



**Transportation Planning Certification Review
for
Portland-Vancouver Metropolitan Area**

October 20-23, 2008

Final Report

January 29, 2009

Prepared by

**Federal Highway Administration
Federal Transit Administration**

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Introduction	5
Findings, Corrective Actions and Recommendations Summary	10
A) Study Area Organizational Structure (23 CFR 450.310)	10
B) Metropolitan Planning Boundaries (23 CFR 450.312)	10
C) Agreements and Contracts (23 CFR 450.314)	11
D) Unified Planning Work Program (23 CFR 450.308)	11
E) Transportation Planning Process (23 CFR 450.306)	11
F) Congestion Management Process (23 CFR 450.320 & 500.109)	12
G) Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Development (23 CFR 450.322)	13
H) Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) and Project Selection (23 CFR 450.324, 326, 328, and 332)	13
I) Financial Planning/Fiscal Constraint (23 CFR 450.322 & 324)	14
J) Public Outreach (23 CFR 450.316, 322, 324)	14
K) Air Quality (23 CFR 450.310, 312, 320, 322, 324, 326, 330 & 334)	15
L) Self Certifications (23 CFR 450.334)	16
M) Title VI and Related Requirements (23 CFR 450.316 & 334)	16
N) Intelligent Transportation Systems (23 CFR 940)	16
Appendix A: Public and Elected Officials Comments	25
Appendix B: Acronyms and Abbreviations	26
Appendix C: US Department of Transportation Review Team	28

Executive Summary

Pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 134 and 49 U.S.C. 1607, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) must jointly certify the metropolitan transportation planning in Transportation Management Areas (TMAs) at least every four years. A TMA is an urbanized area as defined by the U.S. Census with a population over 200,000. Upon completion of the review and evaluation, the results must support a joint certification by the FHWA and FTA that the transportation planning process substantially meets federal planning regulations. The review covers actions by all agencies, including State, Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), Transit Operators and local governments, which are charged with cooperatively carrying out the planning processes on a daily basis. Failure to certify is significant, as it can result in the withholding of U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) funds. The review should also enhance the quality of the planning process and ensure that projects receiving federal funds can advance without delay.

The FHWA and FTA conducted a transportation planning process review for Metro, the MPO for the Portland, Oregon metropolitan area, and the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC), the MPO for the Vancouver, Washington metropolitan area. A list of preliminary review questions was provided to Metro and RTC in September 2008, with a follow-up field review on October 20-23, 2008. The on-site review also included discussions with local elected officials and the public, seeking comments on the planning process and opportunities for improvement.

Included in the Executive Summary is a table outlining the topic areas addressed in the Certification Review along with any corrective actions and recommendations related to each topic area. The full report details the findings for each regulatory requirement along with findings, corrective actions and recommendations.

Conclusions:

Based on the findings of this review, the FHWA and FTA jointly certify that the transportation planning process of the Metro and RTC substantially meet the requirements, subject to the resolution of corrective actions identified in this report within the timeframe specified. In order to ensure timely resolution of the corrective actions identified in this report, the MPOs are asked to develop a detailed plan and schedule, outlining the steps and specific milestones. Recommendations are not statutory requirements; however, they are based on the best practices and current initiatives supported by FHWA and FTA.

The corrective actions outlined in this report must be resolved by the deadlines provided in the report. If Metro and RTC are unable to resolve corrective actions identified in this report in the stipulated time frame, or otherwise agreed to by FHWA and FTA, the planning process will no longer be certified and Federal funding restrictions may be applied.

Summary of 2008 Metro Corrective Actions and Recommendations

Topic Area	Corrective Action	Recommendations
Metropolitan Planning Organization (23 CFR 450.310)	None	None
Metropolitan Planning Boundaries (23 CFR 450.312)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Metropolitan planning area boundaries shall be expanded to reflect, at a minimum, the urbanized area defined by the 2000 Census, within six months of this report. 	None
Agreements and Contracts (23 CFR 450.314)	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metro is commended for executing and regularly reviewing their intergovernmental agreements for planning responsibilities with ODOT, and TriMet; Metro and SMART; and Metro and RTC.
Unified Planning Work Program (23 CFR 450.308)	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UPWP should specifically identify the various planning activities that will be undertaken to resolve all corrective actions required by this review.
Transportation Planning Process (23 CFR 450.306, 318)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metro shall document the process for RTP full and administrative amendments within six months of this report. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metro is commended for its strong collaborative relationship with partner agencies. • Metro should more clearly identify and address safety, security, and environmental justice elements in the metropolitan planning process.
Congestion Management Process (23 CFR 450.316)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metro shall document a more fully integrated CMP that demonstrates the six required elements outlined under 23 CFR 450.320(c), and in an easily understandable way its effective use in monitoring and mitigating congestion. This effort should be developed and documented for review by FHWA and FTA by January 30, 2010. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate with ODOT and other partners to better document how the CMP is used as part of the development of a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Metropolitan Transportation Plan Development (23 CFR 450.322)	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metro should work with ODOT to incorporate more safety data into the planning process. Given limited resources, maximum attention should be placed on identification of deficiencies by creation of crash categorization to enable focused and cost effective follow-up activities at the local level. • Metro should develop new origin and destination study to help refine and validate their modeling results.
Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) (23 CFR 450.324)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next TIP shall include total project cost estimates that may go beyond the 4 year programming cycle. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metro should clarify how project selection criteria are consistent with RTP system performance goals and performance measures. • In documenting fiscal constraint of the TIP, Metro should work closely with ODOT to minimize differences between estimated costs and revenues.
Financial Planning/Fiscal Constraint	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metro should revise financial documentation in the RTP to more clearly communicate fiscal status to the general public.
Public Outreach (23 CFR 450.316)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 6 months, Metro shall adopt a Public Participation Plan, including consultation with Tribes and land management agencies, which meets SAFETEA-LU requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document outreach to non-traditional public sectors and tribes with interests in the MPO area. • Metro should strengthen their use of visualization techniques.
Air Quality (40 CFR 93)	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conformity determination for TIP and RTP update should include transit fare and service level information and discuss how the trends have changed since the previous conformity determination. • Although they are not currently regulated as part of federal conformity requirements, Metro should continue to pursue an evaluation framework for greenhouse gas emissions (e.g., carbon dioxide) to address statewide reduction goals.
Self Certification (23 CFR 450.334)	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide follow-up status of corrective actions and recommendations from USDOT review in future self-certifications.

<p>Title VI and Related Requirements (23 CFR 200.9)</p>	<p>None</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metro should identify minority and low income populations and analyze whether the current and planned transportation system disproportionately burdens or significantly denies these populations the benefits of the transportation system investments. • Title VI complaints and/or disposition should be included in the annual report submitted to ODOT.
<p>Intelligent Transportation System (23 CFR 940)</p>	<p>None</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate with ODOT in establishing a regular review cycle of the regional ITS Plan, and integration with the regional TSMO Plan. • Coordinate with ODOT in updating and implementing the regional ITS plan share date for use in the CMP.

Summary of 2008 RTC Corrective Actions and Recommendations

Topic Area	Corrective Action	Recommendations
Metropolitan Planning Organization (23 CFR 450.310)	None	None
Metropolitan Planning Boundaries (23 CFR 450.312)	None	None
Agreements and Contracts (23 CFR 450.314)	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTC in cooperation with WSDOT and C-TRAN should establish a regular review cycle to update their inter-governmental agreements.
Unified Planning Work Program (23 CFR 450.308)	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UPWP should include any additional planning activities necessary to resolve all certification review corrective actions.
Transportation Planning Process (23 CFR 450.306)	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the next RTP update the base year travel forecast model should be updated based on more recent data. • Develop a planning process flow chart for RTP and TIP development. • RTC should more clearly identify and address safety, security, and environmental justice elements in the metropolitan planning process, to show how they affect project development and implementation.
Congestion Management Process (23 CFR 450.320)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTC shall develop a process to fully incorporate all six element of the CMP, outlined under 23 CFR 450.320 (c), in the planning and programming process, by January 30, 2010. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate with WSDOT and other partners to more effectively use the CMP as part of the development of a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). • Expand the range and scope of the CMP to include effective measures for monitoring and evaluating alternatives to auto travel, such as person throughput, transit use and frequency, and bike/pedestrian accessibility.

<p>Metropolitan Transportation Plan Development (23 CFR 450.322)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In coordination with State and Federal environmental agencies RTC shall incorporate environmental mitigation strategies in the RTP, by January 2010. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RTC should work with WSDOT and other partner agencies to better reflect the use of safety data into the planning process, specifically the development of RTP and TIP. Given the limited resources, maximum attention should be placed on identification of deficiencies by creation of crash categorization to enable focused and cost effective follow-up activities at the local level.
<p>Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) (23 CFR 450.324)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The next TIP shall include an estimated total project cost for each project, which may extend beyond the four years of the TIP cycle. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide documentation on how project selection criteria are consistent with RTP system performance goals and performance measures.
<p>Financial Planning/Fiscal Constraint (23 CFR 450.322 & 324)</p>	<p>None</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In a follow-up to the certification review meeting, RTC has developed project cost estimates in the YOE dollars for both the TIP and RTP. RTC should provide financial documentation in the MTP to more clearly communicate fiscal status.
<p>Public Outreach (23 CFR 450.316)</p>	<p>None</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RTC is commended for adopting its new public participation plan to address SAFETEA-LU requirements. Revise Plan to include specific strategies for reaching out underserved populations and Tribal Governments with interest in the MPO area. Include criteria in Plan for evaluating effectiveness of the Plan. Address how public involvement will be conducted for TIP amendments.
<p>Air Quality (40 CFR 93)</p>	<p>None</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although they are not currently regulated as part of federal conformity requirements, RTC should consider evaluating green house gas emissions (e.g., carbon dioxide) to address statewide reduction goals.

<p>Self Certification (23 CFR 450.334)</p>	<p>None</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide follow-up status of corrective actions and recommendations from USDOT review in future self-certifications. • Assist, as appropriate, member jurisdictions in their effort to comply with ADA requirements within public right-of way.
<p>Title VI and Related Requirements (23 CFR 200.9)</p>	<p>None</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include procedures for addressing environmental justice. • Insert organizational chart reflective of RTC's entire operations, including MPO and RTPO. • Include procedures for addressing Limited English Proficiency.
<p>Intelligent Transportation System (23 CFR 940)</p>	<p>None</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage implementation of elements identified in the ITS Implementation Plan and Regional ITS Architecture to collect data for use in the CMP to improve transportation system operations. • Coordinate with WSDOT in establishing a regular review cycle and update of the regional ITS plan as needed.

Introduction

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) are required to jointly review and certify the transportation planning processes for each metropolitan area with population over 200,000 persons, also known as Transportation Management Area. The Portland/Vancouver metropolitan area is divided into two separate Metropolitan Planning Organizations, one located in Portland, Oregon and the other in Vancouver, Washington. Portland Metro serves the portion of the TMA located in Oregon, while Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC) serves the portion of the TMA located in Washington State. For the purpose of this certification review, the two MPOs are reviewed separately, but concurrently and a single certification report is developed to address the planning process for the TMA as a whole.

The USDOT review team consisted of staff from FTA Region 10, FHWA Oregon and Washington Division Offices, and FHWA's Office of Planning. Subject matter specialists from the FHWA Division offices also participated during those portions of the review relevant to their expertise.

In advance of the onsite meeting, the USDOT review team prepared a review guide which outlined the major federal planning requirements and asked several questions about the MPO structure and planning processes of the MPO. The MPO provided written responses and documentation for the team's review prior to this visit. The questionnaire response and documentation addressed many review questions and helped focus the agenda for the on-site portion of the review.

The on-site review began with a joint meeting of both MPOs in Metro offices on the morning of October 20, 2008 with opening session remarks from the review team and Metro and RTC providing an overview of the current state of the planning process, collaborative efforts, mission, goals, challenges and future outlook. The review team then spent two days with each MPO discussing and reviewing planning processes, and how these meet federal planning regulations. The agenda included sessions with the MPO elected officials and public meetings at Metro and RTC, for the purpose of gathering comments on how the overall transportation planning process is perceived to be working by the public. The site visit was concluded with a joint closeout session with both MPOs, where the review team outlined the preliminary findings, recommendations, and corrective actions that formed the basis for this certification report.

As part of this review, the team considered products and materials related to the transportation planning process, including: Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP), Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), and other documents.

The planning certification review focused on specific objectives, to determine the following:

- 1) Planning activities of Metro and RTC and other agencies with responsibilities for regional transportation planning are conducted in accordance with FHWA and FTA regulations, policies and procedures including the provisions of Title 23 U.S.C. and 23 CFR 450.
- 2) The regional transportation planning process for the MPO area is a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive process that results in the development, implementation, and support of transportation system preservation and improvements.
- 3) The UPWPs adequately document Metro's and RTC's transportation planning activities and all other ongoing significant transportation planning activities occurring in the region.

- 4) The regional transportation planning products, including the MTP and the MTIP, reflect the identified transportation needs, priorities and funding resources.
- 5) The Metropolitan Transportation Plan is multi-modal in perspective and meets the needs of the traveling public and community and is based on the current information.
- 6) Requirements of the Title 23 U.S.C., SAFETEA-LU, 23 CFR 450.300, the Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA), Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) are incorporated where appropriate into the planning process, and
- 7) Corrective actions identified in the last certification review have been adequately addressed and comments and recommendations reasonably considered by the MPOs.

How to Use this Report

Significant findings, corrective actions, recommendations and strengths of the planning process are summarized in the table with the Executive Summary section of this report. The user of this report should be aware of the following definitions, while interpreting the findings of this report:

Findings are statements of fact based on the FHWA and FTA observations made during the site visit and review of the planning documents.

Corrective Actions are improvements needed to correct statutory or regulatory deficiencies which, if not addressed, could lead to a “failure to certify” finding and the possible disruption of federally funded programs and projects.

Comments and Recommendations are not statutory or regulatory deficiencies, but actions identified by FHWA and FTA that represent best practices that are strongly endorsed.

Metro: Findings, Corrective Actions and Recommendations

A) Metropolitan Planning Organization (23 CFR 450.310)

Findings:

1. The geography of the study area remained unchanged since the last plan update and 2004 certification review. No new areas were added to the MPO and no changes to the MPO structure or membership were warranted.
2. Consistent with the 2004 Certification Review recommendations, JPACT re-evaluated and amended the JPACT bylaws to expand MPO representation. The amended bylaws did not change the number of seats on JPACT; however, transit operators representation is now more explicitly called out in the bylaws, and represented by Clackamas County and Cities of Clackamas representatives.
3. TriMet, SMART, SAM, SCTD, and CAT provide public transit services in the region. TriMet is a voting member of the JPACT.
4. The Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) is the air quality agency with jurisdiction in the MPO area. Metro is the air quality planning agency for carbon monoxide (CO). The MPO and DEQ have developed an MOU defining their respective responsibilities.

Corrective Actions:

None

Comments and Recommendations:

None

B) Metropolitan Planning Area Boundaries (23 CFR 450.312)

Findings:

1. Metro updated its planning and federal-aid boundaries to reflect changes with the 2000 Census information, prior to the 2004 certification review.
2. The Metro planning area does not include the entire urbanized area as defined by the 2000 census.

Corrective Actions:

1. The Metropolitan planning area boundaries shall be expanded to reflect, at a minimum, the urbanized area defined by the 2000 census, within six months of this report.

Comments and Recommendations:

None

C) Metropolitan Planning Agreements (23 CFR 450.314)

Findings:

1. Metro, ODOT and TriMet adopted a three-way Intergovernmental Agreement for planning activities effective 6/18/2008-6/17/2016.
2. Metro and SMART have entered into an agreement effective 7/1/2008-6/30/2011 to jointly perform transit planning work. This agreement resolves the corrective action identified in the 2004 certification review.
3. Metro and RTC have developed a Memorandum of Agreement for regional coordination between two MPOs, effective 4/30/2006-4/29/2009.
4. The Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) is the air quality agency with jurisdiction in the Metro area. Metro is the air quality planning agency for carbon monoxide (CO). Metro and DEQ have developed an MOU defining their respective responsibilities.

Corrective Actions:

None

Comments and Recommendations:

1. Metro, RTC, ODOT, TriMet and DEQ are commended for executing their updated intergovernmental agreements.

D) Unified Planning Work Program (23 CFR 450.308)

Findings:

1. Various related tasks or activities to develop and implement the CMP are not clearly described in the UPWP to fully understand how efforts are coordinated.
2. ODOT and TriMet play an active role in the development of the UPWP, both through participation in the TPAC and JPACT and the identification of specific work activities in the UPWP.

Corrective Actions:

None

Comments and Recommendations:

1. UPWP should identify the planning activities that will be undertaken to address each of the corrective action identified in this report.

E) Transportation Planning Process (23 CFR 450.312, 316 & 320)

Findings:

1. The planning process adequately addresses the eight SAFETEA-LU planning factors. However, the integration of safety and security into planning needs to be further strengthened.
2. Metro conducted environmental agencies consultation and coordination, to develop environmental mitigation strategies for the RTP, through CETAS, an inter-agency group convened by ODOT.

3. It is not completely clear to the reviewer how the many and various modal planning activities are coordinated to establish an understandable vision for how transportation safety is addressed in the planning process.
4. The RTP full and administrative amendment process is not clearly stated in the planning process.

Corrective actions:

1. Metro shall document the process for RTP full and administrative amendments within six months of this report.

Comments and recommendations:

1. Metro is commended for its strong collaborative relationship with partner agencies.
2. Metro should more clearly identify and address how transportation safety and security is incorporated among modal planning activities in the metropolitan planning process.
3. Metro should document how activities are coordinated to establish an understandable vision for how transportation safety is incorporated in the planning process.

F) Congestion Management Process (CMP) (23 CFR 450.320 & 500.109)

Findings:

1. At the previous certification review (2004), a corrective action was identified calling for further work on Metro's CMP. Since then the CMP has been further developed. However, the MPO acknowledges that more work is needed to fully develop the five-year vision identified in the 2005 CMP Roadmap.
2. The scope of the CMP effort has been broadly defined to include effective measures for monitoring and evaluating alternatives to auto travel, such as person throughput, transit use and frequency, and bike/pedestrian accessibility.
3. Metro has identified congested corridors to evaluate, initial causes of congestion, and preliminary performance measures to monitor progress.
4. Additional work currently underway includes the development of a comprehensive atlas that will document multi-modal transportation needs and strategies for each corridor. A performance measures work group will refine performance measures and develop a CMP monitoring process.

Corrective actions:

1. Metro shall document a more fully integrated CMP that demonstrates the six required elements outlined under 23 CFR 450.320 (c). This effort should be developed and documented for review by FHWA/FTA by January 2010. Document should include how the various elements of the CMP (e.g. 2040 performance indicators, Regional Mobility Program goals etc.) are coordinated to demonstrate in an easily understandable way its effective use in monitoring and mitigating congestion.

Comments and Recommendations:

1. FHWA and FTA can provide support to advance implementation of the CMP to meet the requirements of SAFETEA-LU.
2. Coordinate with ODOT and other partners (data collection, performance measures, and standards) to more effectively use the CMP as part of the development of its

Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

G) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Development (23 CFR 450.322)

Findings:

1. The current Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) was approved on February 29, 2008 to fully address federal planning requirements. Further work is underway on the RTP to address additional State planning requirements.
2. RTP is fiscally constrained and is Year of Expenditure (YOE) compliant.
3. Metro maintains a strong link between local plans and the RTP.
4. Metro's most recent origin and destination study was completed in the mid 1990s.
5. The 2004 certification review provided two corrective actions: a) improved coordination with other regional planning efforts, and b) inclusion of Operations and Management of the existing and proposed transportation system. Both of these corrective actions have been resolved.
6. The MPO is charged with balancing both Federal requirements and State Growth Management laws. As a result the MPO is engaged in several studies in coordination with State DOT, and local agencies, which blends the concept of growth boundaries and appropriate transportation system investments.
7. It is not very clear how consideration of safety, security and environmental justice affect the project development.

Corrective actions:

None

Comments and Recommendations:

1. Metro should work with ODOT to incorporate more safety data into the planning process and the development of RTP, including pedestrian and bicycle travel. Given limited resources, maximum attention should be placed on identification of deficiencies by creation of crash categorization to enable focused and cost effective follow-up activities at the local level. The MPO should clarify how safety influences project development and prioritization. The MPO should work cooperatively with ODOT to develop analytical tools to identify safety performance of the system.
2. Metro should follow through on developing a new origin and destination study to help validate their planning process and modeling.
3. Metro is commended for its coordination with environmental agencies in developing environmental consideration in RTP development.

H) Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Project Selection (23 CFR 450.324, 326, 328, and 332)

Findings:

1. TIP and subsequent amendments are published on the Web site for public review and adequate opportunities for public comments are provided.
2. Metro projects funded with local STP funds are selected based on well documented procedures.

3. The MPO, the State and the local transit operator (TriMet) work closely together on the development of the TIP.
4. An annual list of federally funded obligated projects is published on Metro's Web site and is also distributed to TPAC and made available to the JPACT.
5. The project listings in the TIP do not identify the total project costs for all sources of funding throughout the full cycle of implementing the project.
6. Metro TIP revenue and expenditure tables did not balance by fiscal year, however, the follow-up information provided some explanation of the reason of discrepancies.

Corrective actions:

1. As part of the next TIP update, project cost estimates should reflect the estimated total project costs, which may extend beyond the four years of the TIP cycle.

Comments and Recommendations:

1. Metro is commended for developing a clear flow chart for TIP amendments.
2. In documenting fiscal constraint of the TIP, Metro should work carefully with ODOT to minimize differences between estimated program costs and revenues on an annual basis. Any imbalances that may exist should be accompanied with an explanation, as part of the financial constraint documentation.
3. Metro should clarify how project selection criteria are consistent with RTP system performance goals and performance measures.

I) Financial Planning/Fiscal Constraint (23 CFR 450.322 & 324)

Findings:

1. Revenue projections are developed in cooperation with the local jurisdictions and ODOT.
2. The operation, maintenance, and preservation needs are addressed through local processes and reflected in the TIP.
3. Fiscal constraint is documented in the financial element of the RTP using YOE dollars. However, the documentation is fragmented and may not be easily understood by all audiences.

Corrective actions:

None

Comments and Recommendations:

1. In subsequent RTP development, the fiscal constraint documentation should be prepared to better communicate the balance of costs and revenues to a general audience in an understandable way.

J) Public Outreach (23 CFR 450.316, 322, 324)

Findings:

1. The umbrella Public Participation Plan has not been updated to reflect changes in SAFETEA-LU.

2. Metro makes excellent use of its website to post materials for stakeholders review and comment. The visual rendering, location and existing conditions of proposed major projects using available tools (google earth, GIS etc) are lacking.
3. Metro employs many non-traditional avenues in reaching the general public.
4. Outreach to tribes is not clearly documented. There are no Tribes physically located within the MPA, however, there are tribal interests within the Willamette Falls area.
5. Metro conducted consultation with state and federal environmental agencies in order to develop environmental mitigation strategies for the RTP, through an interagency group convened by ODOT call Collaborative Environmental and Transportation Agreements Streamlining (CETAS).

Corrective actions:

1. Metro shall develop an updated umbrella Public Participation Plan meeting SAFETEA-LU requirements within six months of this report (23 CFR 450.316(a)).

Comments and Recommendations:

1. Metro is commended for its many public outreach activities. Outreach to non-traditional public sectors and tribal governments needs to be documented.
2. Metro should strengthen its visualization techniques for major projects.

K) Air Quality (40 CFR 93, 23 CFR 450.310, 312, 320, 322, 324, 326, 330 & 334)

Findings:

1. Metro completed the TIP and RTP air quality conformity in a timely manner. RTP and TIP were last determined to be in conformance with federal air quality regulations on February 29, 2008.
2. Metro does a commendable job of documenting air quality conformity findings.
3. All TCMs identified in the SIP are implemented.
4. The 2004 certification review noted two corrective actions. The first required the MPO to provide public involvement consistent with the Oregon State Implementation Plan (SIP). The second highlighted the need to provide interagency consultation for the RTP and TIP amendments. Both of the corrective actions have been resolved.

Corrective actions:

None

Comments and Recommendations:

1. Metro does a commendable job of documenting air quality conformity findings and inter-agency consultation.
2. Conformity determination for TIP and RTP update should include transit fare and service level information and discuss how the trends have changed since the previous conformity determination.
3. Although they are not currently regulated as part of the federal conformity requirements, Metro should continue to pursue an evaluation framework for greenhouse gas emissions (e.g. Carbon Dioxide) to address statewide reduction goals.

L) Self Certifications (23 CFR 450.334)

Findings:

1. Metro produces an annual self certification document as part of the UPWP.

Corrective actions:

None

Comments and Recommendations:

1. Provide follow-up status of corrective actions and recommendations from USDOT review in future self certifications.

M) Title VI and Related Requirements (23 CFR 200.9, 200.9(4), 450.316 & 334)

Findings:

1. Metro has an adopted Title VI Plan but does not document complaints and/or dispositions.
2. Metro does not document impacts/benefits of the transportation investments on the EJ populations.

Corrective actions:

None

Comments and Recommendations:

1. Identify minority and low income populations and analyze whether the current and planned transportation system disproportionately burdens or significantly denies these populations of benefits of the transportation system investments.
2. Title VI complaints and/or dispositions should be included in the annual report submitted to ODOT and USDOT.

N) Intelligent Transportation Systems (23 CFR 940)

Findings:

1. ODOT, the MPO, and local stakeholders, in coordination with the FHWA Division office, developed an ITS Implementation Plan and Regional ITS Architecture in 2005. However, these have not been updated since that time.
2. Elements identified in the ITS Implementation and Regional ITS Architecture should lead to improved overall operation of the transportation system in the region.
3. The implementation of ITS field devices is anticipated to lead to improved data sources to be used in the CMP.
4. Metro has received a state TGM grant to develop a Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) plan for the region in 2009-10 that will incorporate the current ITS program.

Corrective actions:

None

Comments and recommendations:

1. Metro should coordinate with ODOT on implementation of elements identified in the ITS Implementation Plan and Regional ITS Architecture to collect data for use in the CMP to improve transportation system operations.
2. Coordinate with ODOT in establishing a regular review cycle and update of the regional ITS plan as needed, and integration with the regional TSMO plan.

RTC: Findings, Corrective Actions and Recommendations Summary

A) Metropolitan Planning Organization (23 CFR 450.310)

Findings:

1. The geography of the study area remained unchanged since the last plan update and 2004 certification review. No new areas were added to the MPO and no changes to the MPO structure or membership were warranted.
2. C-TRAN provides public transit services in the region. C-TRAN is a voting member of the MPO Policy Committee.
4. The Southwest Clear Air Agency (SWCAA) is the air quality agency with jurisdiction in the MPO area. RTC supports SWCAA in air quality planning agency for carbon monoxide (CO) by providing technical assistance and transportation data. The MPO and SWCAA have developed an MOU defining their respective responsibilities.

Corrective Actions:

None

Comments and Recommendations:

None

B) Metropolitan Planning Boundaries (23 CFR 450.312)

Findings:

1. RTC updated its planning and federal-aid boundaries to reflect changes with the 2000 Census information, prior to the 2004 certification review. No additional changes have been warranted since then.

Corrective Actions:

None

Comments and Recommendations:

None

C) Agreements and Contracts (23 CFR 450.314)

Findings:

1. RTC, WSDOT and C-TRAN adopted Intergovernmental Agreement in 1995 but no regular review process has been established.
2. RTC and Metro have developed an agreement for regional coordination between the two MPOs, effective 4/30/2006-4/29/2009.
3. MPO and SWCAA have developed an MOU defining their respective responsibilities.

Corrective Actions:

None

Comments and Recommendations:

1. RTC in cooperation with WSDOT and C-TRAN should establish a regular periodic review cycle of their inter-governmental agreements.

D) Unified Planning Work Program (23 CFR 450.308)

Findings:

1. RTC identifies planning activities in cooperation with the partnering agencies.
2. RTC has not sufficiently identified tasks or activities to effectively implement the CMP.
3. WSDOT and C-TRAN play an active role in the development of the UPWP, both through participation in the TAC and Policy Committee.

Corrective Actions:

None

Comments and Recommendations:

1. RTC's UPWP should include any additional planning activities that are identified to resolve corrections identified in this report.

E) Transportation Planning Process (23 CFR 450.312, 316 & 320)

Findings:

1. RTC has instituted planning efforts over the past 2 years to ensure that their underlying planning process is SAFETEA-LU compliant.
2. Regional travel demand model is based on the year 2000 base data.
3. RTC has strong collaborative relationship with partner agencies including WSDOT, ODOT, Metro and local transit agencies. Planning studies currently underway involve multiple agencies and member jurisdictions.
4. The Growth Management Act of Washington plays an important role in helping to define how transportation planning in RTC will affect land use planning. This enables RTC to work closely with local agencies to look at strategies beyond capacity expansion and SOV priorities.
5. The RTP and TIP do not clearly identify how safety, security and environmental justice issues are identified, evaluated and prioritized relative to other planning factors or how they affect the development and implementation of projects in the region.

Corrective actions:

None

Comments and recommendations:

1. During the next Plan update the base year used as part of the travel demand model should be based on more recent data.

2. The WSDOT and ODOT and C-TRAN are members of the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee and RTC Board. RTC works closely with Clark County and all local jurisdictions with land use authority.
3. To make the decision process more visible, consider developing a transportation planning flow chart that describes who, how, and when decisions are made in the process.
4. RTC should more clearly identify and address safety, security, and environmental justice elements in the metropolitan planning process.

F) Congestion Management Process (23 CFR 450.320 & 500.109)

Findings:

1. The application of CMP in monitoring congestion and development of RTP and TIP has advanced since the last certification review. The MPO acknowledges that more work is needed to fully develop a CMP so that it is better integrated into the transportation planning and decision making process.
2. The Congestion Monitoring Report (most recent from 2006) does a good job of reporting performance data for the identified regionally significant corridors. Measures include a range of performance characteristics that are used to identify needs and strategies.
3. The focus of the Report is on vehicle volumes, speeds, delay, and capacity. A limited set of transit measures are also included. The current set of measures may be adequate to identify where congestion exists but do not appear to be adequate to identify potential solutions to support a multimodal transportation planning process. In addition it is unclear how the RTP goals are used to identify strategies or evaluate long-term effectiveness.
4. Generally it is unclear how the performance data is used to inform planning decisions or monitor selected transportation investments over time.

Corrective actions:

1. RTC shall develop a process to fully incorporate all six elements of the CMP, outlined under 23 CFR 450.320(c), and more clearly document how the CMP are used in planning and programming process. This effort should be developed and documented for review by FHWA/FTA by January 2010.

Comments and Recommendations:

1. FHWA and FTA can provide support to advance implementation of the CMP to meet the requirements of SAFETEA-LU.
2. Coordinate with WSDOT and other partners for data collection, performance measures, and standards to more effectively use the CMP as part of the development of its Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
3. Performance measures used to monitor regional travel corridors should be expanded to include more transit (e.g., frequency, reliability), ITS (real-time information), TDM (parking, land use), and bike/pedestrian measures (accessibility) to better inform multimodal planning strategies.

G) Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Development (23 CFR 450.322)

Findings:

1. The current Metropolitan Transportation Plan (RTP) was approved in July, 2008.
2. RTC maintains a strong link between local plans and the RTP.
3. Transit System Plans are addressed within the RTP. C-TRAN is currently developing a long range transit plan.
4. Environmental mitigation strategies are not identified and documented in the RTP per new SAFETEA-LU requirements.
5. The RTP identifies safety, security, and environmental justice issues but lacks clear evaluation relative to other planning factors or how they should affect the development and implementation of projects in the region.

Corrective actions:

1. In coordination with State and Federal environmental agencies, identify and document potential system-level environmental mitigation strategies that could support the implementation of the RTP. Amend the RTP to include these strategies by January 2010.

Comments and Recommendations:

1. The RTC should work with WSDOT to incorporate more safety data into the planning process. Given limited resources, maximum attention should be placed on identification of deficiencies by creation of crash categorization, to enable focused and cost effective follow-up activities at the local level. The MPO should clarify how safety and security influence project development and prioritization. The MPO should work cooperatively with WSDOT to develop analytical tools to identify safety performance of the system.
2. Visualization techniques should be strengthened in the RTP for major projects.

H) Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) (23 CFR 450.324, 326, 328, and 332)

Findings:

1. TIP and subsequent amendments are published on the Web site for public review and adequate opportunities for public comments are provided.
2. The MPO, the State and the local transit operator (C-TRAN) work together on the development of the TIP. However, it is not very clear how the selected projects meet RTP system performance goals and measures.
3. An annual list of federally funded obligated projects is published on the MPO's Web site and is also distributed to RTC Technical Advisory Committee and RTC Board.
4. The project listings in the TIP do not identify the Estimated Total Project Costs. The total project costs may extend beyond the four years of the TIP.
5. The TIP does not clearly identify how safety, security and environmental justice issues affect the development and implementation of projects in the region relative to RTP.

Corrective actions:

1. As part of the next TIP update, project cost estimates shall reflect the Estimated Total Project Costs, which may extend beyond the four years of the TIP cycle.

Comments and Recommendations:

1. Provide information on how project selection criteria are consistent with RTP system performance goals and measures.

I) Financial Planning/Fiscal Constraint (23 CFR 450.322 & 324)

Findings:

1. Short and long-term revenue projections are developed in cooperation with the local jurisdictions and WSDOT.
2. The operation, maintenance, and preservation needs are addressed through local processes and reflected in the TIP.
3. Projects in the RTP did not represent costs in Year of Expenditure (YOE) as required by new SAFETEA-LU requirements, at the time of the site visit.
4. Financial document does not clearly identify fiscal status in the RTP.

Corrective actions:

None

Comments and Recommendations:

1. Information provided subsequent to the review meetings show that RTC has instituted changes to the financial plan to include project costs in RTP in the YOE.
2. RTC should provide financial documentation in the RTP to more clearly communicate fiscal status.

J) Public Outreach (23 CFR 450.316, 322, 324)

Findings:

1. On July 15, 2007, RTC adopted an updated Public Participation Plan to address SAFETEA-LU requirements.
2. While RTC employs many non-traditional avenues in reaching the general public, the July 2007 Public Participation Plan does not describe specific “strategies” it will employ for reaching out to underserved populations (low income, minority, limited English Proficient) (23 CFR 450.316(e).
3. The Plan does not describe what criteria will be used to determine the Plan’s effectiveness.

Corrective actions:

None

Comments and Recommendations:

1. RTC Public Participation Plan needs to be revised to include specific strategies for reaching out to underserved populations and Tribal Governments.
2. The Plan should include criteria for when and how RTC will evaluate the Plan for its effectiveness.
3. The Plan should also address how public involvement will be conducted for TIP

amendments.

K) Air Quality (23 CFR 450.310, 312, 320, 322, 324, 326, 330 & 334)

Findings:

1. RTC does not have to provide regional emissions analysis for the RTP, and emissions budget tests are no longer required.
2. Under the new 8-hour Ozone standards, the Vancouver Air Quality Maintenance Area has been re-designated to “unclassifiable/attainment”.

Corrective actions:

None

Comments and Recommendations:

1. Although they are not currently regulated as part of federal conformity requirements, RTC should consider evaluating greenhouse gas emissions (e.g. carbon dioxide) to address statewide reduction goals.

L) Self Certifications (23 CFR 450.334)

Findings:

1. RTC produces an annual self certification document as part of the Regional TIP.
2. RTC’s planning process does not fully consider ADA requirements of member jurisdictions (i.e. projects that support achieving ADA compliance in the public right-of-way).

Corrective actions:

None

Comments and Recommendations:

1. Provide follow-up status of corrective actions and recommendations from USDOT review in future self-certifications.
2. RTC should assist member jurisdictions with ADA compliance.

M) Title VI and Related Requirements (23 CFR 200.9, 200.9(4), 450.316 & 334)

Findings:

1. RTC has submitted a Title VI Plan/Assurances and no complaints were received by RTC
2. RTC’s Title VI Plan contains a three-person organizational chart.
3. RTC’s Title VI Plan does not include a description of how RTC will address environmental justice, and Limited English Proficiency in its planning process.

Corrective actions:

None

Comments and Recommendations:

1. RTC's Title VI Plan needs to include procedures for addressing environmental justice, using demographics of the MPO and RTPO jurisdictions to analyze benefits and burdens of the planned transportation system.
2. RTC's Title VI Plan needs to be reflective of the entire operations of RTC. Therefore, an organizational chart of all RTC staff needs to be inserted in the Title VI Plan. The Plan must also be reflective of RTC's activities associated with the RTPO.
3. RTC's Title VI Plan needs to include procedures for addressing Limited English Proficiency.

N) Intelligent Transportation Systems (23 CFR 940)

Findings:

1. WSDOT, the MPO, and local stakeholders, in coordination with the FHWA Division office, developed an ITS Implementation Plan and Regional ITS Architecture in 2005. However, these have not been updated since that time.

Corrective actions:

None

Comments and recommendations:

1. Coordinate with WSDOT in establishing a regular review cycle and update the regional ITS plan as needed.
2. Encourage implementation of elements identified in the ITS Implementation Plan and Regional ITS Architecture to collect data for use in the CMP to improve transportation system operations.

Appendix A: Public and Elected Officials Comments

This review included public meetings in Metro and RTC Offices on October 20 and October 22, 2008 respectively and with the elected officials on October 21 and October 22, 2008 respectively. The notice advertising the public meeting also encouraged written comments to be submitted to FHWA/FTA.

A) Elected Officials Meeting:

- 1) Metro and RTC does a good job in seeking public participation as part of their ongoing planning efforts.
- 2) Elected officials who were able to attend the meeting with the review team indicated their appreciation of MPO's function and satisfaction with the transportation planning process. Elected officials commended the hard work and skill level of their staff. Additional comments are summarized below:
 - a. MPO should have more discretion with accountability on the use of federal funds in metropolitan planning.
 - b. MPO staff is very skilled and equipped to handle sophisticated planning tasks.
 - c. Projects should be evaluated from the regional benefits perspective. Better connected street network and multi-modal system would benefit the region in trip reduction and mobility goals.
 - d. Most local funds are expended in maintaining and preserving the existing system.
 - e. MPO staff does a good job in communicating the MPO process to the members.

B) Public Meeting:

The public meeting at Metro attracted few citizens. The following summarizes the discussion at the meeting:

- 1) Metro reaches out to the public through various open houses and public hearings.
- 2) Information should be provided with least technical jargon.
- 3) It is acknowledged by the MPO that it has been a challenge to attract the public to the transportation planning public meetings.

Appendix B: Acronyms and Abbreviations

ADA	American with Disabilities Act
CAAA	Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990
CAT	Canby Area Transit
CETAS	Collaborative Environment and Transportation Agreements for Streamlining
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CO	Carbon-monoxide
CMAQ	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
HOV	High Occupancy Vehicle
HPMS	Highway Performance Management System
ITS	Intelligent Transportation Systems
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NHS	National Highway System
ODOT	Oregon Department of Transportation
PM	Particulate Matter
RTC	Regional Transportation Council
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
SAFETEA-LU	Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users

SAM	Sandy Area Metro
SCTD	South Clackamas Transportation District
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SMART	South Metro Area Regional Transit
STIP	Statewide Transportation Improvement Program
TCM	Transportation Control Measure
TIP	Transportation Improvement Program
TMA	Transportation Management Area
TriMet	Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon
UPWP	Unified Planning Work Plan
USDOT	United States Department of Transportation

Appendix C: US Department of Transportation Review Team

Federal Transit Administration

Region 10
915 Second Avenue, Room 3142
Seattle, Washington 98174-1002

Ned Conroy
Phone: (206) 220-4318
Fax: (206) 220-7959
email: ned.conroy@dot.gov

Federal Highway Administration

Oregon Division
530 Center Street, N.E. Suite 100
Salem, Oregon 97301

Satvinder Sandhu
Phone: (503) 587-4723
Fax: (503) 399-5838
email: Satvinder.sandhu@dot.gov

Jazmin Marie Casas
Phone: (503) 587-4710
Email: jazmin.casas@dot.gov

Washington Division
711 S. Capitol Way, Suite 501
Olympia, WA 98501
Sidney Stecker
Phone: (360) 753-9555
Fax: (360) 753-9889
Email: Sidney.stecker@dot.gov

Federal Highway HQ Planning
711 S. Capitol Way, Suite 501
Olympia, WA 98501
Theresa Hutchin
Phone: (360) 753-94-2
Email: Theresa.hutchins@dot.gov

Jody Peterson
Phone: (360) 534-9325
Email: Jody.peterson@dot.gov

Other FHWA Team Members

Nick Fortey- Safety and Freight
Nathaniel Price- ITS and Operations
Virginia Tsu- Right-of-Way and Title VI