

JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

November 13, 2003

MEMBERS PRESENT

AFFILIATION

Rod Park	Metro Council
Matthew Garrett	Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT - Region 1)
Craig Pridemore	Clark County
Fred Hansen	TriMet
Carl Hosticka	Metro Council
Bill Kennemer	Clackamas County
Don Wagner	Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
Larry Haverkamp	City of Gresham, representing Cities of Multnomah County
Maria Rojo de Steffey	Multnomah County
Karl Rohde	City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas County
Jim Francesconi	City of Portland
Rex Burkholder	Metro Council
Roy Rogers	Washington County

MEMBERS ABSENT

AFFILIATION

Stephanie Hallock	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Royce Pollard	City of Vancouver
Bill Wyatt	Port of Portland
Rob Drake	City of Beaverton, representing Cities of Washington County

ALTERNATES PRESENT

AFFILIATION

Andy Ginsburg	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Dean Lookingbill	SW Washington RTC
Susie Lahsene	Port of Portland

GUESTS PRESENT

AFFILIATION

Kathy Busse	Washington County
Karen Schilling	Multnomah County
Kevin Downing	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Rod Monroe	Metro Council
Jim Bernard	City of Milwaukie
John Gillam	City of Portland
John Rist	Clackamas County
Dave Nordberg	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Phil Selinger	TriMet
John Russell	Oregon Transportation Commission
Robin McArthur	Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT - Region 1)

GUESTS PRESENT (Cont.) AFFILIATION

Brianne Echenhart	Portland State University
Dale Himes	Washington State Department of Transportation
Sharon Nassit	NPBA
Nancy Kraushaar	City of Oregon City
Alice Rouyer	City of Milwaukie
Ron Papsdorf	City of Gresham

STAFF

Dick Benner   Richard Brandman   Renee Castilla   Kim Ellis   Tom Kloster  
Mark Turpel

I.     CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

Chair Rod Park called the meeting to order and declared a quorum at 7:17 a.m.

II.    REVIEW OF MINUTES

ACTION TAKEN: Fred Hansen moved and Roy Rogers seconded the motion to approve the meeting minutes of October 9, 2003 as amended. The motion passed.

AMENDMENT: October 9, 2003, 2<sup>nd</sup> page, reference to Powell/Foster to include pavement and preservation.

III.   CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO JPACT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Chris Smith, Transportation Chair for the NW District Association (neighborhood association for NW Portland) and current TPAC member stated that they have completed a twenty-year update to their neighborhood plan with the City of Portland. He expressed a concern regarding a late amendment to the plan that the neighborhood association feels has impacts on regional planning. He explained that as part of the plan, an area on the north side of Juan Street was rezoned to allow offices use. This has led to concerns regarding livability impacts in their neighborhood as well as regional concerns in terms of losing industrial lands to office use. He said that the rezoning was done at the request of ESCO to allow them to remain there and build headquarters office space. He stated that having headquarter space is not something that the neighborhood opposes, however they oppose the speculative office space development portion. Further, that high-density employment should occur in a 2040 regional center not in industrial areas. The impact of that would be serious transportation problems in that corridor as indicated by property owners own consultant's analysis. It would also differ transportation resources that should be going to centers to be applied to this challenge. To the extent that they are not able to mitigate that would also mean they would have freight movement problems as well. These issues were raised in a letter from Councilor Burkholder to Commissioner Francesconi however his understanding is that letter has yet to be answered. In fairness to Commissioner Francesconi, there is report of an SDC associated with this intended to provide mitigation however they have

concerns that any amount of mitigation is only ½ funded by the SDCs therefore the question remains how they find the additional resources. He said that the mitigation measures proposed by the property owner's consultant do not make a lot of sense to them because they call for routing traffic onto local surface streets in the neighborhood which would impact the ability of their constituents. They would like to see a true planning exercise completed although there was not time to do that. They have only an estimated amount of mitigation required and no plan as to what the actual revision will be. They are in the process of appealing the plan to LUBA on several points including this one.

#### OTIA

Matthew Garrett stated that the Oregon Transportation Commission met in Hood River to discuss the OTIA III, in particular, the bridge portion. He explained that the commission confirmed the \$1.3 billion to be allocated to bridge financing as well as validation of the five-state approach for the phase out of bridge projects. In addition to the \$300 million that would be allocated to local bridges, he explained that the commission was focusing on vital freight commerce routes. A list of those routes has been generated and would be given to the Freight Advisory Committee for review. The modernization funds from OTIA III are preliminary set to be released in 2007. He explained that they would be bonding existing dollars in order to raise the additional funds. He said that the OTC has identified nine congressional earmarks that they would ensure to fully fund. Therefore, they are ODOT's priority for modernization dollars. He said that the OTC has decided that any projects brought forward from other jurisdictions not on ODOT's priority list would be the funding responsibility of that jurisdiction. He stated that the I-5/Delta Park project in addition to the Highway 217/Highway 26 project are two priorities for Region 1. Finally, he said that there would be \$100 million for freight/industrial lands/job creation projects. However, as of yet, the OTC has not determined how those funds would be allocated. He concluded by explaining that the timeline for the bridge portion of funding is set to around mid 2004. The Oregon Freight Advisory Committee should have a completed list of projects by March of 2004.

Commissioner John Russell further explained that the jobs portion of funding would not be distributed based upon regional equity but by project and its importance.

#### IV. DRAFT 2004 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP)

Mr. Tom Kloster presented the Draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – (included as part of this meeting record).

Mr. Tom Kloster stated that staff was taking the Draft 2004 RTP though the MPAC/MTAC review process. He explained that MTPAC would be reviewing and making a recommendation to MPAC.

Mr. Fred Hansen asked how FHWA had changed the process of when a project was to be considered for conformity.

Mr. Andy Cotugno explained that when previous fiscally constrained RTPs were established, they reviewed all projects expected to be built over the next twenty years and conformed them. However, if a large project was set to be built over that twenty-year period, the entire project was conformed, however only phases of the project were included in the financially constrained RTP. Allowing phases of projects to be included enabled the limited resources available to be used for other projects. However, recently FHWA has insisted that the entire project that is conformed be also included in the financially constrained RTP, thus reducing the limited amount of dollars available to other projects.

V. SOUTH CORRIDOR DOWNTOWN SEGMENT LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE AND LAND USE FINAL ORDER

Mr. Richard Brandman gave a brief history of the processes leading up to the South Corridor Downtown Segment.

Mr. Ross Roberts presented the South Corridor Downtown Segment Locally Preferred Alternative and Land Use Final Order (included as part of this meeting record).

VI. BI-STATE COMMITTEE BYLAWS

Chair Rod Park gave a brief history of the BI-State Committee.

Commissioner Craig Pridemore continued the history of the Bi-State Committee and the processes leading up to the recent recommended changes.

Councilor Rex Burkholder presented the BI-State Committee Bylaws (introduced as part of this meeting record).

Commissioner Craig Pridemore explained that they are hoping to take the bi-state coordination to higher level leading to increased understanding on both sides of the river. He also explained that the next steps would include reviewing bi state projects and how they are coordinated as well as ensuring that they are balancing growth on both sides.

Councilor Karl Rohde asked for clarification on the membership changes.

Councilor Burkholder explained that the new Bi-state committee would be made up of those jurisdictions that are affected by decisions along the river.

Commissioner Maria Rojo de Steffey asked how private businesses would be involved.

Commissioner Craig Pridemore explained that they have had discussions regarding membership and had decided that they would bring in affected stakeholders, (i.e. businesses, federal, state, local stakeholders, neighborhood groups) as needed.

Mr. Fred Hansen directed the committee members to the Resolves on page two, number five and stated that the first sentence is very broad and narrows somewhat further in the paragraph. He asked for clarification of the intent of that resolve.

Councilor Burkholder replied that the committee discussed what its focus should be and included in those discussions, whether it be land use and transportation as well the issues of economic development, whether they were issues of their own. The committee agreed that the emphasis needed to be placed upon transportation decisions and land use decisions. They further agreed that the affects on economic development, for example, from those transportation and land use decisions needed to be evaluated carefully.

Commissioner Bill Kennemer stated that there has been a disconnect between land use and transportation and requested that it be discussed further at the upcoming JPACT retreat.

Commissioner Jim Francesconi stated that there needed to be a better connect between economic development and transportation/land use. He also stated that marine and air transportation issues were not included either. Although, the Bi-state recommendations to come to JPACT and MPAC for further review, he thought it important that they be discussed at the Bi-State committee as well.

Commissioner Craig Pridemore replied that specific functions of the Bi-State were addressed in the I-5 partnership study and one was the importance of addressing rail needs.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Craig Pridemore moved and Councilor Rex Burkholder seconded the motion to approve

Councilor Rod Monroe urged the JPACT members to support the changes.

ACTION TAKEN: The motion passed.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Jim Francesconi moved and Commissioner Craig Pridemore seconded the motion to amend the resolution to include other issues of importance including economic development and marine and air transportation. The motion passed.

## VII. DEQ'S CLEAN DIESEL INITIATIVE

Kevin Downing presented DEQ's clean Diesel Initiative (included as part of this meeting record).

ACTION TAKEN: Councilor Karl Rohde moved and Ms. Susie Lahsene seconded the motion to approve sending of a letter to local jurisdictions from the JPACT chair.

ACTION TAKEN: The motion passed.

## VIII. COMMENTS ON PROPOSED SPECIAL TRANSPORTATION AREA AMENDMENTS TO THE OREGON HIGHWAY PLAN

Kim Ellis presented Comments on Proposed Special Transportation Area Amendments to the Oregon Highway Plan (included as part of this meeting record).

Andy Cotugno stated that staff is asking for comments on which areas should be designated as STAs and if an area is designated as an STA and also has a freight function, whether or not there should be a management plan to address the operation of that STA segment and take into consideration the freight function. He further stated that JPACT is not amending the freight map, however the RTP update is proposing an amendment to the freight map and therefore the three mentioned segments have an implication on what kind of management plan might be required to accompany an STA. He said one of the freight designations is important because it affects downtown Milwaukie, the other is important because it affects a potential future STA designation in downtown Forest Grove. The last is a mapping error. The comment from TPAC suggest that there be a management plan if there is a freight designation that overlaps with an STA designation as a result of ODOT's plan calling out a freight route as well as Metro's plan calling out a freight route. He directed the members to the cover memo that suggests that JPACT discuss not linking the requirement of a management plan to Metro's freight route. He further stated that the state interest in the management plan should be tied to a state designation freight route because those are the routes that the state has determined are important for freight purposes and not tie to a Metro designated freight route. He explained that it is an extra requirement if the freight routes are tied to Metro's designated freight routes.

Chair Rod Park asked for clarification on the differences between preparing a management plan and not preparing one.

Andy Cotugno explained that the difference is in the design standards that are applied. He said that STA designations require reduced speed and capacity, which slows vehicles. Freight routes that are designated as STAs need to be able to accommodate trucks and a higher emphasis on the freight, therefore requiring a management plan to determine how it can accommodate both needs.

ACTION TAKEN: Ms. Susie Lahsene moved and Mr. Matthew Garrett seconded the motion to approve TPAC's original letter.

Commissioner Roy Rogers expressed concerns regarding the outcome of the action before the committee. He said that they understand the coordination is between ODOT and Washington County in regards to STAs. ODOT also coordinates with them regarding freight issues, NHS issues, etc. He expressed confusion on whether if the action passes, whether the local jurisdictions decisions made can be vetoed by a Metro effort. Although, it appears that the motion is advocating to a regional process than what has been in the past for a local process, he would like further explanation.

Susie Lahsene stated that the Oregon Freight Advisory Committee's is concerned with the policy objectives in place that may potentially come in to conflict with design and whether there is a

mechanism in place to address those trade offs. She said that staff would refer to the street design guidelines to address tradeoffs. She said that she agrees that for those areas where there is an STA area that freight mobility and the intent to serve local needs and to be able to ensure that there are appropriate turning radiuses and that it is not a through movement issue per se. But, in reality what happens is that the discussion occurs in the project development phase and the nature of a project - trying to ensure a particular local focus and therefore rather than having a mechanism that addresses the needs of all the modes, what often happens is that some are ignored and in fact what has happened in a couple of instances is that the trucking needs have been ignored and the result is go back and spend effort and redesign time addressing those. She stated that her concern is more philosophical, for example, if something is designated as a freight route then that designation should be supported.

Fred Hansen expressed his concern that this action essentially says that "we can not trust ourselves to have a regionally significant freight area and that we will protect it and therefore have to have ODOT and/or OTC to protect it." He further asked if a jurisdiction decides that a freight route that has been previously designated as significant for freight decides that they want to eliminate truck traffic, how would that issue be addressed.

Andy Cotugno stated that if there is no freight function than ODOT and the local jurisdiction would be free to design that to chase trucks away. However, if there if there was a regional freight function identified for that route, then ODOT and the local jurisdiction would be obliged to accommodate trucks. Further, if there was a state freight function designated, than they would be obliged to accommodate trucks and in affect, expedite trucks. Whichever those three designations apply, there is a freight implication at a different level in each case. Therefore, if the decision was made that the route was not a major through route because there is no major industry that it is trying to get to, and it is not major exit point to the region that it is trying to get through, then it does not need to be a state function. However, if it does need to accommodate trucks for distribution purposes, then it is called a regional freight function and again would be obliged to accommodate trucks but not speed up trucks.

Ms. Susie Lahsene stated that although it is supposed to work that way, many times, it does not and in many instances, turning radiuses are reduced making it difficult for trucks.

Andy Cotugno stated that ODOT adopted provisions for STAs three years ago but in order to implement them, they required that the local government and ODOT execute a management agreement on what is going to happen there. There has been none accomplished because it has been too hard to get through that process to agree upon on that management agreement. He said that it is a reasonable expectation to have that management agreement if it is a NHS route and a state freight route. He said that if it is not, then it should be worked out locally and further think that the regional freight designation is a local distribution issue that should be worked out locally and not get escalated to a requirement to have a management plan where the success in doing a management plan has been zero.

Matthew Garrett stated that for those areas that require a management plan, ODOT would do their part to ensure that the work can move forward.

Commissioner Jim Fancesconi asked that Metro staff and the Port of Portland meet and discuss what could be done to correct the problems they see.

ACTION TAKEN: The motion passed with Andy Ginsburg, Carl Hosticka and Don Wagner abstaining.

IX. FEDERAL UPDATES

The federal updates were held over until the next meeting.

X. ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chair Park adjourned the meeting at 9:13 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Renee Castilla