



METRO

TRANSPORTATION POLICY ALTERNATES COMMITTEE

February 2, 2007

Metro Regional Center

MEMBERS PRESENT

Scott Bricker
Greg DiLoreto
Sorin Garber
Nancy Kraushaar
Mike McKillip
Dave Nordberg
Ron Papsdorf
John Reinhold
Sreya Sarkar
Phil Selinger
Paul Smith
Rian Windsheimer
Ron Weinman

AFFILIATION

Citizen
Citizen
Citizen
City of Oregon City/Cities of Clackamas County
City of Tualatin/Cities of Washington County
DEQ
City of Gresham
Citizen
Citizen
TriMet
City of Portland
ODOT
Clackamas County

MEMBERS ABSENT

Susie Lahsene
Karen Schilling

AFFILIATION

Port of Portland
Multnomah County

ALTERNATES PRESENT

Ed Abrahamson
Andy Back
John Gillam
Robin McCaffrey

AFFILIATION

Multnomah County
Washington County
City of Portland
Port of Portland

GUESTS PRESENT

Bill Barber
Danielle Cowan
Byron Estes
Joan Kwok
Jean Luke
R. Scott Pemble
Lawrence O'Dell
Derek Robbins
Jonathan Schlueter

AFFILIATION

Citizen
Wilsonville
PDC
Meriwether
Meriwether
Multnomah County
Washington County
Forest Grove
Westside Economic Alliance

STAFF

Andy Cotugno, Paulette Copperstone Kim Ellis, Tom Kloster, Ted Leybold, John Mermin, Josh Naramore, Amy Rose, Caleb Winter

1. CALL TO ORDER, DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

Chair Cotugno called the special meeting to order at 2:38 p.m. and noted a quorum was present.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO TPAC ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were none.

3 ACTION ITEMS

3.1 Transportation Priorities Final Cut List

Ted Leybold, MTIP Manager, distributed his February 2, 2007 memo to TPAC “Transportation Priorities 2008-11 – Draft Metro Staff Recommended Final Cut List (green) and the revised Transportation Priorities 2008-11 Draft Staff Recommended Final Cut List (white) and explained changes/corrections further. He said based on comments received at the last TPAC, staff added more information about public support and staff comments.

Chair Cotugno said the recommendations were divided into Base Program and MTIP Staff Recommended Program(s) and that staff thought TPAC should take action on the Base Program first. He asked for a motion on the Base Program and also for a 2nd tier start with the base recommendation. The Committee discussed how to proceed. Paul Smith said Ted Leybold and staff did a great job, that the memo and staff report weighed policy and geographic equity together and it would be more rational to move staff’s recommendation as the main motion.

Main Motion (#1):	Paul Smith moved, seconded by Ron Papsdorf, to approve the MTIP Staff Recommended Program.
--------------------------	--

Ron Papsdorf said JPACT instructed TPAC to support projects for urban reserve areas brought into the UGB that have completed their planning work and said one of those areas was Pleasant Valley.

1st Motion to Amend Main Motion (#2):	Ron Papsdorf moved, seconded by Paul Smith, to amend SE 190 th Drive: Pleasant View/Highland to SW 30 th Street to increase the passing corridor and bike lanes for a total of \$883,000; \$600,000 from MTIP matched by \$223,194.00 from Pleasant Valley. The reduction in MTIP would come from \$350,000 from the RTO Program and \$250,000 reduction in funding for the ITS program.
---	--

Ron Papsdorf clarified that part of his rationale for the motion was that the RTO program has received additional funds in previous cycles and that the ITS program is new and has not been fully developed thus making a cut in funding reasonable. He said the ITS program can receive additional funding in subsequent MTIP cycles. Ron Papsdorf said Pleasant Valley could provide \$220,000 of the estimated costs now. He said SDCs couldn’t be collected until development is in place. He said the area should have real added value, not suburban sprawl, and that good investments should be made in the area at the beginning. He noted the project would be in an

existing part of the city not inside the UGB to begin with but that was added, and leads to, Pleasant Valley. Chair Cotugno asked Ron Papsdorf to recommend a friendly amendment to the motion that the cut in the RTO budget come first from the \$300,000 Individualized Marketing program since that was nominated by the RTO program as supplemental to the RTO program. Ron Papsdorf noted RTO had received a 14 percent increase in their budget. Chair Cotugno suggested that TPAC not micro-manage, and let RTO decide where the funds should come from. Ron Papsdorf agreed.

Scott Bricker said Pleasant Valley/Gresham have the highest SDCs in the region and asked if those were an option. Chair Cotugno said MTIP could set that up as criteria. He said when they finally get to financing the RTP, those issues will be on the table and the wide disparity in SDCs around the region will be on the table for discussion also.

The Committee discussed the motion to amend further. John Reinhold asked what the recommended cuts were for ITS again. Ron Papsdorf said ITS is a brand new program so it should have two years to get started and then they could come back and revisit their appropriate level of funding. Greg DiLoreto asked how the 190th project compared with the others. Staff said it ranked 75.5.

Andy Back said he agreed with Paul Smith’s recommendation, but expressed concern about amending staff’s recommendation. He said the Committee should start with the base program recommendations first. Chair Cotugno asked the Committee if they wished to proceed the way they started or if they wanted to start by amending the base program first. Ron Papsdorf said Metro staff selected the “gray boxes” and that it would be fair to discuss the whole thing and then make amendments.

Andy Back said it was up to Paul Smith to amend the Main Motion. Chair Cotugno said if so, the motion would be to substitute the base program for the motion on the floor.

<i>Motion to Substitute and Replace Main Motion (#3):</i>	Andy Back moved, seconded by Paul Smith, that TPAC approve the Base Program instead of the MTIP Staff Recommended Program.
--	--

<i>Vote on #3</i>	Two members voted aye. The rest voted nay. The motion failed to pass.
--------------------------	---

Scott Bricker asked what lists staff were sending to JPACT. He said the list should be called the “TPAC list,” not the base list or the staff recommended list. Rian Windsheimer said TPAC could support that. Phil Selinger said the list should be presented as intact to JPACT as possible. He said the logic, scoring, and other components should all be considered. A committee member asked how TPAC had done this in the past. Ted Leybold said staff had presented the TPAC list with a summary of the changes.

<i>2nd Motion to Amend Main Motion: (#4)</i>	Mike McKillip, seconded by Andy Back, to add \$2 million for Farmington Road.
--	---

Margaret Middleton said the project met all significant criteria, had gaps in the sidewalks so would qualify as a gap-filling project and would be a highly regionally significant project on a former state highway.

Chair Cotugno said TPAC was over programming already. He said as it stands now, 10% of the projects will need to slip into a subsequent year. Andy Back asked if engineering was included in the Farmington Road project. Chair Cotugno said the project has been around since the first UGB decision was made in the 1970s and that the engineering has been done which was a good first step. John Reinhard asked if the ROW acquisition was meant to increase lane capacity. Margaret Middleton said it was. The Committee discussed project details further.

3rd Motion to Amend Main Motion: (#5)	Nancy Kraushaar moved, seconded by Ron Weinman, to add McLoughlin Blvd: Clackamas River to Dunes Drive back to the list asking for it to be funded from a non-specific source.
---	--

Nancy Kraushaar explained the project represented \$120 million in private sector investment and tied into water quality and tourist benefits. She said the development of Clackamette Cove would clean up a blighted urban area, add to the tax rolls and enhance their comprehensive plan. She said she was not comfortable with suggesting that funds be taken from other sources to fund it at this time but wanted to move the project forward for discussion. She said that the regional balance might be a little skewed. Ron Papsdorf asked if the developer was contributing funds or the ROW. Nancy Kraushaar said the development did not front McLoughlin but they were not asking the City for development funds.

Chair Cotugno said they did this every two years and assumed there would be slippage, then the over programming goes away. He said every year they start with an analysis of how much funding they have and explained financing methodologies further.

Scott Bricker asked what happened to the Willamette Greenway Trail project. He said the City of Portland submitted information on a \$600,000 phase of the project. He said if TPAC was going to approve other projects than that project should at least get a gray box. He asked what happened to the project if it would have warranted a gray box.

Ted Leybold said the City of Portland did submit an updated application and that information was provided to TPAC at their January 26 meeting and additional copies were available at this meeting also. He said the information staff got was the same they got for the 190th project and said they were not going to do a big technical evaluation because they would end up in an endless loop. He said staff did not recommend a change to the first cut projects recommended by TPAC. He said if it moved forward, it would be up to TPAC. Scott Bricker requested that JPACT get a memo detailing the changes to these lists.

Gregg Everhart in the audience reminded those present that it was initially scored but never showed up very high on the list. She said it was very high on citizen lists and it would be awkward if not included.

4th Motion to Amend Main Motion (#6)	Scott Bricker moved, seconded by Paul Smith, make the Willamette Greenway project a gray box on the list with \$ 1.2 million and \$.6 million
--	---

Chair Cotugno said the Willamette Greenway Trail could be listed at \$1.2 million for the first segment and a second segment at \$.6 million. Scott Bricker said \$1.2 million would be funded through the City of Portland. John Reinhold asked if this was just a case of bringing forth a history of what has happened up to now. He said the final recommendation reflect that the

numbers have changed. Ted Leybold said he was reticent about portraying it that way in the Base Program because then it would open the door for everyone who was not on the 1st cut list. Robin McCaffrey asked if there was discussion about awarding it or if staff asked that the funds get moved. Scott Bricker said it was recommended it be funded. He said he made the motion that the trail should not come out of this list again because he did not think it was the best use of the region's money. But he said it was an extension piece and at the time they were not able to come to agreement with the Portland Parks Department. He said what is different now is that a lot of different partners have come to the table.

Greg DiLoreto said TPAC has the list for JPACT and now there were four projects TPAC wants JPACT to "know" about. He said all JPACT has to know is that TPAC had a huge discussion and that all of the projects are important. Paul Smith noted the project did score high. John Reinhold asked if the project would take care of a gap. Scott Bricker said it would and described the project further.

Sorin Garber said a compromise could be a minority report of sorts so that JPACT could just get the list. Scott Bricker said he was not recommending the project differently than reflected in the materials. Phil Selinger said he liked the original staff recommendation and thought it should be presented unamended.

Chair Cotugno said that went back to Greg DiLoreto's suggestion to vote nay on the amendments, present the staff report to JPACT but highlight these items as presented. He said if they voted aye on the amendments TPAC would want to tell JPACT that was \$4.8 million of over programming. Andy Back asked if allocation by 10 percent was high or low and asked for some historical background on the issues. Chair Cotugno explained over programming further. Andy Back asked if it would be possible to combine the four projects together in one motion.

John Reinhold asked if TPAC was approving the numbers or staff's (green) memo? Ted Leybold said TPAC was approving Resolution No. 07-3773, For the Purpose of Allocating \$64 Million of Transportation Priorities Funding for the Years 2010 and 2011, Pending Air Quality Conformity Determination (pink) plus the numbers list.

<p><i>Vote on Motion #6</i></p>	<p>All those present voted aye to separate the segments of the Willamette Greenway Trail project on the project list as previously discussed, which included \$600,000 for the SW Lane to SW Lowell segment and \$1.2 million for the SW Gibbs to SW Lane segment.</p>
--	--

Chair Cotugno said TPAC should vote on over programming. Greg DiLoreto said he would vote nay on over programming. Ron Papsdorf said they should ask JPACT if they wanted to over program or not and tell them about the projects. He said he could not recall over programming by a by a full 10 percent before. He said the Cornelius project was relatively small. Nancy Kraushaar said TPAC could tell JPACT it was about regional balance and noted JPACT would trade projects also. Ted Leybold discussed projects that fulfilled regional balance goals. Ron Papsdorf said the McLoughlin project was very important to Clackamas County.

Mike McKillip said if projects popped in, after all the background work had been done, they should not be able to get on the list. Andy Back was uncomfortable with taking something off the list but thought some unlisted projects were as good as what was on the list. He said it was for JPACT to make policy decisions on over programming. John Reinhold said there was a big difference between the two projects. He said Washington County and Beaverton have funds they

are willing to contribute if the projects go through, whereas the McLoughlin Boulevard project doesn't. He asked what would happen to Beaverton's funds if this did not get approved. Margaret Middleton said they would continue to pursue the funding whatever the source. She said the project would pop up again in two years.

Phil Selinger said it would not be a good use of funds to split the two and that it was TPAC's job to deliver a balanced list to JPACT. Rian Windsheimer said that was why they were providing them with the second list. He said TPAC would talk to them about today's meeting anyway. Nancy Kraushaar said TPAC could present them with priorities. Ron Papsdorf said Mike McKillip's motion was different from Nancy Kraushaar's motion – it was to over program by \$2 million. Mike McKillip said that was not quite right - they just wanted to suck up the first \$2 million that did not get used. Dave Nordberg wanted JPACT to know that if TPAC did not discuss a project that did not mean it did not have their support. Danielle Cowan said JPACT would discuss what they wanted to discuss anyway but would note the areas TPAC struggled with.

Paul Smith said Greg DiLoreto made a good point that there will be a meeting record and memos resulting from the meeting JPACT would know what the discussion was about at TPAC.

<i>Motion #7</i>	Paul Smith moved, seconded by Robin McCaffrey, to send a memo to JPACT detailing TPAC's discussion at this meeting.
-------------------------	---

Chair Cotugno suggested action on the Farmington motion, giving it \$2 million contingent on the other \$2 million and doing the same for the McLoughlin project at \$2.8 million. The Committee discussed over programming further. Ted Leybold said TPAC should just approve a simple over program and not prioritize. Mike McKillip and Andy Back, the mover and seconder of Motion No. 4, agreed to the modification.

<i>Vote on Motion #4</i>	Four members aye. Eleven members voted nay. The vote was 11/4 against and the motion failed.
---------------------------------	--

Chair Cotugno said TPAC should give further consideration to McLoughlin either by cutting or over programming.

<i>Vote on Motion #5</i>	Five members voted yes. Ten members voted nay. The vote was 10/5 against and the motion failed.
---------------------------------	---

Chair Cotugno said now TPAC should vote on the motion about Farmington and McLoughlin. Scott Bricker made a friendly amendment to add \$600,000 to that list. Robin McCaffrey said TPAC did not have that discussion and thought the meeting record reflecting that was enough. Paul Smith said it was simply to reflect the level of discussion from the project proponents. Scott Bricker concurred and said if all four projects went down, all four should go in the memo. Robin McCaffrey said it was a moot point and that JPACT was going to do what it wanted. Chair Cotugno said the memo should provide information to JPACT about the three projects that were discussed at some length: McLoughlin, Farmington and the \$600,000 trail segment.

<i>Vote on Motion #7</i>	Two members voted nay. The rest of the committee voted aye. The motion passed.
---------------------------------	--

<i>Vote on Main Motion as Amended (Motion #1)</i>	All those present voted aye. The main motion as amended passed unanimously.
--	---

The Committee briefly discussed what information they should provide JPACT about this meeting.

4. ADJOURN

As there was no further business, Mr. Cotugno adjourned the meeting at 4:45p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Paulette Copperstone, Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR FEBRUARY 2, 2007

The following have been included as part of the official public record:

ITEM	TOPIC	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
* 3.1	Calendar	1/26/07	Calendar of Activities for 2007 Transportation Priorities and 2008-11 MTIP	020207t-01
* 3.1	Memo	1/25/07	To: TPAC From: Ted Leybold Re: Transportation Priorities 2008-11 – Draft Metro Staff Recommended Final Cut List	020207t-02
* 3.1	Information	1/26/07	Base Program Narrowing Factors rationale	020207t-03
* 3.1	Information	N/A	MTIP Staff Recommended Program Narrowing Factors rationale	020207t-04
* 3.1	Resolution	N/A	Resolution No. 07-3773, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ALLOCATING \$64 MILLION OF TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES FUNDING FOR THE YEARS 2010 AND 2011, PENDING AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY DETERMINATION	020207t-05
* 3.1	List	N/A	Transportation Priorities 2008-11 Draft Staff Recommended Final Cut List	020207t-06

* Included in packet

**Distributed at meeting