



Region X

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

915 SECOND AVENUE
SUITE 3142
SEATTLE, WA 98174

December 17, 1979

Ms. Connie Kearney
Chairperson
Regional Planning Council
of Clark County
P.O. Box 5000
Vancouver, Washington 98663

RECEIVED
DEC 20 1979

METRO SERVICE DISTRICT

Mr. Rick Gustafson
Chief Executive Officer
Metropolitan Service District
527 S.W. Hall Street
Portland, Oregon 97201

Subject: FHWA/UMTA Certification
of the Transportation
Planning Process in the
Portland, OR/Vancouver, WA
urbanized area

Dear Mr. Gustafson:

The Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) have completed their review of the urban transportation planning process in the Portland, OR/Vancouver, WA urbanized area. Based on this review, we have concluded that the planning process generally meets the requirements of the September 17, 1975, joint FHWA/UMTA planning regulations.

The certification finding is enclosed. UMTA and FHWA will be happy to discuss the enclosed finding with you.

Sincerely,

Aubrey Davis
Regional Director

Enclosure

FHWA/UMTA CERTIFICATION DETERMINATION
of the Transportation Planning Process

in the

Portland, Oregon - Vancouver, Washington Urbanized Area

The Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) have completed a review and evaluation of the transportation planning process in the Portland-Vancouver urbanized area. In doing so, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was consulted on the air quality aspects. We have determined that the process substantially meets the requirements of the Joint FHWA/UMTA planning regulations dated September 17, 1975 (23 CFR 450A and 49 CFR 613A) with the following deficiencies:

1. A new regional transportation plan (or plans) should be completed and endorsed by both the Metropolitan Service District (Metro) and the Regional Planning Council of Clark County (RPC) within a year. It (they) should include a long-range element and a Transportation Systems Management (TSM) element for both highways and transit, and cover both the Oregon and Washington portions of the urbanized area. Also, the short range transit plans of Tri-Met and Vancouver Transit should be completed and endorsed by Tri-Met and City of Vancouver and incorporated into the TSM element. Issues of interstate significance should be clearly identified and discussed in the transportation plan(s). The status of the plan(s) will be a critical issue during the next certification review.

It is essential that there be a transportation plan(s) currently held valid by the two MPOs. If the new plan(s) are not completed within approximately six months, then the existing Interim Transportation Plan and TSM element should be reviewed, revised as necessary and endorsed by both MPOs.

2. The Prospectus should be revised to contain a more complete description of the transportation planning process, especially since two MPOs are responsible for it.

The revised Prospectus should contain an explanation of the multi-year planning program and a fuller description of the status and anticipated accomplishments, procedures and functional responsibility of participating agencies for carrying out each element of the process. The agreements contained in the Prospectus should also be reviewed and replaced as necessary so that copies of all currently executed cooperative agreements are included. Specifically, new agreements between Metro, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and Tri-Met should be executed.

3. The FY 1980 Unified Work Program (UWP) for transportation and air quality planning is very general in nature and only provides a brief outline of work to be undertaken. Supplemental descriptions of work were included with grant applications to several Federal funding agencies to satisfy their need for a more detailed description of work. Future UWPs should contain a more specific description of the work to be undertaken.
4. With the shift in the program period for the TIP covering the Washington portion of the urbanized area, there appears to be a more pronounced difference in programming projects between the Washington and Oregon areas.

FHWA/UMTA urge re-establishment of a common program period for the TIP and development of a single urbanized area TIP as is done with the UWP. If this is not done, the two TIPs should be prepared and endorsed at the same time even if the time periods covered in the two TIPs differ. Issues of interstate significance should be specifically addressed in each TIP.

5. Although coordinative arrangements between the two MPOs have been established through joint representation on various MPO committees, the area should examine ways for more effective policy level coordination, especially for issues of interstate significance. Governor Atiyeh and Governor Ray are considering establishing a bi-state policy body to analyze how that and other objectives may be accomplished.

The transportation planning process is certified for capital funding under FHWA programs and for planning, operating and capital assistance under UMTA programs.

This certification of the planning process will remain in effect until a new certification determination is made.

T. Dec 12/10/79
 T. Dec Date
 Regional Director
 Office of Planning and Research
 Federal Highway Administration

Aubrey Davis 12/1/79
 Aubrey Davis Date
 Regional Director
 Urban Mass Transportation
 Administration