

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING USE) RESOLUTION NO. 88- 884
OF FEDERAL-AID URBAN SYSTEM FUNDS)
IN PARTIAL SUPPORT OF OREGON'S) Introduced by the Joint
TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER CENTER FOR) Policy Advisory Committee
TRANSPORTATION) on Transportation

WHEREAS, In 1984 Oregon established a Technology Center to assist local governments in improving their transportation programs; and

WHEREAS, The combination of federal and state financing which supported the Center over the years will end this June 1988; and

WHEREAS, A proposal to continue funding the Center calls for federal, county and city participation using Federal-Aid Urban funds; and

WHEREAS, The Portland urbanized area's share for an 18-month period of operations has been targeted at \$20,122 in accordance with Exhibit A; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Council of the Metropolitan Service District releases \$20,122 of Federal-Aid Urban (FAU) funds to the Center:

FAU Regional Reserve	\$11,445
City of Portland	<u>8,677</u>
Total	\$20,122

2. That the Council of the Metropolitan Service District finds these actions in accordance with the Regional Transportation

Plan and gives affirmative Intergovernmental Project Review approval.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District
this 24th day of March, 1988.



Mike Ragsdale, Presiding Officer

AC/gl
9060C/531
02/19/88



Department of Transportation
HIGHWAY DIVISION
 TRANSPORTATION BUILDING, SALEM, OREGON 97310

March 3, 1988

CON 21-2

In Reply Refer to
 File No.

Andy Cotugno
 Transportation Director
 Metropolitan Service District
 2000 SW 1st Avenue, #100
 Portland, OR 97201-5398

Dear Mr. Cotugno:


SUBJECT: Obligation Restrictions for
 Excess R/W - Salem I-305
 Withdrawal

The Salem Urbanized Area is advancing their final Interstate Transfer project for contract letting on May 26, 1988. This project will utilize the balance of their transfer funds.

The attached FHWA memorandum of July 29, 1987 restricts obligation of \$1,075,900 of Salem's 580 funds until excess R/W is disposed of. The disposition is underway with all properties to be offered for sale by July 1, 1988.

We intend to propose that the restriction be applied on a state-wide basis. This will allow Salem to obligate the balance of the I-305 withdrawal value. Since Portland is the remaining withdrawal area, the restriction would then apply to your 580 funds. With your 580 balance of \$9.5 million, it appears that this proposal will not jeopardize or delay any 580 obligations. However, the state will guarantee that funds will be available to MSD should the restricted funds be needed for future obligations.

Your written concurrence in this approach is required. A response at your earliest convenience would be appreciated, since the Federal Highway Administration must approve of this arrangement as well.

Sincerely,

 Cam Gilmour, Manager
 Program Section

GEZ:pf
 Attachment

cc: Don Forbes

Alan Hershey, MWVCOG



U.S. Department
of Transportation
Federal Highway
Administration

MEMORANDUM

Washington, D.C. 20590

Subject: Obligation Restrictions for
Excess Right-of-Way Resulting from
Interstate System Withdrawals

Date JUL 29 1987

From: Associate Administrator for
Engineering and Program Development

Reply to
Att. of HNG-13

To: Regional Federal Highway Administrators
Regions 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10

Section 103(b) of the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act (STURAA) of 1987 requires the Secretary to reserve from obligation withdrawal value an amount equal to Federal funds expended to acquire right-of-way for Interstate System segments withdrawn under 23 U.S.C. 103(e)(4) unless the property has been sold or retained by the State (with repayment of Federal funds credited) or a reuse (without a credit to Federal funds) has been approved by the Federal Highway Administrator. Our April 24, 1987, memorandum requested FHWA field offices to determine the amounts that must be reserved from obligation and to report this information to Headquarters. The requested information has been supplied.

The attached table entitled "Analysis of Potential Need to Restrict the Obligation of Substitution Funds" summarizes the pertinent factors affecting the necessity of restricting the obligation of substitution funds in certain instances. Field offices should verify for their States that the information shown on the table and in the accompanying background material is correct. Any discrepancies should be reported to the Federal-Aid and Design Division, Interstate Management Branch. The analysis shows that there are only four withdrawal areas where obligations of available funds must be restricted (unless a statewide approach, as discussed later in this memorandum, is approved).

For the Sacramento, California, withdrawal area, an additional \$12,813,920 in transit funds has been obligated since December 31, 1986, but before the date of enactment of the 1987 STURAA. Thus, none of the remaining \$4,731,895 in transit funds currently available can be obligated until the excess right-of-way representing at least \$672,053 has been disposed of or payback waivers granted. Once this has been accomplished obligations can again resume on a dollar-for-dollar basis with every dollar that is released from the required reservation, up to the area's remaining withdrawal value. However, transit funds currently available exceed the remaining withdrawal value by \$1,193,364. Regardless of the ultimate disposition of the excess right-of-way, some type of adjustment to the available funds would be necessary since obligations cannot exceed withdrawal value.

In New Jersey, for the Philadelphia withdrawal area, none of the available highway and transit funding can be obligated as our records indicate that the withdrawn value is zero. The substitute highway funds may be shifted to other areas within the State in accordance with established procedures.

For the Albany, New York, withdrawal area, none of the available highway and transit funding can be obligated. The total withdrawal value, including the extra mandatory transit withdrawal value only amounts to \$181,401 which is \$74,232 less than the amounts available for obligation. Thus, regardless of the ultimate disposition of the excess right-of-way, some adjustments to available funds would be necessary. Further, until actions are taken to reduce the required reservation for excess property below the total withdrawal value, no substitution funds may be obligated.

For the Salem, Oregon, withdrawal area, \$1,075,900 of the available funds must be restricted from obligation until actions are taken to reduce the required withdrawal value reservation.

We have interpreted the 1987 STURAA provisions to allow some flexibility on how the obligation restrictions may be applied. In the case of States with more than one withdrawal area, the required obligation reserve may be applied on a statewide basis provided the responsible local officials of all the areas involved furnish formal written concurrence in this approach and the Governor (or the Governor's designee) proposes the statewide application of the provision. Under this approach, obligations would not have to be restricted until the statewide remaining withdrawal value is reduced by obligations to the statewide required reserve. Any proposals to adopt this statewide approach must receive prior approval from the Washington Headquarters. Requests should include the Governor's (or Governor's designee) proposal and documentation from the responsible local officials of each withdrawal area in the State.

Intrastate shifting of FY 1987 apportioned funds from one withdrawal area to another, intrastate distribution of FY 1987 discretionary allocations different than that shown on the attached revised Exhibit D, distribution of prior year allocations different than that shown on attached revised Exhibit F, changes in the amounts shown in attached Exhibit E, disposal of excess property with a credit to Federal funds, and waiver of payback on excess property are all factors which can affect the extent to which available funds may be obligated. Any changes to these factors which would necessitate restricting the obligation of available highway or transit substitution funding or which would result in changes for the four States noted above should be reported immediately to the Interstate Management Branch. Any questions regarding the necessity for restricting obligations should also be directed to the Interstate Management Branch. We are providing all pertinent information to UMTA Washington Headquarters staff to assure that, where necessary, substitute transit obligations will be restricted as required.


Rex C. Leathers

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 88-884 FOR THE
PURPOSE OF APPROVING USE OF FEDERAL-AID URBAN
SYSTEM FUNDS IN PARTIAL SUPPORT OF OREGON'S
TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER CENTER FOR TRANSPORTATION

Date: February 18, 1988

Presented by: A. Cotugno

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

Proposed Action

Adopt the Resolution approving \$20,122 of Federal-Aid Urban (FAU) funds as the Portland urbanized area's contribution toward Oregon's Technology Transfer Center for Transportation. This amount is to be drawn from the following sources:

FAU Regional Reserve	\$11,445
City of Portland	<u>8,677</u>
Total	\$20,122

TPAC and JPACT have reviewed this action and recommend approval of Resolution No. 88-884.

Background

The Center was established in September 1984 for the purpose of assisting local governments in improving their transportation programs. The funding for the Center has been provided from a combination of state and federal sources which will come to an end on June 30, 1988.

A strategy to continue operating the Center for an additional 18 months has been developed. The strategy calls for financing the Center from federal highway funds, and contributions from Oregon cities and counties. Metro and other MPO's in the state have been asked to contribute by way of releasing Federal-Aid Urban funds for use by the Center.

Attachment A has been included and provides a detailed description of the Center's function, the strategy for financing its continued operations, and the amount requested from the state's small urban areas and MPO's. Metro's contribution of \$20,122 is 53.6 percent of the \$37,500 requested; it is a direct ratio of our urbanized area allocation and the state's total urban apportionment.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends approval of Resolution
No. 88-884.

AC/sm
9060C/531
03/10/88

