

From: [Rust, Lynn](#)
To: [document.control](#)
Cc: [Daly, Keith](#); [Humphrey, George](#)
Subject: FW: Metro CRC IGA Amendment 6
Date: Tuesday, September 28, 2010 2:27:58 PM
Attachments: [image003.png](#)

Please file as correspondence from Metro to CRC. Subject: agreement.

This can be filed in the agreement correspondence in project files. Thanks.

Lynn Rust
360-816-2177

From: Humphrey, George
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2010 2:21 PM
To: Rust, Lynn; Daly, Keith
Subject: FW: Metro CRC IGA Amendment 6

We can't do amendment 6. Amendment 5 hasn't been executed yet.

From: Ross Roberts [mailto:Ross.Roberts@oregonmetro.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2010 12:03 PM
To: Ficco, Doug; Brandman, Richard; Wagner, Don
Cc: Humphrey, George; Robin McArthur; Andy Cotugno
Subject: Metro CRC IGA Amendment 6

Doug, Richard and Don-

Our IGA with the CRC is set to expire on September 30th, and we have not yet received an amendment from you that would extend the end date. We anticipate the MetroScope report to be completed when Andy returns the first week of October and will be incurring some charges after 9/30 on that work item. We will not need additional budget for the existing work order, just an extension to the expiration date. Extending the date through the end of the calendar year would be prudent so we don't have to do monthly extensions.

We are also preparing a work scope and budget for Metro activities in support of the LUFO that we will forward as soon as we know the schedule for adoption of the LUFO. We anticipate approximately \$60,000 in Metro costs to adopt a LUFO, but have not completed our cost estimate yet.

In addition, the issues Andy raised in early September (below) are still relevant and we need to discuss the level of continued support that you will need from Metro. We'll schedule a meeting to discuss when Andy returns. In the meantime, we look forward to Amendment 6 to extend the expiration date of the current IGA.

Ross Roberts
Deputy Director|Planning and Development

Andy's e-mail from September 3rd is below.

Richard and Don:

It is difficult for me to tell where the CRC project is going in response to the PSC action on August 9 and the IRP report to the Governor. I appreciate the project is still developing an action plan so many issues are unanswered and many long delayed vacation plans at the end of summer make it difficult to formulate a direction. I have had some meetings with project staff, city of Portland staff, the Hayden Island Design Group and ZGF and see progress being made on further development of project details associated with the Hayden Island Interchange and Marine Drive Interchange and surrounding streets, LRT and bike/ped. connections.

My problem is I am going to be on vacation from September 8 to October 4 and therefore can't be involved with settling these issues during that period.

The following are concerns that I have that will likely need to progress during the next month:

1. It is not clear to me whether the project is on a 6-month schedule to finish the FEIS and ROD or a two year schedule. Depending upon the answer, it may or may not be timely to adopt needed amendments to the Metro RTP and the required Land Use Final Order (LUFO) and seek funding through the 2011 Legislatures.
2. If the CRC project is going to the two Legislatures for funding next spring, there is a need to develop regional support. JPACT has typically endorsed Legislative priorities prior to the session and I brought the issue up at the Sept. 2 JPACT meeting.
3. Note: A meeting with Robin McArthur, Dick Benner, Mark Turpel and Richard Brandman was held that reached the conclusion that Metro would not need to amend the RTP if the project's definition remains consistent with the current assumptions. If there is an interest in Metro amending the RTP, there is a fair amount of work to get things ready to go. We would expect the project staff to produce needed materials under the guidance and review of the Metro staff. This would include:
 - a. Development of documentation on each of the 134 conditions of approval included as part of the LPA adoption several years ago. Determination that these have been satisfactorily addressed is a key step in asking for adoption of the RTP amendment. Please note that JPACT has requested review of all conditions, not just those adopted by Metro.
 - b. Preparation of the necessary staff report, ordinance and findings and the exhibits that represent the actual pages being amended. Metro staff can provide guidance and review materials.
 - c. Preparation of needed public notices and handout materials.
 - d. Tracking of a comment and response log during the comment period.
4. I understand Mark Greenfield has been contracted to develop materials needed for adoption of a Land Use Final Order. I have asked him to identify support activities that will be needed from Metro. Metro will assist on these upon execution of an intergovernmental agreement with the project to pay for this support. All activities associated with preparation and adoption of a LUFO have been part of the project budget and should be handled the same with this project.
5. It is also not clear to me how much of my time the project is interested in using on further

development of the project, especially related to design refinement in the Hayden Island/Marine Drive area. The Hayden Island Design Group developed the recommendation to the PSC for Option D but called out a series of further design refinements that need to be addressed. I would like to participate but cannot without support from the project. If the project chooses not to provide that support, my time will be limited to an occasional IPS meeting.

6. One of the biggest outstanding issues is further definition of the Mobility Council and associated performance measures. I think the work of the Performance Measures Advisory Committee last year and the recent application of Performance Measures as part of the PSC work program are good progress but significantly more progress is needed. Again, I would like to help but will be limited to an occasional IPS meeting without project support.
7. Metro still owes the project a final Metroscope report under the contract executed several months ago. As you know, we provided the PSC with high level conclusions but have not yet completed the full documentation. Unfortunately, competing demands from the Portland-Milwaukie LRT project and conflicting vacations have gotten in the way. Metro staff is working on the report but I have requested that it not be submitted to the CRC project until I have a chance for a final review upon my return from vacation in October.

*** eSafe scanned this email for malicious content ***

*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***