Metropolitan Service District

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

Agenda

Date: June 14, 1979

Day: Thursday

Time: 7:30 a.m.

Place: Conference Room "D"

1. CANDIDATE PROBLEMS FOR MSD RESERVE

This is an informational item requested by JPACT. TPAC had no comment or recommendation. Staff intends to firm up a list of candidate problem areas by June 22, 1979.

2. RECOMMENDED CRITERIA FOR ESTABLISHING PROBLEM AND PROJECT PRIORITIES FOR THE MSD RESERVE

Major Issues:

What policies are to be used to screen a large number of problem areas to a smaller group and determine which projects should be funded with the MSD Reserve.

TPAC Concerns:

A. What funds are available for projects serving only local circulation needs?

Staff Response: Traditional FAU funds (or Interstate Transfer funds replacing FAU funds) or Title II Safety funds are available for these types of projects.

B. Why shouldn't cost overruns on previously funded projects be eligible?

Staff Response: Contingency funds have been established to cover such overruns. Information on the extent of overruns (which projects and how much cost) won't be available for some time.

C. What is the definition of regional travel movements?

Staff Response: Included are major travel flows between cities, counties and other large-scale

DATE	
NAME	AFFILIATION
NAME	AFFILIATION
GARY SPANOVICH	msD
Alan HARvey	
Rose Besserman	City MANGER, VANCOUVER
Connie Klearney	Clark Co.
Narew Shackston	MSD
name Sijasani	
	to a service of the s

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE

activities (such as regional shopping centers, large industrial complexes, or regionally significant cultural centers).

D. What kind of citizen involvement is planned?

Staff Response: The approved study process describes a citizen involvement process including public hearings (meetings may also be called by sponsoring jurisdictions).

E. Will an assessment of the likely implementation schedule be made when a project is funded to ensure correspondence with the availability of federal funds?

Staff Response: This type of check is needed to ensure funds are only spent on preliminary engineering on projects which can be implemented within the federal timeframes.

TPAC Recommendation:

Approve the criteria subject to the following qualifiers:

- A. Staff Report #44, p. 6, Policy II, Criteria 2 add "residential areas."
- B. Staff will review the proposed "measures of effectiveness" for each criteria with local jurisdictional staff before applying the policies and criteria to the 15-20 high priority problems.
- C. A schedule for obligating PE funds be set when projects are funded.

Staff Recommendation:

Approve with TPAC changes and forward for Council Adoption

3. QUARTERLY REPORT

This information report shows the status of MSD funding authorizations.

4. TRANSPORTATION RELATED ENERGY PLANNING ACTIVITIES IN THE MSD REGION

Major Issues:

What has been done for energy planning and what are other agencies doing? What should MSD be doing?

TPAC Concerns:

If additional energy planning becomes a priority, which work item would be dropped?

TPAC Recommendation:

None.

Staff Recommendation: The recommendations are included in the forwarding memo.

5. STATUS REPORT ON WATER TRANSPORTATION PROPOSALS

An oral information report will be given.

6. DESCRIPTION OF TRAVEL SIMULATION TECHNIQUES

This information report was prepared in response to a request from JPACT members. Staff will present a short oral report.

7. AMEND THE INTERIM TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM AND TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO INCLUDE THE 1-505 ALTERNATIVE

Major Issues:

Need to process the I-505 alternative so that the project can be programmed once the I-505 withdrawal is approved.

TPAC Concerns:

None.

TPAC and Staff Recommendations:

Forward to Council recommending adoption of resolutions.

8. AIR QUALITY PROGRESS REPORT

Major Issues:

How should the SIP planning process accommodate the decision of the Environmental Quality Commission to have a state ozone standard which is lower than the federal standard?

TPAC Concerns:

A. What types of controls would need to be examined to achieve the state standard?

- B. Who would fund the additional planning needed to examine and achieve agreement on control measures addressing the state standard?
- C. What happens on the Washington side of the river?
- D. Would it be possible to use .12 as the primary standard and .08 as the secondary?
- E. Could the time frame for meeting the state standard be set beyond the federal compliance dates?

TPAC Recommendation

None.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff should work with DEQ to outline the impacts of the .08 standard and how it should be addressed in the SIP.

9. MSD CONTRACTS

Attached is a list of contracts described in the UWP which are to be signed on or about July 1, 1979. The Council has requested JPACT to review the contracts.

CWO: KT: gh 3975A D/2