached in FY 1986, at which time 50 percent of the peak hour fleet would have wheelchair lifts. By FY 1989, 73 percent of the peak hour buses would be accessible. To assist those who cannot use the fixed-route bus system, Tri-Met would continue to support demand-responsive service by coordinating and partially funding these services provided by various other agencies.

B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: In addition to the Major Services Improvement Plan, a fallback option is proposed. This option, the Existing Service Commitments Plan, would also place emphasis on fleet replacement. In this option, Program Accessibility would be achieved in FY 1988 with 552 accessible buses purchased between 1981 and 1990. The Ridesharing and Special Needs Transportation programs would continue at about the same level as today, except that Tri-Met would maintain a coordinating role for special needs door-to-door service and provide no direct funding support.

C. CONCLUSION: Metro staff recommends adoption of the Resolution endorsing the 504 Transition Plan by which program accessibility can be achieved.

BP:ss
8215/118
5/20/80

2. That the Metro Council endorses the 504 Transition Plan subject to its further development and periodic reappraisal and refinement.

3. That the Metro Council finds the 504 Transition Plan in accordance with the region's continuing, cooperative, comprehensive planning process and hereby gives affirmative A-95 Review approval.

BP:ss
8236/118

EXHIBIT A

DEFINITION OF PROGRAM ACCESSIBILITY

- Fixed Route Bus System - The system must be accessible to handicapped persons who can use steps; and the system, when viewed in its entirety, must be accessible to wheelchair users. With respect to vehicles, these requirements mean that at least one-half of the peak-hour bus service must be accessible and accessible buses must be used before inaccessible buses during off-peak service.

- Light Rail Systems - The system when viewed in its entirety must be accessible to handicapped persons including wheelchair users. All stations must be accessible to handicapped person who can use steps, and key stations must be accessible to wheelchair users. Key stations include transfer points, interchange points with other modes, end stations, stations serving major activity centers (colleges, hospitals, etc.), or stations which generate sizable amounts of handicapped trips.

  Each vehicle must be accessible to handicapped persons who can use steps; at least one-half of the peak-hour light rail service must be accessible to wheelchair users and accessible vehicles must be used before inaccessible vehicles during off-peak service.

BP:ss
8215/118

NOTE: Tri-Met is in the process of revising this plan.

SUMMARY

TRANSITION PLAN
OF
THE TRI-COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT OF OREGON

IN

COMPLIANCE WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION REGULATIONS IMPLEMENTING SECTION 504 OF THE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973

Prepared by:

Tri-Met
May 20, 1980

I. Highlights of the 504 Regulations as They Refer to Mass Transportation

In May, 1979, the United States Department of Transportation issued regulations for implementation of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. These regulations stated that "...no otherwise qualified handicapped individual...shall, solely by reason of his or her handicap, be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

Mass transportation was specifically addressed in the 504 Regulations in a statement requiring "...access for elderly and handicapped persons to public mass transportation facilities, equipment and services."

Section 504 also requires that recipients of federal dollars prepare a transition plan that describes how program accessibility will be achieved. This plan must be reviewed by a citizen's committee, presented at a public hearing, endorsed by the Metropolitan Planning Organization, and submitted to the Urban Mass Transportation Administration by July 1, 1980.

The following is a brief description of the 504 requirements with respect to mass transportation and a summary of Tri-Met's Transition Plan. Final approval of this Plan by the Metropolitan Service District (Metro) is expected in June, 1980.

II. Program Accessibility Requirements

A. Fixed Facilities for the public:

1. Existing fixed facility accessibility shall be achieved by a staged sequence of...modifications, replacements, and new construction...changes not involving extraordinarily expensive structural changes...shall be implemented no later than three years after the effective date of this regulation." (June 1, 1982)

2. New facilities and alterations. "New transit fixed facilities for the public shall incorporate such other features as are necessary to make the fixed facilities accessible to handicapped persons." Design or alteration of new facilities shall be "accessible to and usable by handicapped persons."

B. Fixed Route Bus System: Program accessibility is achieved when 50% of the peak hour fleet is accessible to handicapped persons and "the system when viewed in its entirety, is accessible to wheelchair users." This must be achieved no later than 1989. With respect to vehicles, all new vehicles purchased "...shall be accessible to handicapped persons, including wheelchair users..."

C. Program Policies and Practices: "Program policies and practices that prevent a system...from achieving program accessibility shall be modified...no later than three years after the effective date of this regulation." (June 1, 1982)

D. Interim Accessible Transportation: "No later than three years after the effective date of this part (June 1, 1982), each recipient whose system has not achieved program accessibility shall provide or assure the provision of interim accessible transportation for handicapped persons who could otherwise use the system if it had been made accessible. Such transportation shall be provided until program accessibility has been achieved."

"Interim accessible transportation shall be developed in cooperation with an advisory group of representatives of local handicapped persons and groups... During the period for interim accessible transportation, the recipient shall be obligated to spend annually an amount equal to two percent of the financial assistance it receives under Section 5 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964... The recipient is not obligated to spend more on interim accessible transportation than the amount specified... Subject to the expenditure limitation interim accessible transportation shall be available within the recipient's normal service area and during normal service hours... The recipient... shall use its best efforts to coordinate and use effectively all available special services and programs in the community..."

E. Transition Plan: "The purpose of the plan is to identify the transportation improvements and policies needed to achieve program accessibility and to provide interim accessible transportation prior to the achievement of program accessibility..."

The plan shall include:

1. "Identification of public transportation vehicles, fixed facilities, services, policies and procedures that do not meet (the) program accessibility..."

2. "Identification...of the improvements and policies required for bringing them into conformance..."

3. "Establishment of priorities among the improvements, reasonable implementation schedules and system accessibility benchmarks..."

4. "Assignment of responsibility among public transportation service providers for the implementation of improvements and policies."

5. "Identification of coordination activities..."

6. "Estimation of total costs and identification of sources of funding..."

7. "Description of community participation..."

8. "Identification of responses to substantive concerns raised during public hearings on the plan."

III. Summary of Tri-Met's 504 Transition Plan

A. Assessment of Current Transit System Accessibility

1. Vehicles: None of Tri-Met's 559 standard size buses on fixed-route service have wheelchair lifts or kneeling features.

2. Services: The major barrier to service accessibility is the lack of accessible vehicles. Additional service barriers include:

*areas currently not served in Tri-Met's service district,

*areas currently being served with no sidewalks and inadequate loading areas,

*greater demand for special door-to-door services than current capacity.

3. Policies and Practices: Since Tri-Met has no accessible buses on mainline service, no programs exist in the training of drivers to assist wheelchair users. However, a number of policies currently exist for elderly and disabled passengers. These include:

*reserved seating in the front of buses for elderly and disabled passengers,

*training drivers to assist elderly and disabled passengers when necessary,

*seeing-eye dogs to accompany visually impaired passengers,

*coordination of special transportation services in the tri-counties,

*free travel training for the mentally retarded,

*reduced senior citizen fare during certain specified hours.

4. Fixed-Facilities: Tri-Met fixed facilities which fall under program accessibility requirements include the following:

*Main Administration Building, 4012 S.E. 17th Avenue

*Customer Assistance Office, 522 S.W. Yamhill

*Beaverton Transit Station

*Cedar Hills Transit Station

*Barbur Boulevard Transit Station

*71 Park and Ride Lots

*615 Bus Shelters

All of the above-listed facilities meet or exceed the existing facilities requirements and there are no new facilities or alterations as defined in the regulations.

5. Special Transportation System: Tri-Met currently operates six LIFT buses and acts as the major planner and coordinator of special transportation services through subcontracts with other providers, in the tri-counties. In FY 80, the Tri-Met Board allocated $660,000, twice the amount of the previous year, for special transportation services. In September, 1979, a citizen's advisory committee was appointed by the Board to help the staff "determine the best ways to provide the most service, identify the financial resources to support it and define the appropriate role for Tri-Met" in the short and long term. In February, the Committee presented a series of recommendations to the Tri-Met Board that included, the elimination of Tri-Met's operations of the LIFT, the increase of special transportation services through subcontracts, and a 25% increase (to $825,000) in the Tri-Met budget for special transportation.

B. Program Accessibility Plan

1. Vehicles: In accordance with state and Federal law, all new buses purchased by Tri-Met will be wheelchair accessible. Depending on Tri-Met's service expansion program over the next five years, 50% of Tri-Met's peak hour fleet could be accessible as early as 1986, and no later than 1989.

2. Service Accessibility: Tri-Met's Transit Development Program (TDP) is designed to improve the level of service provided by Tri-Met over the next five years. These improvements in service will become available to transportation-handicapped persons as Tri-Met acquires buses with wheelchair lifts. But since accessible buses will be acquired over a period of six to nine years, that is, the system will not be immediately accessible, a strategy for deployment is needed. As accessible buses become available, they should be placed on bus lines that maximize the opportunity of transportation-handicapped persons to use the fixed-route bus system.

One strategy for deployment of accessible buses is to give priority first to those lines that (1) serve concentrations of elderly and handicapped persons, (2) serve destinations of

particular interest to handicapped persons, and (3) are a major link in the Tri-Met route structure. Evaluation of all current Tri-Met lines with these criteria, resulted in a grouping of lines according to priority of greatest utility of service for handicapped persons. This grouping is summarized on the following table.

Priority Grouping of Tri-Met Lines

According to Priority For Accessibility

Group #1

Lines: #6 - Sellwood/Union, #8 - Irvington/Jackson Park,
#12 - Beaumont/Foster, #14 - Sandy/52nd Avenue,
#15 - Lincoln, #53 - 23rd Avenue

Group #2

Lines: #2 - St. Johns, #3 - Fessenden, #19 - East Glisan/Division,
#20 - East Burnside/21st Avenue, #21 - Mt. Tabor,
#26 - Holgate/33rd Avenue

Group #3

Lines: #28 - Mississippi/Woodstock, #29 - Crystal Springs/Vancouver,
#72 - 82nd Avenue, #77 - Beltline

Group #4

Lines: #5 - Vancouver, #9 - Broadway/Powell, #34 - River Road
#37 - Tualatin/North Shore, #40 - Capitol Hill/Halsey

Group #5

Lines: #18 - Troutdale, #27 - Harold, #30 - Ardenwald, #33 - Oregon City,
#41 - Portland Community College, #54 - Beaverton-Hillsdale Hwy,
#56 - Washington Square, #57 - Forest Grove, #59 - Cedar Hills,
#67 - Beaverton/Cedar Hills, #71 - Killingsworth, #75 - 39th Ave.

The proposed phasing of accessible buses into the Tri-Met system would be as follows:

Fiscal Year 1982. Tri-Met will receive 87 60-foot articulated buses in mid-1981. These buses will be put into service in Fall, 1981. Approximately 77 of these buses will actually be scheduled for service, while 10 will be used as maintenance reserve. Because these buses are the first high-capacity vehicles

to be used by Tri-Met, consideration must be given to passenger loading characteristics and overload situations that exist on many Tri-Met lines today, as well as to the criteria for accessible buses described above.

Seven of the 12 lines in priority groups 1 and 2 would receive a total of 43 accessible buses. These include lines #2, #8, #12, #14, #19, #20, and #21. In addition, the accessible buses would be scheduled on 15 other routes including #9, #18, #33, and #57. At this time, 14% of the buses scheduled during the peak period and 38% of during off-peak would be accessible.

Fiscal Year 1983. Tri-Met will receive 75 standard 40-foot buses this year, of which 64 will be placed in scheduled service. At this point in time, 23% of Tri-Met's peak service will be operated with accessible buses.

By FY 1983, all 12 priority groups 1 and 2 lines would have accessible buses, as would half of the priority group 3 lines.

Fiscal Year 1984. Tri-Met will receive 30 articulated buses and 60 standard buses, of which 79 will be placed in scheduled service. About 31 percent of Tri-Met's peak service will be accessible. All lines in priority groups 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 would be operated with accessible buses.

Fiscal Years 1985-1986. During this period, Tri-Met will purchase 170 new buses, bringing its accessible fleet to 422 buses. Program accessibility would be reached during this period. Accessible buses would be scheduled on all Tri-Met lines, and more importantly, nearly all buses scheduled during non-peak times would have wheelchair lifts.

3. Policies and Practices

In order to reach full program accessibility, Tri-Met's policies and practices in areas other than vehicle and facility accessibility must be addressed. The following summarizes some specific policy recommendations to be implemented over the next three years.

*SAFETY AND EMERGENCY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES. Policies will be established to insure the routine transporting of persons with differing disabilities and the evacuation of passengers in emergency situations.

*PERIODIC SENSITIVITY AND SAFETY TRAINING. Tri-Met operators will have sensitivity training in the handling of disabled passengers as part of their routine training sessions. These sessions will also include training in the use of the LIFT mechanism and the securement of passengers while riding the bus.

*ACCOMMODATIONS FOR COMPANIONS OR AIDES OF HANDICAPPED TRAVELERS. Accommodations for aides for disabled passengers may include a possible fare reduction or no-fare.

*INTERMODAL COORDINATION. Tri-Met will coordinate services with other transportation institutions and modes as the fleet becomes accessible (e.g., Amtrak, intercity bus, and airport).

*COORDINATION WITH AGENCIES AND INSTITUTIONS. Tri-Met will support transportation services on behalf of the disabled (e.g., interface between fixed-route service and social service transportation providers prior to and after program accessibility is reached.)

*MARKETING CONSIDERATIONS. Tri-Met will provide information on accessible services including: Braille maps and a teletypewriter for hearing impaired persons; periodic publications describing accessible facilities and services; identification of bus facilities with the international symbol for accessibility; signs identifying how to use the devices to hold down wheelchairs; signs explaining to passengers requirements to make seats available to handicapped passengers; designation of accessible trips on public timetables, Mall information screens, downtown Trip Planning kiosks and user information units; designation on bus stop signs of accessible bus routes; interior channel cards to inform sighted passengers how to help blind passengers; transit advertising panels in the exterior of the accessible buses to communicate to the general public that the buses are accessible.

*LEASING, RENTAL AND PROCUREMENT PRACTICES. Tri-Met when negotiating service contracts and leases for passenger facilities (such as park-and-ride lots) will be consistent with program accessibility.

*PLANNING PRACTICES. Tri-Met, when planning with public and private agencies, for demand-response services will assure maximum opportunities to provide the desired services.

*REGULATORY CONSTRAINTS. Tri-Met will encourage reforms in regulations that currently hinder accessible services.

*MANAGEMENT SUPERVISION. Tri-Met will provide supervision of accessible facilities and vehicles, including road supervision, dispatching practices, and schedule coordination at transfer facilities.

*MAINTENANCE AND SECURITY. Testing and inspection of accessibility features will occur on a regular basis.

*LABOR AGREEMENTS AND WORK RULES PROVISIONS. Tri-Met will insure that operator responsibilities will include special provisons for the transporting of disabled passengers.

*INSURANCE COVERAGE. This will include special agreements with other providers for adequate insurance coverage for the transporting of disabled passengers.

4. Fixed Facilities: Even though Tri-Met meets or exceeds existing facility requirements as defined in the DOT's regulations, in order to provide a higher level of accessibility, the following will be accomplished over the next three years:

*By July 30, 1980 all facilities listed (page 3) except Park-and-Ride lots and bus shelters will be resurveyed to determine what modifications would be necessary to bring them up to the "new facilities" requirements.

*By June 30, 1981, Tri-Met will, whenever reasonable, bring existing facilities, except Park-and-Ride lots, up to "new facilities" standards.

*Prior to the time accessible fixed-route service commences on a particular line, Park-and-Ride lots and bus shelters serving that line shall be, whenever possible, upgraded to "new facilities" requirements, so that Park-and-Ride lots have parking spaces designated for the disabled and that shelters be marked as accessible.

5. Special Transportation System: Interim services will be provided prior to the achievement of program accessibility. To insure that an equivalent level of service, with funding limitations, is possible, the following policies are proposed:

*Tri-Met shall make all its programs accessible to the disabled as required under Department of Transportation regulations.

*Tri-Met shall plan, coordinate, provide a funding base, and act as broker for a coordinated door to door pre-scheduled transportation program for qualified disabled people in the tri-county area. The basic goal of door to door service shall be to provide services as equivalent to the fixed route service as is possible. As fixed route buses become accessible, the door to door service shall, whenever possible, function as a feeder service to the fixed routes.

*Tri-Met shall encourage and facilitate coordination between Tri-Met funded door to door service and other public and private transportation serving special needs in the area. Other transportation includes fixed route buses, carpools, taxis, vanpools, churches, etc.

*Tri-Met shall continue the Honored Citizen Program for senior citizens.

*Tri-Met shall provide free travel training tickets and a reduced fare (15¢) pass for mentally retarded adults.

*Tri-Met shall become a central information point regarding transportation for the disabled throughout the tri-county area.

*An advisory committee for the transportation handicapped shall be appointed by the Tri-Met Board and meet, at least monthly, to assess and make recommendations regarding the six previously listed responsibilities. This committee shall report yearly to the Board regarding the past year's operation and make recommendations for the next year.

C. Cost of Accessibility Improvements

Tri-Met's Five Year Transit Development Program (TDP) includes a financial forecast for service improvements over the next five years. These cost estimates include costs for compliance with the 504 Regulations (see Table 1).

D. Citizen Participation

1. Special Needs Transportation Policy Advisory Committee

*In May, 1979, the Tri-Met Board established the Special Needs Transportation Policy Advisory Committee (SNTPAC). In September, 1979 this 18 member committee met for the first time to help develop short and long range policies for special transportation services for the elderly and disabled.

*In April, 1980, the Committee met twice to review elements of Tri-Met's 504 Transition Plan.

2. Public Hearings

*On December 12, 1979, prior to presenting its recommendations to the Tri-Met Board, SNTPAC held a public hearing to discuss options for special transportation services in the future.

*A public hearing on Tri-Met's 504 Transition Plan will be jointly sponsored by Tri-Met and Metro on May 27.

3. Other Citizen Input

*In the last year, mailings to over 350 people/agencies interested in special transportation services and press releases occurred regularly, where participation in the beforementioned meetings was invited.

Table 1

TRI-MET FINANCIAL FORECAST
MAJOR SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS
"LIKELY CASE" I

First forecast: November 15, 1979
Revised forecast: May 12, 1980

(In thousands of dollars)

OPERATING STATISTICS	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85
Buses (std.Artic.)	540/0	559/0	570/0	536/87	611/37	671/117	761/117
LRT Vehicles	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Vehicle Miles (millions)	20.7	21.5	22.3	24.4	27.3	30.3	37.0
Place Miles (millions)	1140	1180	1210	1400	1560	1790	2200
Transit Capacity Growth		4%	3%	15%	12%	15%	23%
Ave. Weekday Passengers (000)	125	143	151	166	185	206	240
Cash Fares (¢)	45/65¢	55/75¢	65/90¢	75/105¢	90/125¢	110/150¢	130/170¢
Pass Fares ($)	$16/20	$18/25	$21/29	$24/34	$29/40	$34/47	$41/53
Average Fares	34¢	38¢	45¢	53¢	60¢	71¢	82¢
Fare Recovery Ratio	30%	30%	33%	36%	37%	38%	41%
REVENUES ($000)							
Fares	12457	15311	19502	25250	31857	41977	59482
Miscellaneous	1103	1905	2222	2355	2500	2660	2800
Payroll Tax	27277	34194	39324	45219	52454	60322	69370
Federal Operating Assist.	5735	5838	6130	6830	7240	7675	8136
Federal Technical/Demo. Assist.	759	1600	1803	1500	1600	1800	1900
Proposed State Operating Assist.	-	-	1300	1400	1600	1700	1900
SUBTOTAL NON-CAPITAL REVENUES	47331	58848	70281	82554	97251	116134	143588
Federal Capital Assist. (Bus)	3681	1824	15327	35657	4863	25885	22165
State Capital Assist. (Bus)	505	600	968	4401	578	3235	2770
SUBTOTAL (Bus)	4186	2424	16295	40058	5441	29120	24935
Federal Capital Assist. (LRT)	0	160	8523	23120	77270	19968	0
State Capital Assist. (LRT)	0	0	3768	4624	15500	3890	0
SUBTOTAL (LRT)	0	160	12291	27744	92770	23858	0
SUBTOTAL CAPITAL REVENUES	4186	2584	28586	67802	98211	52978	24935
TOTAL REVENUES	51517	61432	98867	150356	195462	169112	168523
Tri-Met 100% Capital Outlay—Bus and other/LRT	330/0	1300/0	5198/33	6750/1156	1917/3790	4266/481	4275/482
OPERATING COSTS ($000)							
Bus Operators	22081	26634	29895	36186	44391	55229	67910
Fuel & Oil	2191	4235	8235	10290	12859	16070	19281
Maintenance & Support	6881	8518	10109	11694	13763	19405	27363
Administrative & General	7996	12287	13224	14180	16300	18738	21542
Transportation Admin.	2643	4091	4685	5510	6727	8307	10214
LRT Operations	0	0	0	0	110	550	5030
*Special Needs Transportation	571	395	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL OPERATING COSTS	42333	56160	66148	77860	94150	118399	151340
CAPITAL COSTS ($000)							
Vehicles (Bus & Support)	62	1300	11123	26206	1818	30522	21284
Facilities (Bus)	3955	1150	4106	14505	2330	2102	6636
Equipment	499	480	6434	6097	3210	1092	1272
SUBTOTAL (Bus)	4516	2930	21663	46808	7358	33716	29192
Vehicles (LRT)	0	0	0	3600	24200	9242	0
Facilities & Equipment (LRT)	0	850	11763	25300	72560	14768	0
SUBTOTAL (LRT)	0	350	11763	28900	96760	24010	0
TOTAL CAPITAL COSTS	4516	3780	33426	75708	103918	57726	29192
OPERATING CONTINGENCY			4000	5000	6000	7000	8000
NET CHANGE IN CASH			-4707	-8212	-8606	-14013	-20009
BEGINNING WORKING CAPITAL	6292	10959	11400	4093	-4119	-12725	-26738
ENDING WORKING CAPITAL	10959	11400	4093	-4119	-12725	-26738	-46747
WORKING CAPITAL REQ'D			[7030]	[7730]	[3530]		

*Due to the elimination of Tri-Met's LIFT Program in 1980, costs for special transportation are "included in the Administrative and General category beginning in 1980/1981.

The projected budget for special transportation services is as follows:

1980/81	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84
$825,000	$1,199,500	$1,296,000	$1,401,500

*In July, 1978, a 504 Committee was appointed by the Tri-Met Board to review the "proposed" 504 Regulations. The Committee prepared a report and presented it to the Tri-Met Board.

Comments received will be summarized and addressed in the complete 504 Transition Plan before it is sent to UMTA on July 1.

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: Determining Whether a Full Scale Feasibility Study of River Transit is Warranted

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

A. ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend Council adoption of the attached Resolution which finds that a full-scale feasibility study of river transit is not warranted.

B. POLICY IMPACT: Approval of the Resolution would mean that the Metro Council does not favor using federal funds to pursue the development of a river transit system.

C. BUDGET IMPACT: This action would be consistent with the proposed FY 1981 budget in that funds are not included for further analysis of river transit.

II. ANALYSIS:

A. BACKGROUND: The Metro Council in adopting Resolution No. 79-59 endorsed the study of a water transportation concept and directed Metro transportation staff to conduct an analysis of whether or not river transit should proceed into a full-scale feasibility study.

B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: Metro staff compared five possible river transit system alternatives with the option of providing comparable bus service. Only one of the five demonstrated promise in terms of providing travel time savings. The remaining four were all slower than a comparable bus system. For the alternative which was faster, patronage estimates were made and a capital and operating cost comparison with a comparable bus transit system was developed. In addition, energy consumption was determined. Documentation of analysis is contained in Staff Report #68: Analysis of River Transit Alternatives (attached).

C. CONCLUSION: The Metro staff analysis indicates that the river transit alternative demonstrating travel time savings would be significantly less cost-effective and energy-efficient than a comparable bus system. Based on this staff analysis, it is recommended that the attached Resolution be approved. The Resolution finds that the proposed river transit system alternatives would not provide sufficient mobility, economic and ridership benefits to warrant a full-scale feasibility study.

CWO:bk
8256/118

FOR THE PURPOSE OF DETERMINING)
WHETHER A FULL SCALE FEASIBILITY)
STUDY OF RIVER TRANSIT IS)
WARRANTED)

WHEREAS, The Metro Council, acting as the Policy Committee for the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Portland urbanized area, has the responsibility for authorizing studies addressing the feasibility and desirability of proposals for improving the region's transportation system; and

WHEREAS, A citizen group, known as Rose City River Transportation, Inc., has asked that Metro authorize a study of the feasibility of a water transportation system using the Willamette and Columbia Rivers; and

WHEREAS, The City of Portland contracted with George Baldwin and Associates for $5,000 in EDA funds to generate basic information concerning the characteristics of water transit vehicles; and

WHEREAS, The Metro Council in Resolution No. 79-59 directed Metro staff to analyze the information produced by the City sponsored study and conduct an analysis of whether a full-scale feasibility study of a possible river transit system in the local area is warranted; and

WHEREAS, Metro staff has completed its study of the proposed river transit system (see attached report); and

WHEREAS, The analysis documented in the Metro staff study indicates that a river transit system would be neither cost-effective or energy-efficient compared to a bus transit system providing comparable service; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

That the Metro Council finds that the proposed river transit system alternatives does not provide sufficient mobility, economic and ridership benefits to warrant a full feasibility study at this time.

JG:ss
8234/118

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE SPACT

DATE 6-12-80

	NAME	AFFILIATION
M	DICK CARROLL	WSDOT
M	AL MYERS, MAYOR	City of GRESHAM
M	Bill Young	D.E.Q.
M	Charles Williamson	Metro
S	Wm. ockert	Metro
G	MIKE LINDBERG	City of Portland
M	Bob Bothman	ODOT
G	Ted Spence	ODOT
S	Rick Gustafson	Metro
M	ERNIE BONNER	METRO
M	Jim Fisher	WASHCO
S	Cindy Cotugno	Metro
G	Anne Sylvester	RPC
S	Keith Lawton	Metro
G	Winston Kurth	Clackamas County
G	Bebe Rucker	Multnomah County
G	Bill Greene	DEQ
S	Bill Petty	METRO
G	Park Woodworth	Tri-Met
G	PAUL BAY	TRI-MET
G	Cowles Mallory	City of Portland
G	John MacGregor	PORT OF PORTLAND
G	STEVE DOTTERRER	CITY OF PORTLAND
M	Donald E Clark	Mult Co.

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE JPACT

DATE 6-12-80

	NAME	AFFILIATION
~~AK~~	~~Don Clark~~	
S	Karen Thackston	
S	Dusty Bolyn	
S	J. Gieseking	METRO