




# Memo

METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT 527 S.W. HALL ST., PORTLAND, OREGON 97201 503 221-1646  
Providing Zoo, Transportation, Solid Waste and other Regional Services

Date: February 6, 1985

To: JPACT

From:  Andrew C. Cotugno, Transportation Director

Regarding: Proposed I-205 LRT Study Schedule and Effect on Other Studies

## Background

At the December 13, 1984 meeting of JPACT, an action was taken to designate the I-205 corridor from Portland International Airport to the Clackamas Town Center as the next corridor to be examined under the Regional LRT Study work program. The action taken was a priority decision on scheduling the LRT studies and did not alter the priority designation of any corridors for construction nor did the action define a schedule for the study vis-a-vis other work program elements. Specifically, further information was requested regarding the status of various other studies and their relationship to the I-205 LRT schedule.

## Proposed I-205 LRT Schedule

- Tri-Met: Conduct conceptual engineering and operations analysis from April to December, 1985 using existing staff and approximately \$40,000 of consulting services from within budgeted resources for these purposes (subject to finalizing local match arrangements).
- Metro: Conduct assessment of transit ridership potential, economic evaluation, impact assessment and overall evaluation from November, 1985 to March, 1986 from within budgeted resources for this purpose.

## Proposed Schedule for Balance of Regional LRT Plan

- Milwaukie Corridor: Technical analysis and recommendations complete.
- Bi-State Corridor: Technical analysis and recommendations by July, 1985.

JPACT

February 6, 1985

Page 2

- . "Sketch" assessment of remaining corridors to identify components of a "Priority LRT System" to be conducted after completion of I-205 LRT Study: April - December, 1986.
- . More detailed work thereafter as required and defined by "sketch" assessment, including:
  - a) Completion of full "Phase I" work program for corridors recommended to be included in "Priority LRT System" to provide data comparable to Milwaukie, Bi-State and I-205 corridors;
  - b) Identification of alignment to be protected for corridors not included in "Priority LRT System" but desired to be retained for further consideration; and
  - c) Completion of downtown alignment and operations plan.

#### Proposed Schedule for Other Projects

- . Initiate Sunset LRT PE: Summer, 1985 pending conclusion of Blue Ribbon Committee.
- . Tri-Met Blue Ribbon Committee: February - June, 1985; announcement of membership and first meeting imminent; input from state, regional, local agencies yet to be scheduled.
- . Southwest Corridor Study: November - December, 1985 (more detailed schedule sent to Technical Advisory Committee).
- . RTP Update - Phase I (to reflect revised assumptions): July, 1985.
- . RTP Update - Phase II (to reflect updated projects and programs): July, 1985 - June, 1986.
- . Southeast area bus route restructuring to go into effect September, 1985: public outreach scheduled soon. Board decision in May.
- . Banfield LRT bus route restructuring: public outreach scheduled in fall, 1985. Board decision in March, 1986.

ACC:lmk

STAFF REPORT

Agenda Item No. \_\_\_\_\_

Meeting Date \_\_\_\_\_

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 85-\_\_\_\_ FOR THE  
PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE FY 1985 AND FY 1984  
UNIFIED WORK PROGRAMS

---

Date: January 29, 1985

Presented by: Andy Cotugno

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

Proposed Action

Adopt the attached resolution providing for \$60,000 of new Section 9 funding and \$67,500 of reprogrammed funds in the currently adopted Unified Work Program for the following purposes:

- |  |                   |
|--|-------------------|
| 1. Metro travel-forecasting<br>computer expansion  | + \$60,000        |
| 2. Tri-Met terminal for using<br>travel forecasts  | + \$30,000        |
| 3. Metro model refinement to<br>complete conversion of models<br>and recalibration to 1983 | + <u>\$37,500</u> |
|  | \$127,500         |

This amendment to the Unified Work Program is consistent with Metro Ordinance No. 85-186 amending the Metro FY 1984-85 Budget.

Background

1. Computer Expansion -- In 1983, Metro acquired a new computer package to convert the travel-forecasting operation from a UTPS system at Multnomah County Data Processing Authority to an in-house system. This was designed to improve the usability of the forecasts and reduce costs. The equipment acquired was based upon the requirement of converting ongoing regional forecasting operations. This conversion is basically accomplished and meets the needs of Metro's ongoing operations. The expansion proposed by this resolution is to permit greater use by outside agencies for studies in addition to those that are the responsibility of Metro. Over the past 18 months, as more of the travel-forecasting package has been converted, there has been greater outside demand for these services. Although Metro is currently budgeted at \$71,500 to provide these services to outside jurisdictions, it is clear that this level of expenditure is not possible within existing computer

capacity and still meet demands for Metro's ongoing regional studies. This trend is expected to escalate as more outside staff become proficient at using the system under less Metro supervision. The expansion is budgeted with \$30,000 of new Section 9 transit planning funds to permit its use in transit planning and \$30,000 of reprogrammed highway planning funds to permit its use in highway planning. The highway planning amount is to be reprogrammed from the technical assistance budget, resulting in a reduction from \$71,500 to \$41,500. This is because the expansion is for outside agency technical assistance and because it is clear the full \$71,500 will not be expended based upon the actual first six-month expenditure of \$15,700.

The computer expansion also includes a terminal to permit Tri-Met to connect in as a remote work station similar to ODOT. This terminal is proposed to be funded at \$30,000 of new Section 9 transit planning funds.

2. Model Refinement -- This represents a budget increase from \$79,000 to \$116,500 to permit completion of the conversion to EMME-2, calibration to new 1983 population/employment patterns, traffic counts and transit ridership and refinement of a detailed forecasting system for the western part of the region. These activities have incurred delays and cost increases due to unexpected complications with the new package and competition for computer space with outside users. It is essential that these be completed since they are fundamental steps toward updated 2005 forecasts.

#### EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends adoption of Resolution  
No. \_\_\_\_\_.

AC/gl  
2859C/327-3  
02/06/85

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE  
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE	)	RESOLUTION NO.
FY 1985 AND FY 1984 UNIFIED WORK	)	
PROGRAMS	)	Introduced by the Joint
	)	Policy Advisory Committee
	)	On Transportation

WHEREAS, The FY 85 Unified Work Program (UWP) was adopted in May 1984 by Resolution No. 84-462; and

WHEREAS, Changes to the UWP must be approved by the Metro Council and the federal funding agencies; and

WHEREAS, The FY 85 and FY 84 UWPs must be revised to accurately reflect revised task priorities and actual funding availability; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council hereby approves the amendments to the FY 85 and FY 84 UWPs as shown in Attachment "A."
2. That staff is directed to submit this Resolution with its exhibits and necessary grant amendments to the federal agencies for approval.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District  
this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 1985.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ernie Bonner, Presiding Officer

KT/gl  
2859C/327-2  
01/31/85

## FY 84/85 UWP AMENDMENT

Project	85 PL/ODOT	84 PL/ODOT	85 Sec. 8	Section 9	85 e(4)	Total
Model Refinement	\$ 26,436 + 5,232 \$ 31,668		\$ 52,564 +32,268 \$ 84,832			\$ 79,000 +37,500 \$ 116,500
Metro Computer	0 +24,768 \$ 24,768	0 +5,232 \$5,232		0 +30,000 \$30,000		0 +60,000 \$ 60,000
Tri-Met Terminal				0 +30,000 \$30,000		0 +30,000 \$ 30,000
Technical Assistance	\$ 40,000 -20,000 \$ 20,000		\$ 31,500 -10,000 \$ 21,500			\$ 71,500 -30,000 \$ 41,500
Southwest Corridor	\$ 25,552 -10,000 \$ 15,552				\$ 80,948 0 \$ 80,948	\$ 106,500 -10,000 \$ 96,500
Elderly & Handicapped			\$ 9,500 -5,500 \$ 4,000			\$ 9,500 -5,500 \$ 4,000
Management & Coordination	\$ 28,326 0 \$ 28,326		\$ 64,674 -7,000 \$ 57,674			\$ 93,000 -7,000 \$ 86,000
Transp. Imp. Program	\$ 16,854 0 \$ 16,854	\$5,232 -5,232 0	\$ 26,250 -9,768 \$ 16,482		\$ 60,746 0 \$ 60,746	\$ 109,082 -15,000 \$ 94,082
Other Projects	\$ 91,847 0 \$ 91,847		\$120,711 0 \$120,711	\$1,189,790 0 \$1,189,790	\$305,365 0 \$305,365	\$1,707,713 0 \$1,707,713
TOTAL	\$229,015 0 \$229,015	\$5,232 0 \$5,232	\$305,199 0 \$305,199	\$1,189,790 +60,000 \$1,249,790	\$447,059 0 \$447,059	\$2,176,295 +60,000 \$2,236,295

ACC:lmk  
1-28-85



# Memo

METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT 527 S.W. HALL ST., PORTLAND, OREGON 97201 503 221-1646  
Providing Zoo, Transportation, Solid Waste and other Regional Services

Date: January 17, 1985

To: Intergovernmental Resource Center Advisory  
Committee and Interested Parties

From: Steve Siegel, Administrator  
Intergovernmental Resource Center

Regarding: Objectives and Schedule

Thank you for your interest in Metro's Intergovernmental Resource Center. This memo outlines the timetables, issues and tentative meeting schedule for this year's budget review by the Advisory Committee.

## Time Constraint

By statute, Metro must notify local governments of the annual dues assessment by March 3 (120 days prior to the beginning of the fiscal year). To transmit this notification, the Metro Council will adopt its action at its February 28 meeting. Thus, the Advisory Committee should be prepared to finalize its dues recommendation by February 22.

## Major Issues which Need Advisory Committee Recommendation

1. Recommendation on work program and budget including associated dues level of FY 1986.
2. Finalize discussion on proposed Metro dues legislation.
3. Recommendation on how to better incorporate all cities in the Intergovernmental Resource Center process.

## Tentative Meeting Dates and Times

A maximum of three meetings are planned, each one about 1½ hours in length. Our previous communications indicated a tentative first meeting date of January 25. Some jurisdictions have been unable to make their appointments to the Advisory Committee in sufficient time to confirm this date. Therefore, the following revised schedule is proposed:

- Meeting 1     Friday, February 1, 1985  
                 Metro Office, 7:30 to 9:00 a.m.
- Meeting 2     Friday, February 8, 1985  
                 Metro Office, 7:30 to 9:00 a.m.
- Meeting 3     Friday, February 22, 1985  
                 Metro Office, 7:30 to 9:00 a.m.

If these dates and times do not work for the Advisory Committee, they will be changed. Please contact Gwen Ware at 221-1646 by Friday, January 25, 1985, to confirm or propose change.

Meeting notices and specific agendas will be mailed to you in advance of the meetings.

Advisory Committee Materials

Enclosed are the primary materials for all three meetings:

1. Summary of proposed FY 1986 IRC Work Program, Budget and Dues level.
2. Draft Narrative on FY 1986 Work Program.
3. Proposed Metro dues legislation.
4. The mission, charge and composition of the Advisory Committee as adopted by the Metro Council.

These materials will be supplemented with brief explanatory presentations at the Advisory Committee meetings. New materials, based on Advisory Committee recommendations, will be prepared and disseminated when appropriate.

Open Invitation

All local governments are invited to attend Advisory Committee meetings or may transmit comments to me to be distributed to the Advisory Committee.

SS/srs  
2749C/D3-2





# Memo

METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT 527 S.W. HALL ST., PORTLAND, OREGON 97201 503 221-1646  
Providing Zoo, Transportation, Solid Waste and other Regional Services

Date: January 17, 1985

To: Intergovernmental Resource Center Advisory Committee

From: Steve Siegen, Administrator  
Intergovernmental Resource Center

Regarding: Proposed FY 1986 Work Program, Budget and Dues  
Level for the Intergovernmental Resource Center:  
Summary

Attached is a three-page summary of the proposed FY 1986 work program for the Intergovernmental Resource Center (IRC). Also enclosed is a lengthier narrative on the work program, which explains the purpose, products and rationale for each of the work elements. Since many readers will have time to review the outline only, the remaining paragraphs explain some key points or assumptions:

1. The "Dues" column represents the per capita dues paid by local governments. The total dues projected in the proposed budget assume a 1 percent population increase over last year and a 51¢ per capita rate. It also assumes Port of Portland and Tri-Met dues at 12.5 percent of the local government rate applied over the entire district. Based on the deliberations of the Advisory Committee and actual population estimates from Portland State University, the actual amount of dues to be collected will change.

In the draft budget, the need for dues exceeds the projected amount. One of the issues for the Advisory Committee is to determine which projects get funded.

2. The "Grant" column includes funds mostly from transportation grants; a modest amount of LCDC funds are assumed. Most of the grants require local match. The grant money has been programmed to eligible projects.
3. "Other" funds are mostly contracts received for the purposes that they are programmed.
4. The rows in the attached outline represent work elements. The work program is broken into five main categories: Administration, Data Services, Transportation, Development

Services and Criminal Justice. For the most part, these categories are broken into three sub-parts: Regional Studies, Technical Assistance and Coordination Services. These sub-parts are then composed of several tasks.

5. The proposed work program consists of approximately 55 distinct tasks, a 25-person staff and a total budget (including salary, fringe, overhead and material and services of \$1.795 million. The size of the proposed program is similar to the current one. Slightly more than \$90,000 currently has no proposed funding. When the budget is finalized, those projects without funding will not be performed.
6. The costs associated with each task are total costs including: salary, fringe, overhead and material and services.

If in reviewing the summary, questions arise, the answer may be covered in the lengthier narrative. If I can be of assistance, please do not hesitate to call.

SS/srs  
2750C/D3-3

Attachment

# WORK PROGRAM OUTLINE AND BUDGET FOR INTERGOVERNMENTAL RESOURCE CENTER

	<u>Dues</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
<b>I. Administration</b>				
<b>A. Management and Administration</b>				
1. IRC Program Management . . . . .	45,061	0	0	45,061
2. IRC Materials & Services . . . . .	28,000	0	0	28,000
3. Transfer to General Fund . . . . .	137,000	0	0	137,000
4. Contingency. . . . .	15,000	0	0	15,000
<b>B. Coordination</b>				
1. Regional Directory . . . . .	4,644	0	0	4,644
2. Staff Metro Managers Association . . . .	6,049	0	0	6,049
3. NARC/ORCA Liaison. . . . .	6,049	0	0	6,049
<b>II. Data Services</b>				
<b>A. Regional Data Base Maintenance</b>				
<b>1. Historical and Current Year Data</b>				
a. Demographic/Housing Data . . . . .	11,637	9,152	951	21,740
b. Employment Data. . . . .	23,916	18,800	1,954	44,670
c. Land Use Data. . . . .	6,734	5,296	550	12,580
d. Travel Data. . . . .	268	3,190	332	3,790
e. Development Trends . . . . .	8,700	0	0	8,700
<b>2. Short- and Long-Term Forecast Data</b>				
a. Demographic/Housing Forecasts. . . .	7,922	6,230	648	14,800
b. Employment Forecasts . . . . .	10,118	7,964	828	18,910
c. Land Use Forecasts . . . . .	6,766	5,321	553	12,640
d. Travel Forecasts . . . . .	268	3,190	332	3,790
<b>B. Technical Assistance</b>				
<b>1. Subscription Services</b>				
a. Socio-Economic Data Assistance . . .	39,310	0	0	39,310
b. Travel Data Assistance . . . . .	3,186	37,995	3,949	45,130
c. User Training. . . . .	1,303	15,542	1,615	18,460
<b>2. Contract Services</b>				
a. Socio-Economic Data. . . . .	0	0	31,550	31,550
b. Travel Data. . . . .	0	0	19,760	19,760

	<u>Dues</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
<b>C. Capability Development</b>				
1. Socio-Economic Data				
a. Graphic Display Methods. . . . .	18,610	0	0	18,610
b. Disaggregated Household Data . . . .	7,370	0	0	7,370
2. Travel Data				
a. 1985 Origin-Destination Survey . . .	9,809	116,974	12,157	138,940
b. Travel Model Refinement. . . . .	3,896	46,456	4,828	55,180
<b>III. Transportation</b>				
<b>A. Regional Transportation Planning and Programming</b>				
1. Regional Planning Studies				
a. RTP Update . . . . .	13,013	155,183	16,128	184,324
b. Regional LRT Study . . . . .	8,135	97,005	10,086	115,223
c. Southwest Corridor Study . . . . .	6,698	79,885	8,303	94,886
2. Transportation Improvement Program . . .	8,323	99,263	10,317	117,903
<b>B. Technical Assistance</b>				
1. Subscription Services				
a. Cornell/Barnes/Burnside Assessment .	1,322	15,762	1,638	18,722
b. Transportation Analysis Assistance Budgets for Jurisdictions. . . . .	1,443	17,213	1,788	20,445
2. Contract Services				
a. Support to Westside LRT PE . . . . .	0	0	24,094	24,094
b. Banfield LRT "Before" Assessment . .	0	0	29,000	29,000
<b>C. Coordination</b>				
1. TPAC/JPACT/TIP Subcommittee. . . . .	2,817	33,593	3,491	39,901
2. Federal Legislative Liaison. . . . .	5,339	4,041	10,420	19,800
3. Six-Year Program Update. . . . .	699	8,335	866	9,900
4. Coordination with FHWA/UMTA. . . . .	3,188	38,019	3,951	45,159
5. ODOT Apportionment Study . . . . .	678	8,082	840	9,600

	<u>Dues</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
IV. Development Services				
A. Regional Land Development and Public Facility Planning				
1. Land Use				
a. Urban Growth Boundary. . . . .	24,623	10,000	10,000	44,623
b. Comprehensive Plan Review. . . . .	21,254	10,000	0	31,254
2. Public Facilities				
a. Public Facility Plans. . . . .	10,120	0	0	10,120
b. Regional Sewer Plan Maintenance. . .	11,739	0	0	11,739
c. Urban Service Financing. . . . .	13,376	29,965	0	43,341
3. Economic Development				
a. Industrial Lands Analysis. . . . .	25,285	0	0	25,285
b. Development Constraints Report . . .	14,939	0	0	14,939
B. Technical Assistance				
1. Subscription				
a. Intern Assistance Program. . . . .	17,098	0	0	17,098
b. Professional Training Workshops. . .	14,717	0	2,000	16,717
c. Regional Information Services. . . .	7,668	0	0	7,668
C. Coordination				
1. Intergovernmental Project Review . . . .	16,742	0	0	16,742
2. Urban Services Forum/Water Resources Policy Alternatives Committee. . . . .	5,060	0	0	5,060
3. Staff Regional Convention, Trade and Sports Facilities Task Force . . . . .	30,729	0	0	30,729
4. Staff Regional Parks Task Force. . . . .	19,472	0	0	19,472
V. Criminal Justice Services				
A. Coordination				
1. Staff Regional Adult Corrections Task Force . . . . .	13,611	0	0	13,611
TOTAL. . . . .	699,705	882,420	212,926	1,795,051
PROJECTED DUES . . . . .	606,975			
DUES DEFICIT . . . . .	92,730			



# Memo

METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT 527 S.W. HALL ST., PORTLAND, OREGON 97201 503 221-1646  
Providing Zoo, Transportation, Solid Waste and other Regional Services

Date: January 17, 1985  
To: Interested Parties  
From: Steve Siegel, Administrator  
Intergovernmental Resource Center (IRC)  
Regarding: Draft Narrative on FY 1986 Work Program for the  
Intergovernmental Resource Center

## I. ADMINISTRATION

### A. Management and Administration

#### 1. IRC Program Management

The Administrator is responsible for overall (a) budget preparation and monitoring, (b) work programming, (c) scheduling, (d) personnel administration and (e) general management of the 25-person IRC staff. The Administrator also supports the Metro Council and Executive Officer and member governments on IRC matters.

#### 2. IRC Materials and Services

This includes Travel, Meetings and Conferences, Training, Dues and Subscriptions, Advertisements, Special Printing, Special Postage, Office Supplies, Contract Services, and Data Processing for the entire IRC.

#### 3. Transfer to Create General Fund

The budgeted overhead rate for FY 1985-86 is 50 percent on salary and fringe costs. This pays for IRC's portion of such things as Rent, Motor Pool, Telephones, General Printing and Xeroxing, General Postage, Word Processing, Central Accounting, Personnel, etc.

These costs are included in each program cost shown. In addition to these overhead costs, the revenue for Metro's general purpose government activities is created by General Fund transfers from the line departments. The expenditures include election costs,

Council costs, Executive Officer costs, etc. These are not grant eligible expenses and, therefore, are picked up by dues only.

4. IRC Contingency

B. Coordination

1. Regional Directory

Prepare and disseminate a directory of the region's elected officials and key staff.

2. Staff Metro Managers Association

The Metro Managers Association, consisting of city managers from throughout the region, has been in existence for some time without staffing by Metro. The group's objective was to meet once a month to proceed through a carefully prepared agenda. In the absence of a direct staffing responsibility, this has been a hit-and-miss proposition. Several city managers have suggested the IRC provide the necessary staffing. By doing so, Metro can have more constructive contacts with the region's smaller cities, which has been a problem.

3. Nation Association of Regional Councils (NARC)/Oregon Regional Council Association (ORCA) Liaison

This work program element provides a link between the Portland metropolitan area and the federal and state organizations for regional councils. Metro will provide direct staff support to ORCA.

II. DATA SERVICES

A. Regional Data Base Maintenance

1. Historical and Current Year Data

a. Current Demographic and Housing Data

Maintain 1980 Census information on persons, households, families and dwelling units by all census categories. In addition, a 1985 update of 1) persons by age and by sex, 2) households by size and by income, and 3) dwelling units by type and by persons per unit will be estimated. A computer file and summary report will be produced.

b. Current Employment Data

1980 data on employees by the nine major Standard Industrial Code (SIC) categories and by major occupation groups will be maintained. In addition, a 1985 update of employees by the nine major SIC categories will be estimated. A computer file and summary report will be produced.

c. Current Land Use Data

A 1980 file of land in use by generalized zoning categories and vacant land by plan designation will be maintained. In addition, estimate a 1985 update of the above land use data. A computer file and summary report will be produced.

d. Current Travel Data

A 1983 travel data base consisting of 1) auto traffic volumes on collectors, arterials and highways, 2) transit passenger volumes and 3) travel patterns by mode of travel and purpose of travel will be maintained. A 1985 update will be produced as a computer file and summary report.

e. Development Trends

This is an annual report on development trends derived from the above updates and their comparison to existing forecasts. The report provides a popularized version of the technically oriented documentation proposed in previous tasks.

2. Short- and Long-Term Forecasts

a. Demographic and Housing Forecasts

The long-term (Year 2005) forecasts of 1) persons by age and by sex, b) households by size and 3) dwelling units by type will be maintained. New short-term (five-year) forecasts of the above variables and households by income will be produced as a computer file and summary report.

b. Employment Forecasts

Long-term forecasts maintained and short-term forecast produced of retail and total employment. Products include computer file and summary report.



c. Land Use Forecasts

Long-term forecasts maintained and short-term forecast produced of land in use by generalized zoning and vacant land by plan designation. Products include computer file and summary report.

d. Travel Forecasts

Long-term and short-term forecasts produced of 1) auto traffic volumes, 2) transit passenger volumes, and 3) travel patterns by mode and purpose. Products include computer file and summary report.

B. Technical Assistance

1. Subscription Services

a. Socio-Economic and Land Use Data

The same socio-economic and land use data, staff and computer resources that are required for regional projects are often requested by member jurisdictions for local projects. The requests for assistance take several forms:

- Custom formatting the data to meet specific local needs.
- Special forecasts.
- Assistance in accessing the computer data base.

To meet these needs, a socio-economic data assistance pool is budgeted for member governments as follows:

	<u>FY 86 \$</u>
Clackamas Co. and Cities	\$ 6,170
Multnomah Co. and Cities	7,260
Washington Co. and Cities	9,080
City of Portland	13,800
Tri-Met	1,000
Port of Portland	1,000
State of Oregon	1,000
	<u>\$39,310</u>

If needed, priority setting and redistribution of unused retainers will be set by a user committee.

b. Travel Data

For similar reasons and in a similar manner, retainage pools are established for travel data assistance as follows:

	<u>FY 86 \$</u>
Clackamas Co. and Cities	\$ 5,231
Multnomah Co. and Cities	6,012
Washington Co. and Cities	7,400
City of Portland	11,432
Tri-Met	6,019
Port of Portland	6,019
State of Oregon	3,017
	<u>\$45,130</u>

2. Contract Services

a. Socio-Economic and Land Use Data

Large special projects that go beyond the effective use of the technical assistance pools, jurisdictions that have demands in excess of retainage funds or other groups, public or private, that need assistance from Metro's socio-economic or land use data will be responded to on a contract basis. Clients requesting such services are expected to provide the needed financial resources. Funds generally available to member governments will not be used for these purposes.

b. Travel Data

Same as above, applied to travel data.

c. User Training

Many jurisdictions are requesting that their own staff be trained to directly use certain portions of the IRC's technical capability. This permits an increased use of the data system. Retainage pools are proposed to provide needed training and over-the-shoulder advice to local planners employing the system in this manner as follows:

	<u>FY 86 \$</u>
Clackamas Co. and Cities	\$ 2,140
Multnomah Co. and Cities	2,460
Washington Co. and Cities	3,030
City of Portland	4,680
Tri-Met	2,460
Port of Portland	1,230
ODOT	2,460
	<u>\$18,460</u>

C. Capability Development

1. Socio-Economic Data

a. Graphic Display Methods

Increased computer graphics capability will reduce costs and increase the quality of the socio-economic data resource. This task develops a capability to display data in a mapped form from a micro-computer partially paid for by the proposed budget for this task.

b. Disaggregated Household and Employment Data

Some holes in the IRC's current data base include household information by 1) size and income, and 2) size and auto ownership. Last year's purchase of a special census tape entitled "Urban Transportation Planning Package" provides the base data to plug these holes in the data base. This tape also includes employment data lacking in the current system. This work element analyzes the special census tape.

2. Travel Data

a. 1985 Origin-Destination Survey

The base data needed to operate a travel forecasting system includes detailed travel data obtainable only through sophisticated survey research techniques. The collection and use of this data includes several major tasks which are too technical to detail here, but tend to be moderately expensive. This task was last performed in 1977. The need for updated data coupled with the availability of grant funds for this purpose motivated the recommendation to perform this task in FY 1986.

b. Travel Model Refinement

Several technical updating tasks are programmed including re-estimating the travel models based on the new travel survey data.

III. TRANSPORTATION

A. Regional Transportation Planning and Programming

1. Regional Planning Studies

a. Regional Transportation Plan Update

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is a long-range program of highway and transit improvements. It provides the basis for coordinating local comprehensive plans and for specifying short-range highway and transit improvements. A certified RTP is a prerequisite for the receipt of federal transportation funds in the metropolitan area. This update re-evaluates the current list of improvements in light of recently revised long-term population and employment forecasts. The two major elements of the update include:

Transit Plan Update - The currently adopted transit policy will be re-evaluated in light of changing ridership projections and Tri-Met's changing financial status.

Highway Plan Update - The need for highway projects will be updated with a particular emphasis on identifying a comprehensive improvement program on the Minor Arterial and Collector street system.

b. Regional Light Rail Transit Plan

This project assesses the major transit corridors to determine whether light rail transit (LRT) is a feasible option and, if so, to identify alignments to protect for possible future LRT construction. Major elements of the study include conceptual engineering, transit operations analysis, capital and operating cost analysis, transit ridership forecasts, "life-cycle" economic analysis and generalized environmental impact assessment. This study will focus on completing the Bi-State and I-205 analysis between the Portland International

Airport and Clackamas Town Center and initiating work on the Barbur Corridor and the Sunset LRT extensions. In addition, information about LRT in the Macadam Avenue Corridor will be provided to the Macadam Avenue SPRR Re-Use Study.

c. Southwest Corridor Study

This project is intended to develop an overall improvement program in the I-5 South/Barbur Boulevard and Highway 217 Corridors. Projects being examined include bus or LRT service in the I-5/Barbur Corridor, interchange improvements to I-5, the Aloha Bypass, improvements to Murray Boulevard and Durham Road and others. In addition, support will be provided to local jurisdictions to define needed improvements to the Minor Arterial and Collector system. This study will result in a series of additions to the RTP.

2. Transportation Improvement Program

This activity involves allocation, approval and management of federal transportation funding available to the Portland region. As a federal prerequisite, all such expenditures must be approved as part of the TIP. As part of this task, Metro assists in the technical development of federally funded projects and participates in ODOT's Local Officials' Advisory Committee.

B. Technical Assistance

1. Subscription Services

a. Cornell/Barbur/Burnside Assessment

This project is intended to assist Washington County and Portland in defining needed highway improvements through the West Hills. The result will likely involve comprehensive plan adjustments to one or both plans and will identify projects for inclusion in the RTP. This is a continuing commitment from FY 1985.

b. Transportation Analysis Assistance Budgets for Local Jurisdictions

In the Data Services section, I noted the demand for IRC data assistance on local projects. A

similar demand exists for travel analysis services. In a manner similar to data, local assistance budgets have been proposed as follows:

	<u>FY 86 \$</u>
Clackamas Co. and Cities	\$ 2,370
Multnomah Co. and Cities	2,724
Washington Co. and Cities	3,352
City of Portland	5,178
Tri-Met	2,727
Port of Portland	2,727
ODOT	1,367
	<u>\$20,445</u>

2. Contract Services

a. Support to Westside LRT PE

Metro staff will provide technical services to Tri-Met in the preparation of PE and the DEIS. Funding will come from Tri-Met's PE grant.

b. Banfield LRT "Before" Assessment

This is the first element of a project to document the effects of the Banfield LRT and highway project on travel patterns and behavior. This element will document the "Before" condition to provide the data base for evaluating the "After" condition in 1987. This will be funded through a special grant with local match from Tri-Met.

C. Coordination

1. JPACT/TPAC/TIP Subcommittee

Metro's committees are intended to provide a forum to develop consensus on transportation issues of regional and intergovernmental importance. JPACT is a policy level committee of elected officials and board members; TPAC has a representation of technical officials. Both committees deal with all major regional transportation policy issues. In addition, the TIP Subcommittee includes technical representatives to deal with specific federal funding management issues.

2. Federal Legislative Liaison

This task supports the regional lobbying effort to secure federal transportation funding. It includes a budget for a regional lobbyist funded by Metro, Clackamas County and Washington County (Portland and Tri-Met also participate through other budgets).

3. ODOT Six-Year Program Update

This task provides input to ODOT's bi-annual update to their highway program and to assist the region in adopting their priorities for inclusion in the Six-Year Program.

4. Coordination with UMTA/FHWA

In order to maintain "certification" that the region is eligible to receive federal transportation grants, Metro must meet a variety of planning and administrative requirements programmed in this task.

5. ODOT/LOC/AOC Highway Apportionment Study

ODOT, the League of Oregon Cities and the Association of Oregon Counties has recently initiated a study to revise the basis upon which the state gas tax is apportioned to the State Highway Fund and to cities and counties. The intent is to develop a recommendation to the 1987 session of the Oregon Legislature. This project is intended to monitor the progress of the study, disseminate materials to local jurisdictions and discuss issues of policy significance with JPACT.

IV. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

A. Regional Land Development Planning

1. Land Use Planning

a. Urban Growth Boundary (UGB)

Previous experience indicates that 10 UGB amendment cases should be anticipated during FY 1985-86 (none with extraordinary circumstances). In addition, a variety of UGB procedural and substantive problem areas are programmed to be resolved. These include several inconsistencies that local jurisdictions requested be clarified such as the floodplain line

in Hillsboro, the double UGB line in Sherwood and Clackamas County, shoreline issue in Portland and Multnomah County, etc. Staff time to respond to continuous requests for UGB information regarding annexations, project permits, development permits, etc., is also budgeted.

b. Plan Review

During FY 1985-86, LCDC's recently adopted rule on Periodic Review of Comprehensive Plans will begin to impact land planning in the Metro region. Metro must determine its techniques and procedures for conducting periodic reviews. One area requiring special attention is how to address compliance with LCDC's Metropolitan Housing Rule. A second notable task is to determine techniques and procedures for responding to LCDC's new Economic Development Rule. The resultant procedures and criteria will be applied to incoming plan updates and amendments.

2. Public Facilities Planning

a. Public Facility Plans

LCDC's new rule on Public Facility Plans necessitates data inventories, analyses and revised intergovernmental planning agreements for all cities, counties, sewer and water districts in the region. Metro's Urban Services Forum, an intergovernmental group of land planning and public works staff, recommends that Metro work with the jurisdictions to determine a systematic, coordinated and least-expensive way to meet the new requirements. This is likely to require that Metro staff (1) prepare certain inventories/ analyses on behalf of jurisdictions, (2) prepare model intergovernmental agreements, and (3) prepare plan review criteria.

b. Regional Sewer Plan Maintenance

The "208" Plan designates the regional network of sewer treatment facilities and transmission lines. The "208" Plan is required for federal sewer funding eligibility. The "208" Plan must be annually updated and recertified by DEQ and EPA. Historically, the updating has been done on a piecemeal basis. The Water Resources Policy Alternatives Committee, composed of staff from local sewer



departments and special districts, recommends that the current "208" Plan should be rewritten to avoid difficulties and confusion with grant applications, annexations and local planning.

c. Urban Service Financing

Technical data and analyses will be prepared to support state, regional and local transportation revenue-generation programs. To respond to requests for current information on grants and other revenue options, Metro staff is programmed to review and compile material from the Federal Register, several grant information services, and federal and state contacts. This information will be provided to local jurisdictions through phone contacts, regular mailings and special workshops. In addition, an analysis of new state legislation affecting urban service financing will be prepared and disseminated.

3. Economic Development

a. Industrial Lands Analysis

In 1981, Metro performed an analysis of the amount of large lot industrial parcels remaining in the region. This analysis concluded that there was a shortage and recommended amendments to the UGB. Due to the recent rapid absorption of industrial land, the sufficiency of industrial acreage is an issue again. Requests to study industrial lands have been received from Washington County, Clackamas County, Hillsboro and the State's Economic Development Department. In response, staff is programmed to analyze the supply and demand for industrial land, in particular, large-lot parcels. The analysis will serve as the basis for responses to several anticipated UGB amendment requests.

b. Development Constraints Report

The rapid development in Washington County and the slow development in Multnomah and Clackamas Counties present a new array of regional development issues which have not been compiled or discussed. This task provides technical analyses and a local government forum to resolve these issues.

B. Technical Assistance

1. Subscription

a. Intern Assistance Program

This program is designed to respond to the special project needs of the region's smaller jurisdictions. It provides technical assistance to local jurisdictions on specific community development projects either through the use of Metro staff or graduate student interns. If graduate students are utilized, Metro provides a list of pre-screened candidates who are qualified for the specific project and, possibly, a small (up to \$500) grant award to be used with local government matching funds (50/50) to pay for the intern. This program has existed for several years and has been well received, particularly by the region's smaller jurisdictions.

b. Professional Training Workshops

Provide professional development workshops and training sessions, once a month, to the local jurisdictions on topics determined through an annual survey of needs. Administer the land use training program, using a series of instruction books and videotapes prepared by BGRS to newly-elected officials and new appointments to planning commissions. Plan and run the annual Metro Conference on a topic of widespread interest using main speakers from outside the region.

c. Regional Information Service

Prepare and disseminate a regular monthly, four-page information sheet on urban service legislation, grants, projects, land development trends and other topics of importance to the local jurisdictions. In addition, special editions will be prepared when warranted.

C. Coordination

1. Intergovernmental Project Review

The federal government through Executive Order 12372, and State of Oregon through its administrative proce-

dures process, require Intergovernmental Project Review (IPR) of most applications for federal assistance and direct development activities of the federal government. The State rule establishing an IPR system in Oregon also designates Metro as the Areawide Clearinghouse for the Portland area.

Metro will receive and distribute applications for federal assistance including state block grant allocation programs, and Draft Environmental Impact Statements (DEIS) for local jurisdictional review and comment. If conflicts or disagreements arise between the applicant and local jurisdiction reviewing the proposal, Metro will coordinate meetings to resolve any disputes. Metro will compile all local comments both favorable and negative, and transmit them to the State of Oregon Intergovernmental Relations Division (IRD) for final transmittal to the federal funding agency and applicant.

2. Urban Service Forum/Water Resources Policy Alternatives Committee

During FY 1984, an Urban Services Forum was formed consisting of local staffs from planning, water, sewer, transportation and drainage departments. This group will meet once a month to discuss issues of common concern, in particular, the required public facility plans. The Water Resources Policy Alternatives Committee is required by the adopted "208" Plan. It meets quarterly to discuss sanitary sewer issues and to recommend amendments to the "208" Plan.

3. Regional Convention, Trade and Spectator Facility Task Force

Recommended by an ad hoc group of community and political leaders, this task force will:

- a. Seek to implement a convention center.
- b. Examine the need for satellite convention facilities.
- c. Examine the need for new sports facilities.
- d. Examine the need for trade facilities.
- e. Prepare regional funding and management options.

Metro staff is programmed to coordinate a multi-jurisdictional study and staff the task force.

4. Regional Parks Task Force

The Metropolitan Citizen League's Parks Committee recommended that Metro conduct an in-depth study of regional parks and that Metro appoint a Task Force to oversee the study. The League presented the Committee report to the public and held a panel discussion on the report. The panel consisted of Mike Lindberg, Portland City Commissioner; Eva Killpack, Washington County Commissioner; Dennis Buchanan, County Executive, Multnomah County; and Dan Zinzer, Clackamas County Parks Administrator. The panel concurred that Metro should conduct such a study.

The study will focus on those existing park facilities (not recreational programs) located within the tri-county area which attract users from throughout the region. It will define a way for existing, regional park facilities to be integrated into a system which can be efficiently operated and have an equitable, stable funding base.

The proposed budget covers staffing the Regional Parks Task Force and writing of the Plan. The budget for the detailed analyses of the individual facilities must be programmed in the budgets of the local jurisdictions currently responsible for the subject parks.

V. CRIMINAL JUSTICE

A. Coordination

1. Regional Adult Corrections Task Force

At the request of the three counties, a Regional Adult Corrections Task Force is recommended consisting of representatives from the County Commissions, the Sheriffs, the District Attorneys, the Community Corrections Administrators, the Circuit and District Courts, the Jail Administrators and the Metro Council. The purposes of this group are to (a) exchange information, (b) develop mutually agreeable policy positions, (c) recommend fiscal and programmatic solutions, and (d) develop a regional partnership with the State Corrections Division. This work element staffs the task force.

# WORK PROGRAM OUTLINE AND BUDGET FOR INTERGOVERNMENTAL RESOURCE CENTER

	<u>Dues</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
<b>I. Administration</b>				
<b>A. Management and Administration</b>				
1. IRC Program Management . . . . .	45,061	0	0	45,061
2. IRC Materials & Services . . . . .	28,000	0	0	28,000
3. Transfer to General Fund . . . . .	137,000	0	0	137,000
4. Contingency. . . . .	15,000	0	0	15,000
<b>B. Coordination</b>				
1. Regional Directory . . . . .	4,644	0	0	4,644
2. Staff Metro Managers Association . . . .	6,049	0	0	6,049
3. NARC/ORCA Liaison. . . . .	6,049	0	0	6,049
<b>II. Data Services</b>				
<b>A. Regional Data Base Maintenance</b>				
<b>1. Historical and Current Year Data</b>				
a. Demographic/Housing Data . . . . .	11,637	9,152	951	21,740
b. Employment Data. . . . .	23,916	18,800	1,954	44,670
c. Land Use Data. . . . .	6,734	5,296	550	12,580
d. Travel Data. . . . .	268	3,190	332	3,790
e. Development Trends . . . . .	8,700	0	0	8,700
<b>2. Short- and Long-Term Forecast Data</b>				
a. Demographic/Housing Forecasts. . . .	7,922	6,230	648	14,800
b. Employment Forecasts . . . . .	10,118	7,964	828	18,910
c. Land Use Forecasts . . . . .	6,766	5,321	553	12,640
d. Travel Forecasts . . . . .	268	3,190	332	3,790
<b>B. Technical Assistance</b>				
<b>1. Subscription Services</b>				
a. Socio-Economic Data Assistance . . .	39,310	0	0	39,310
b. Travel Data Assistance . . . . .	3,186	37,995	3,949	45,130
c. User Training. . . . .	1,303	15,542	1,615	18,460
<b>2. Contract Services</b>				
a. Socio-Economic Data. . . . .	0	0	31,550	31,550
b. Travel Data. . . . .	0	0	19,760	19,760

	<u>Dues</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
C. Capability Development				
1. Socio-Economic Data				
a. Graphic Display Methods. . . . .	18,610	0	0	18,610
b. Disaggregated Household Data . . . .	7,370	0	0	7,370
2. Travel Data				
a. 1985 Origin-Destination Survey . . .	9,809	116,974	12,157	138,940
b. Travel Model Refinement. . . . .	3,896	46,456	4,828	55,180
I. Transportation				
A. Regional Transportation Planning and Programming				
1. Regional Planning Studies				
a. RTP Update . . . . .	13,013	155,183	16,128	184,324
b. Regional LRT Study . . . . .	8,135	97,005	10,086	115,223
c. Southwest Corridor Study . . . . .	6,698	79,885	8,303	94,886
2. Transportation Improvement Program . . .	8,323	99,263	10,317	117,903
B. Technical Assistance				
1. Subscription Services				
a. Cornell/Barnes/Burnside Assessment .	1,322	15,762	1,638	18,722
b. Transportation Analysis Assistance Budgets for Jurisdictions. . . . .	1,443	17,213	1,788	20,445
2. Contract Services				
a. Support to Westside LRT PE . . . . .	0	0	24,094	24,094
b. Banfield LRT "Before" Assessment . .	0	0	29,000	29,000
C. Coordination				
1. TPAC/JPACT/TIP Subcommittee. . . . .	2,817	33,593	3,491	39,901
2. Federal Legislative Liaison. . . . .	5,339	4,041	10,420	19,800
3. Six-Year Program Update. . . . .	699	8,335	866	9,900
4. Coordination with FHWA/UMTA. . . . .	3,188	38,019	3,951	45,159
5. ODOT Apportionment Study . . . . .	678	8,082	840	9,600

	<u>Dues</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
IV. Development Services				
A. Regional Land Development and Public Facility Planning				
1. Land Use				
a. Urban Growth Boundary. . . . .	24,623	10,000	10,000	44,623
b. Comprehensive Plan Review. . . . .	21,254	10,000	0	31,254
2. Public Facilities				
a. Public Facility Plans. . . . .	10,120	0	0	10,120
b. Regional Sewer Plan Maintenance. . .	11,739	0	0	11,739
c. Urban Service Financing. . . . .	13,376	29,965	0	43,341
3. Economic Development				
a. Industrial Lands Analysis. . . . .	25,285	0	0	25,285
b. Development Constraints Report . . .	14,939	0	0	14,939
B. Technical Assistance				
1. Subscription				
a. Intern Assistance Program. . . . .	17,098	0	0	17,098
b. Professional Training Workshops. . .	14,717	0	2,000	16,717
c. Regional Information Services. . . .	7,668	0	0	7,668
C. Coordination				
1. Intergovernmental Project Review . . . .	16,742	0	0	16,742
2. Urban Services Forum/Water Resources Policy Alternatives Committee. . . . .	5,060	0	0	5,060
3. Staff Regional Convention, Trade and Sports Facilities Task Force . . . . .	30,729	0	0	30,729
4. Staff Regional Parks Task Force. . . . .	19,472	0	0	19,472
V. Criminal Justice Services				
A. Coordination				
1. Staff Regional Adult Corrections Task Force . . . . .	13,611	0	0	13,611
TOTAL. . . . .	699,705	882,420	212,926	1,795,051
PROJECTED DUES . . . . .	606,975			
DUES DEFICIT . . . . .	92,730			

MEASURE SUMMARY

Removes sunset provision relating to local government service charges imposed by metropolitan service district.

Requires consultation with advisory committee before metropolitan service district may impose certain service charges.

Requires ports and mass transit districts located within metropolitan service district to pay service charge when service charges are assessed against cities and counties.

Limits per capita rate of service charge assessed against ports and mass transit districts.

A BILL FOR AN ACT

Relating to metropolitan service districts; amending ORS 268.513.

Be It Enacted by the People of the State of Oregon:

SECTION 1. ORS 268.513 is amended to read:

268.513. (1) The council[, in its sole discretion, may determine that] shall consult with the advisory committee appointed under ORS 268.170 before determining whether it is necessary to charge the cities and counties within the district for the services and activities carried out under ORS 268.380 and 268.390. If the council determines that it is necessary to charge cities and counties within the district for any fiscal year, it shall determine the total amount to be charged and shall assess each city and county with the portion of the total amount as the population of the portion of the city or county within the district bears to the total population of the district provided, however, that the service charge shall not exceed the rate of 51 cents per capita per year. For the purposes of this subsection the population of a county does not include the population of any city situated within the boundaries of that county. The population of



1 each city and county shall be determined in the manner prescribed  
2 by the council.

3 (2) The council shall notify each city and county of its intent  
4 to assess and the amount it proposes to assess each city and county  
5 at least 120 days before the beginning of the fiscal year for which  
6 the charge will be made.

7 (3) The decision of the council to charge the cities and  
8 counties within the district, and the amount of the charge upon  
9 each, shall be binding upon those cities and counties. Cities and  
10 counties shall pay their charge on or before October 1 of the  
11 fiscal year for which the charge has been made.

12 (4) [This section shall not apply to a fiscal year which ends later than  
13 June 30, 1985.] When the council determines that it is  
14 necessary to impose the service charges authorized under subsection  
15 (1) of this section for any fiscal year, each mass transit district  
16 organized under ORS chapter 267 and port located wholly or partly  
17 within the district shall also pay a service charge to the district  
18 for that fiscal year for the services and activities carried out  
19 under ORS 268.380 and 268.390. The charge for a mass transit  
20 district or port shall be the amount obtained by applying, for the  
21 population of the mass transit district or port within the  
22 boundaries of the district, a per capita charge that is 12-1/2  
23 percent of the per capita rate established for cities and counties  
24 for the same fiscal year. Subsections (2) and (3) of this section  
25 apply to charges assessed under this subsection.

---

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE  
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

AN ORDINANCE FOR THE PURPOSE OF	)	ORDINANCE NO. 84-180
ESTABLISHING A LOCAL OFFICIALS	)	
ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE INTER-	)	
GOVERNMENTAL RESOURCE CENTER	)	

THE COUNCIL OF THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT HEREBY ORDAINS:

Section 1. Establishment of Intergovernmental Resource

Committee and Overall Mission

The Council of the Metropolitan Service District hereby establishes the Intergovernmental Resource Committee as the local officials advisory committee for the Intergovernmental Resource Center (IRC) under the provisions of ORS 268.170. The mission of the Intergovernmental Resource Committee is to promote intergovernmental cooperation and coordination as a means for resolving issues of mutual concern.

Section 2. Specific Charge for the Intergovernmental Resource

Committee

(a) Recommend the annual work program and budget for the IRC to the Council of the Metropolitan Service District.

(b) Recommend the annual intergovernmental consensus building program to the Council of the Metropolitan Service District including: (1) the priority issues meriting intergovernmental attention, (2) the general composition of associated task forces/committees, and (3) the specific charges to the associated task forces/committees.

(c) Recommend amendments, when required, to the work program or regional consensus building program to the Council of the Metropolitan Service District.

Section 3. Membership of the Intergovernmental Resource

Committee

(a) The Intergovernmental Resource Committee is composed of the following membership:

<u>Representative(s)</u>	<u>Jurisdiction</u>
1	Clackamas County
1	Multnomah County
1	Washington County
1	Cities of Clackamas County
1	Cities of Multnomah County
1	Cities of Washington County
1	City of Portland
1	Port of Portland
1	Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District
1	State of Oregon
3	Metropolitan Service District

(b) The specific appointment of a representative is to be made by the governmental entity(ies) served by that representative.

(c) Intergovernmental Resource Committee membership is limited to members of policy bodies or chief executive officers from the above-mentioned governmental entities.

(d) The chairperson of the Intergovernmental Resource Committee will be appointed by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District  
this 20th day of November, 1984.

Conly Rutpatrick  
Presiding Officer

Certified A True Copy of the Original Thereof  
A. Marie Wilson  
Clerk of the Council

Attest:

A. Marie Wilson

Clerk of the Council

## COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE

JPACT

DATE

2-14-85

7:30 a.m.

## NAME

## AFFILIATION

M Marvin Wordys

Cities of Multnomah County

✓ G Ruth Walsh

- " -

✓ G Bob Post

TRI-MET

✓ G Ted Jensen

ODOT

M R. Pokornowski

City of Vancouver

M Van Vapey

Clark Co.

M George Van Bergen

metro

M RICHARD WAKER

METRO

M Wes McLeod

Wash Co

M Ed Hardt

ODOT

M Jim Gardner

METRO

M LARRY COLE

CITIES OF WASHINGTON COUNTY

M Ron Thom

Cities of Clark Co.

M LLOYD ANDERSON

PORT OF PORTLAND

MA Earl Blumenauer

Multnomah County

M ~~BOOKER J. JONES~~

CLACKAMAS COUNTY

M Margaret Strachan

City of Portland

S Peg Henneman

metro

S Keith Ahola

WSDOT

G Steve Dittmer

City of Portland

G Bebe Rucker

Port of Portland

G Rick DANIELS

WASH. CO.

G Geoff Larkin

City of Portland

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE JPACT

DATE 2-14

NAME

AFFILIATION

S- Karen Shackleton

Metro

G GUSIE LAHSENE

MULTCO

G Gilbert Malen

Regional Planning Council

✓ G Betty Beyster

Ti met

✓ G Julia Pommeroy

M. Strachan

✓ Peter F Fry

CEIC

E Elton Chang

FHWA

S Keith Lawton

Metro

S Richard Bradman

Metro

✓ Geraldine L. Bael

WJB, Inc