

JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

July 11, 2002

Meeting Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT

Rod Monroe
Fred Hansen
Maria Rojo de Steffey
Kay Van Sickle
Rob Drake
Craig Pridemore
Larry Haverkamp
Royce Pollard
Stephanie Hallock
Rod Park
Jim Francesconi
Rex Burkholder

AFFILIATION

Metro
Tri-Met
Multnomah County
Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT Region 1)
City of Beaverton, representing Cities of Washington Co.
Clark County
City of Gresham, representing Cities of Multnomah Co.
City of Vancouver
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Metro
City of Portland
Metro

MEMBERS ABSENT

Don Wagner
Karl Rohde
Bill Kennemer
Bill Wyatt

AFFILIATION

Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas Co.
Clackamas County
Port of Portland

ALTERNATES PRESENT

Michael Jordan
Dave Lohman

AFFILIATION

Clackamas County
Port of Portland

GUESTS PRESENT

Laurel Wentworth
Ron Papsdorf
Lance Greensback
Susie Lahsene
Kathy Lehtola
Tom Markgraf
L.A. Ornelas
John Wiebke
John Fratt
Dean Lookingbill
Dave Nordberg

AFFILIATION

City of Portland
City of Gresham
Cambridge Systematics, Inc.
Port of Portland
Washington County
Earl Blumenauer's Office
OHSU
City of Hillsboro
Port of Vancouver
SW Washinton RTC
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)

STAFF

Andy Cotugno
Kim White

Richard Brandman
Renée Castilla

Mike Hoglund
Bill Barber

Ted Leybold

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

Chair Monroe called the meeting to order and declared a quorum at 7:36am.

II. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO JPACT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were no citizen communications.

III. MINUTES OF MAY 9, 2002 JPACT MEETING

ACTION TAKEN: Rob Drake moved and Larry Haverkamp seconded the motion to approve the meeting minutes of May 9, 2002. The motion passed.

MINUTES OF JUNE 13, 2002 JPACT MEETING

ACTION TAKEN: Craig Pridemore moved and Larry Haverkamp seconded the motion to approve the meeting minutes of June 13, 2002. The motion passed.

IV. ODOT STIP – INTERIM PROJECT ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND PRIORITIZING FACTORS

Dave Williams presented the ODOT STIP – Interim Project eligibility criteria and prioritizing factors. (Included as part of this meeting record.)

He stated that ODOT plans to program three projects for modernization in the next STIP. Those are:

- 1) US 26/217 to Murray because ODOT is legislatively mandated to restore the Barnes Road ramp by FY 05
- 2) The \$1.9 million commitment owed to Boeckman Road;
- 3) \$2 million commitment on US 26 Zigzag Road to Rhododendron.

The remaining modernization funds they hope to use for PE on the Delta Park/Lombard project as well as Sunrise Corridor in Clackamas Counties. This will assist them in obtaining federal funds for demonstration projects later.

Rex Burkholder asked why the eligibility criterion regarding TSP consistency did not apply to bridge projects as it does to modernization and preservation. He is concerned that bridge rehabilitation projects seem to ignore other plan objectives such as bike and pedestrian improvements.

Dave Williams responded that ODOT does what they can to the degree feasible within certain physical constraints. Also, the main criterion for preservation and bridge was that relating to the management systems – ODOT does not have the money to do pavement and bridge rehabilitation solely to add street amenities. Hence, ODOT shall only consider such projects if the physical condition of the roadway warrants it.

Rex Burkholder stated that in the criteria is not specifically explained.

Dave Williams stated that the questions are fair and he would pass the comments and concerns on.

Fred Hansen asked whether the "narrow" interpretation of modernization ODOT applied to OTIA remains in effect for the next STIP update. He further stated that the 2004-07 STIP is not OTIA and the standard definition of modernization applies.

Dave Williams agreed with Fred's statement and stated that if JPACT finds his projects worthy of funding and they are included in the financially constrained RTP then ODOT would consider them for funding.

Fred Hansen stated he would like to see multi modal addressed in the permanent criteria.

Dave Williams stated he would pass on those comments.

V. RESOLUTION NO. 02-3206 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE POLICY DIRECTION, PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR THE PRIORITIES 2003 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) UPDATE

Mike Hoglund presented Resolution No. 02-3206 For the purpose of adopting the policy direction, program development and evaluation criteria for the priorities 2003 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) update. (Included as part of this meeting record.)

Mike Hoglund stated that both MPAC and TPAC recommended approval of this resolution. He further stated that there were no major issues however, some TPAC committee members had concerns regarding the match differentials and size of the matches. The other issue was the question of allocating funds at the local levels for projects. He said he spoke with Mayor Drake regarding allocating funds at the local level and explained that currently counties work with their cities on a package of projects. However, with FHWA and TEA-21 funds; sub-allocation to local jurisdictions is not allowed. He stated that the JPACT tries for a geographic emphasis on the final program. He further stated that there were clarification issues on the definition of industrial and intermodal connectors.

Chair Monroe reiterated that JPACT cannot sub-allocate funds to local partners. However, JPACT can give the local partners say in the application process and try to find a balance that works within the federal guidelines.

Mike Hoglund also stated that the purpose of Mayor Drake's request was that the MTIP process be simplified.

Rob Drake stated that the MTIP process is a complicated system. He stated that the average citizen has a hard time coming to regional meetings and because his staff often is buried in the paperwork, they are unable to talk to citizens about the issues and processes.

Dave Lohman stated that for the average citizen, the MTIP is an incredible process. Citizen comments are helpful for making and sorting through difficult decisions, however because it is such an extensive process it is often confusing to the public. He then directed the committee members to page 3 of 4 under "other policy objectives" and asked if points were going to be given to projects that only complete the gaps within the system without improving or fixing another problem.

Mike Hoglund stated that in order for a project to receive a 90/10 match, the project would have to go through a screening to determine if the project completes the system. He stated that a project would have to finish a segment and not begin a new segment.

Dave Lohman then directed the committee to page 11 of 14 regarding multi-use pads. He asked if a project was great at affordable housing and/or accessing a town center but did not do anything else would it end up with lower ranking. He also asked whether a project should receive bonus points for supporting the economy.

Mike Hogle stated that Metro staff feels trails should be eligible for match dependent upon location within 2040. However, if they are outside of a center then they should be funded at a 70/30 match. If they are inside a center then they should be funded at a 90/10 match. Mike also noted that a project must show an economic or centers benefit to be included in the program.

ACTION TAKEN: Fred Hansen moved and Rob Drake seconded the motion to approve Resolution No. 02-3206. The motion passed.

Chair Monroe took a moment to welcome Commissioner Jim Francesconi, City of Portland and Commissioner Michael Jordan, Washington County.

VI. OREGON HIGHWAY PLAN AMENDMENT ON DESIGNATION OF SPECIAL TRANSPORTATION AREAS (STAs) COMMENTS

Mike Hogle presented the Oregon Highway Plan amendment on designation of special transportation areas (STAs). (Included as part of this meeting record.)

Mike Hogle presented Attachment 2 changes drafted by the Port of Portland. (Included as part of this meeting record).

Kay Van Sickle stated that STAs were originally intended for rural communities to spur some of their redevelopment leads. They first began as demonstration projects and were not thought through toward how they would work with MPO's.

ACTION TAKEN: Dave Lohman moved and Rob Drake seconded the motion to approve letter with proposed amendments by the Port of Portland.

Dave Lohman stated that the Port of Portland was concerned about transportation improvements and creating a new level of flexibility with the freight corridors that have been established.

Fred Hansen addressed concerns he had with the Port of Portland's additional language; fourth bullet on second page. The addition of "ODOT freight planning staff must review these strategies." He feels this should be deleted because what ODOT does internally is up to them. He also expressed concern with the deletion of "and safety" in the seventh bullet on the second page.

Kim White stated that she deleted "and safety" because she feels safety should be handled at the project development stage. That any changes for safety, operational and maintenance impacts should be looked at then.

Larry Haverkamp stated that he agreed with Fred Hansen that must is too a strong of a word, however emphasized that freight is very important.

Kay Van Sickle stated that Metro staff should express their concerns and send in their recommendations but is unsure how ODOT staff would react to such strong language.

Rod Park suggested replacing "must" with "should" for having ODOT freight planning review STA's.

Rex Burkholder asked about the state highway system with relation to freight and stated both are important critical pieces.

Dave Lohman stated that the Port would like to see the RTP Freight System designated in the State Highway plan because there are things in the freight system that are not included in the highway plan.

Mike Hoglund stated that the freight system in the RTP appears to be OK and indicated it does go through town centers. However, the freight system shows very little on the National Highway System.

Rod Park asked what the Port gains by adding the national highway system.

Susie Lahsene stated that they looked at criteria for establishing STAs on key freight corridors. She stated that the STAs need to be looked at about how they relate specifically to freight and what the freight impacts would be on freight corridors if they coincide with an STA.

Fred Hansen stated he is willing to make STAs work for overall 2040 land use goals but is not prepared to support the National Highway Plan.

The Motion passed with two friendly amendments. 1) Removing National Highway System from the Port of Portland's amendments and 2) changing "must" to "should" on bullet 4 of the Port of Portland's amendments.

VII. NATIONAL COMMODITY FLOW AND FHWA'S FREIGHT FRAMEWORK ANALYSIS

Dave Lohman introduced Lance Greensback with Cambridge Systematics, Inc. who presented the National Commodity Flow and FHWA's Freight Framework Analysis. (Included as part of this meeting record.)

Chair Monroe advised the committee that the first meeting of the Transportation Investment Task Force is scheduled for Tuesday, July 16, 2002 and he would have a full report at the next JPACT meeting.

VIII. BI-STATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE I-5 CORRIDOR

Andy Cotugno presented the Bi-State Transportation Committee recommendations for the I-5 Corridor. (Included as part of this meeting record.)

Larry Haverkamp stated he would like other jurisdictions, besides the obvious, be given the opportunity to comment on the Bi-State Transportation Committee's recommendations for the I-5 Corridor.

Jim Francesconi stated that first; he would like to see follow-up happen about the freight mobility questions, what is happening and how to address it. Second, to obtain more citizen and business involvement for this issue. Third, focus on ISTEA reauthorization and funding.

Andy Cotugno stated that at a previous JPACT meeting he handed out a paper regarding the reauthorization of TEA-21. He asked members to review that handout and be prepared for a discussion on options and priorities August meeting. He further stated that the reauthorization discussion would be broken up into two categories; the policy issues would be discussed at the August meeting and the project issues such as earmarking priorities would be discussed in October and/or November.

IX. ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chair Monroe adjourned the meeting at 9:20 am.

Respectfully submitted,

Renee Castilla