



METRO

2000 S.W. First Avenue
Portland, OR 97201-5398
503/221-1646

Memorandum

Date: June 2, 1987
To: JPACT
From: *AK* Andrew Cotugno, Transportation Director
Regarding: REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES

During the past several months, JPACT has considered several funding issues (Section 3 "Letter-of-Intent," Interstate Transfer, and Federal-Aid Urban) and discussed a number of issues affecting regional priorities. Most recently, JPACT tabled a proposed resolution on Interstate Transfer and Federal-Aid Urban funding, seeking an alternate proposal to deal with a broader range of issues affecting both transit and highway projects. In response to JPACT's concern, staff recommends that there be a comprehensive review of possible regional transit and highway priorities so that individual funding decisions can be made within the context of the bigger picture.

Described in Attachment "A" are the following significant transportation funding issues recommended for discussion by JPACT:

- Local highway project funding for Marine Drive, Stark Street, 185th Avenue and 82nd Drive/Railroad overcrossing (from the resolution tabled in May)
- Regional highway corridor priorities for the Sunrise Corridor, Western Bypass, I-84/U.S. 26 Connector and I-5/I-405 Downtown Portland Loop
- Short-term transit capital improvements
- Regional LRT corridor priorities and funding
- Railroad abandonments
- Local arterial funding
- Local and suburban transit service configuration and funding

Described in Attachments "B" and "C" are background data on the current availability of federal and state transportation resources.

It is recommended that JPACT review and discuss these transportation issues in order to provide staff with sufficient guidance on how to define a process for JPACT to deal with these issues. In general, it is suggested that these are the issues that must be addressed by JPACT in order to conclude with a renewed vision and set of priorities for the region.

AC/gl
7576C/D5

Attachment

ATTACHMENT "A"

Regional Transportation Issues

1. Local Highway Projects -- A commitment should be made soon on an Interstate Transfer and/or Federal-Aid Urban allocation to four regionally significant highway projects. They are all projects that have a portion of the needed funding committed for construction purposes and need a decision on the remainder in order to schedule the projects for right-of-way acquisition and construction within the next two years. It is clear that an allocation from one of these funding sources should be made in the near future.

	<u>Funds Available</u>	<u>Recommended Allocation</u>	<u>Remaining Problem</u>
Marine Drive -	\$14.0 million	\$3.2 million	\$.3 m.
Stark Street -	.7 million	1.15 million	--
185th Avenue -	7.4 million	1.68 million	2.0 m.
82nd Drive/RR -	2.5 million	1.68 million	2.1 m.
TOTAL		<u>\$7.71 million</u>	

2. Regional Highway Projects -- Four major unfunded state highway projects have been under discussion throughout the region during the past several years:

	<u>Approx. Cost</u>
- The Sunrise Highway from McLoughlin Boulevard to U.S. 26	\$180 million
- The Western Bypass from I-5 to the Sunset Highway	\$150 million
- The I-84 to U.S. 26 connector in Gresham	\$50-100 million
- The I-5/I-405 downtown Portland loop	\$150-200 million

All of the projects are intended to address clear, regionally significant problems but are very large in scope and cost. A short-term strategy should be developed to define which elements are most critical for implementation. From this assessment, regional priorities for the Six-Year Highway Improvement Program update should be adopted. In addition, other project requests should be integrated into the Six-Year Highway Program priorities dealing with various interchange and widening projects needed elsewhere in the region.

3. Short-Term Transit Capital Improvements -- Section 3 "Letter-of-Intent" funding and Section 9 funding programs

should be finalized to meet short-term transit capital requirements over the next five years. Funding should be clearly identified to meet routine capital requirements, bus replacement and construction of key stations and park-and-ride lots. Potential unfunded capital cost = \$10-15 million.

This could involve the reallocation of a portion of the Section 3 "Letter-of-Intent" funds and should be tied into adoption of a five-year Transit Development Program.

4. Regional Rail Corridors -- A comprehensive review of the regional light rail corridors should be undertaken to establish the priority of the various corridors and appropriate steps to proceed with toward implementation. From this, a short-term strategy for pursuing the Sunset LRT, I-205 LRT and Milwaukie LRT should be adopted, followed by a long-term strategy for funding the capital and operating cost of implementation. Potential costs: Sunset LRT = \$250 million; Milwaukie LRT = \$85 million; I-205 LRT = \$85 million.
5. Railroad Abandonments -- Three railroad rights-of-way are (or may soon be) for sale: the Jefferson Street line from Portland to Lake Oswego, the Bellrose line from Portland to Milwaukie to Gresham and the Burlington Northern line through Washington County. All of the corridors affect a potential LRT route, several planned highway projects and planned bike routes. A firm decision should be made on whether or not to acquire these corridors and, if so, a strategy developed for this purpose. Potential cost = \$4 million.
6. Local Arterial Funding -- With the conclusion of the Interstate Transfer Program, \$12-15 million per year is no longer available for local arterial improvements. The only viable replacement source is Federal-Aid Urban funds at \$3.8 million/year (\$1.6 million Portland/\$2.2 million balance of region). The 1987 Oregon Legislature may yet adopt a road funding increase but it will likely not include a previously proposed "Urban Arterial Program" and funding to local governments will largely be dedicated toward operations and maintenance shortfalls. With this situation, there should be a regional strategy on how to handle FAU funds (i.e., regional allocation, formula allocation or dedicate to transit projects) - and - there should be a decision on whether to pursue another regional highway funding source through state and/or regional initiatives.
7. Local/Suburban Transit -- Long-term expansion of local transit service is not possible without additional funding. In addition, it is not clear how to most effectively provide suburban transit service. A conclusion is needed on the overall level of needed local and suburban service to pursue, the most effective method of providing the service and funding strategy.

ATTACHMENT "B"

Federal Transportation Funding

<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Amount Federal/State/Local Match</u>	<u>Eligibility</u>	<u>Approval Requirements</u>
Interstate (FHWA)	\$16 m. per year statewide 92/8	For completion of previously approved segments of the Interstate system. Includes \$17.75 m. for I-205 busway.	Six-Year Program/TIP
Interstate - 4R (FHWA)	\$38 m. per year statewide 92/8	For rehabilitation and modernization of 718-mile Interstate system throughout Oregon (urban and rural).	Six-Year Program/TIP
Primary (FHWA)	\$29 m. per year statewide 88/12	For rehabilitation and modernization of 4,926 miles of major state highways throughout Oregon (urban and rural); by OTC policy 60 percent (\$18 m.) is for rehabilitation; 40 percent (\$11 m.) is for modernization.	Six-Year Program/TIP
Urban (FHWA)	\$7 m. per year statewide, including: - \$1.6 m. Portland - \$2.2 m. Portland region 88/6/6	For rehabilitation and modernization of 1,022 miles of arterials and collectors in the Portland region; eligible to be transferred to bus or rail facilities or vehicles.	TIP/OTC

<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Amount Federal/State/Local Match</u>	<u>Eligibility</u>	<u>Approval Requirement</u>
Section 3 (UMTA)	80/20	Available on a discretionary, competitive basis for major capital improvements, including fleet expansion, stations, park-and-ride lots, garages and LRT. LRT funding subject to following defined process and meeting cost-effectiveness standards.	TDP/TIP
Section 3 Letter-of-Intent (UMTA)	\$76.8 m. at \$12 m./year \$48.4 m. - grants received \$11.7 m. - programmed \$16.7 m. - under consideration 80/20	"Letter-of-Intent" approved by Congress and awarded to Portland region in 1982 for funding in 1982-1988. Provided as a commitment to "bus only" improvement program in exchange for regional "trade" of Interstate Transfer funds.	TIP/TDP
Section 16(b) (2) (UMTA)	\$320,000 per year statewide 80/20	Available to private, non-profit corporations only for capital improvements required to serve elderly and handicapped. Funds are available on a statewide basis and awarded competitively by ODOT. Applicant provides local match. Proposed service in Portland region must be service that cannot be provided by Tri-Met LIFT Program.	OTC/TIP

ATTACHMENT "C"

State Highway Funding

<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Distribution</u>	<u>Eligibility</u>
Current Highway Trust Fund at 12¢ gas tax, truck weight-mile tax, vehicle registration	\$278 m./year	13.36% to Cities	Any highway-related purposes; predominantly used for maintenance.
		21.57% to Counties	
		Mult. Co./Cities = \$ 21 m./yr. Clack. Co./Cities = 8 m. Wash. Co./Cities = 8 m. \$ 37 m./yr.	
		65.07% to ODOT	Any highway-related purpose; predominantly used for maintenance -- except for local match on federal funding at \$14 m./year and one-time State Modernization Program at \$200 m. in five years.

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE JPACT

DATE 6-11-87

NAME

AFFILIATION

NAME	AFFILIATION
M- Earl Blumenauer	Portland
M- Will Allison	Tri-Met
M- Bonnie Hays	Washington County
✓ G- Doug Allen	Citizens for Better Transit
✓ G- Steve Dotterer	PORTLAND STAFF
S- Karen Shackston	
✓ G- Diane Jones	City of Gresham
✓ G- Greg Di Loreto	Gresham
✓ G- RICHARD N. ROSS	CITY OF GRESHAM
✓ G- Pamela Kambur	SE Uplift Neighborhood Program
✓ G- DOUG CAPPAS	TRI-MET
✓ G- Bob Post	TRI-MET
✓ G- Denny Moore	ODOT, Transit
M- Marjorie D. Schunk	Cities of Mult. County
✓ G- Ted Spier	ODOT
MA- Rick Kuehn	ODOT
MA- Tom Beupham	DEQ
M- Ron Thom	Cities of Clack. Co.
M- George Van Bergen	Metro
M- Ed Ferguson	WSDOT
M- Vev Neysen	Clack Co. W.C.
M- Ed Diergeist	Clackamas Co.
EO- Steve	Metro

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE T-PACT

DATE 6-11-87

NAME

AFFILIATION

M- RICHARD WAKER

METRO

M- Pauline Anderson

Multnomah County

✓ G- Grace Crunican

Portland

✓ G- Lee Hames

Tri-Met

✓ G- Gil Mallery

IRC of Clark County

G- Geraldine Ball

I-5 Corr. Transp. Comm.

S- Andy Cotugno

Metro

S- Richard Brantman

Metro

✓ G- Susie LaSene

Multnomah County

S- Vickie Rocter

Metro

G- Gary Spanovich

Clackamas County

J