

Joint Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)
December 13, 2001
Meeting Notes

MEMBERS PRESENT

Rod Monroe, Chair
Rod Park
Rob Drake
Fred Hansen
Roy Rogers
Dean Lookingbill, alternate
Larry Haverkamp
Dave Lohman, alternate
Don Wagner
Annette Liebe, alternate
Kay Van Sickel
Karl Rohde
Charlie Hales
Maria Rojo De Steffey
Rex Burkholder
Bill Kennemer

AFFILIATION

Metro
Metro
Beaverton, representing Cities of Washington County
Tri-Met
Washington County
SW Washington RTC
City of Gresham, representing Cities of Multnomah County
Port of Portland
Washington State Department of Transportation
Oregon Department Environmental Quality
Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT – Region 1)
City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas Co.
City of Portland
Multnomah County
Metro
Clackamas County

GUESTS PRESENT

Kate Deane
Lynn Peterson
Dave Williams
Ron Papsdorf
John Gillam
Dave Nordberg
Rudy Kadlub
Charlotte Lehan
Danielle Cowan
Curt Kipp
Cam Gilmour
Thayer Rorabaugh
Katie Mangle
Linda Floyd
Josh Alpert
Matthew Garrett
Thomas Briggs Marleyraf
Bernie Bottomly
Ross Williams
Steve Lkelley
Louis Ornelas

AFFILIATION

Oregon Department of Transportation
Tri-Met
Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT – Region 1)
City of Gresham
City of Portland
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Costa Pacific Communities
City of Wilsonville
City of Wilsonville
Wilsonville Spokesman (newspaper)
Clackamas County
City of Vancouver
TPAC Citizen Representative
City of Wilsonville/SMART
City of Portland (Charlie Hales's Office)
Oregon Department of Transportation
Congressman Earl Blumenaur's Office
Tri-Met
CST/CLF
Washington County
Oregon Health Science University

STAFF

Andy Cotugno
Richard Brandman
Mike Hoglund
Chris Deffebach
Renée Castilla

SUMMARY

The meeting was called to order and quorum declared by Chair Rod Monroe at 7:38am.

CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were no citizen communication items.

MEETING REPORT

Action Taken: Rex Burkholder moved and seconded by Roy Rogers to approve the November 1, 2001 JPACT meeting notes. The motion passed unanimously.

I-5 TRANSPORTATION AND TRADE PARTNERSHIP

Andy Cotugno stated that Kate Deane has been managing the I-5 Task Force process. They are currently undergoing a public review period and are asking for feedback. He indicated that the Task Force has not formally adopted this draft as their position but would be reconvening January 29, 2002 to adopt a recommendation.

Kate Deane stated that the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership is a bi-state planning project, sponsored by ODOT, WSDOT and FHWA. A 28-member bi-state task force leads it and the purpose of the project is to develop a strategic plan for I-5 corridor between Portland and Vancouver. Their project overview and purpose is to look at a multi-faceted plan, not only looking at the freeway, but also at transit service in the corridor, managing demand, freight and passenger rail.

Kate stated that the status of the project is as follows:

- In January 2000, a 28-member bi-state task force began its work.
- Members of the committee include elected, business, neighborhood and community representatives.
- The Task Force spent January – June working with the public and one another to determine what improvements should be studied.
- Those draft results are now available.

She said that the option packages evaluated included:

- Baseline (2020)

- Express Bus/3 Lanes
- LRT/3 Lanes
- Express Bus/4 Lanes
- LRT/4 Lanes
- West Arterial
- Commuter Rail

Kate said that the next steps would be: January 2002 – Public review of draft recommendations, Bi-State Committee review and comment on draft recommendations, Task Force adopts draft recommendations; February 2002 – Plan refinements including additional technical review and developing finance plan; June 2002 – Public review of draft recommendations, Task Force adopts final recommendations and strategic plan; Post 2002 – Review by JPACT and RTC, Adoption into Regional Transportation Plans, EIS if major improvements are recommended.

Fred Hansen stated that Kate Deane has done a terrific job on the process. He also stated that the base line is not current conditions and includes levels of improvements not yet financed. He also had two comments: 1) the improvements on the I-5 Corridor did not make things much better because the I-5 corridor is the preferred area of movement; and 2) they determined that the traffic was not all “through” traffic. About 60% of the traffic in the corridor (SR 500/Columbia Corridor) serves a sub-regional transportation shed and stays in that corridor.

Roy Rogers asked the Committee how competitive the process would become in the next six months for 5309 New Starts money.

Rod Monroe replied that the JPACT committee needs to consider the fact that it has been very successful in receiving federal money and it owes that in part to both the Oregon and Washington delegations. He stated that the Washington delegation is in an instrumental position to assist JPACT with funding projects in a mutual way. If only Oregon projects get funded, this might cause more difficulty receiving federal funds. He stated that everyone must work together to amass political clout and continue to have the Oregon and Washington delegation be supportive of JPACT transportation priorities.

Andy Cotugno stated that the projects all should line up well with regards to re-authorization. He stated that Clark County is seeking the development money for their light rail out of next authorization period to pursue EIS engineering. If the timing continues to work out with the Oregon and Washington elections, then he does not see a problem for funding all projects involved.

Rod Monroe emphasized that the appropriation for the commuter rail project for Washington County might get reduced. He said that JPACT and Metro would provide support for Washington County if it were determined that they would like the assistance

Karl Rohde asked Kate Deane why the west arterial road does not appear on the map, but in the draft paper, appears as a significant heading.

Kate Deane replied that the west arterial did get looked at very strongly and was taken off the table. While it solves problems for Oregon neighborhoods, it creates problems for Washington neighborhoods. Because there is no resources at this time to determine how someone gets from point A to point B, it would result in increased transportation along the downtown roads of Fourth Plain and Mill Plain Roads, through neighborhoods, which would cause widening of those roads and potential displacements.

Dave Lohman stated that overall; this has been an interesting process. He also stated the he appreciates the group's willingness to solve problems for transportation. He understands how complex this analytical process has been and now with the public comment period, the group can start to address the problems and look at solutions. However, realistically, solutions are 20 years out for some projects. Others might begin sooner if local and federal funding is there.

Rod Park noticed that the land used portion was listed as item number 6 on the draft recommendations. He asked if this was listed by importance.

Charlie Hales stated that he didn't feel the Land Use Committee had successfully grappled with the difficulty in getting land use policy to avoid eroding transportation investments. He stated that it was not a new problem and that they did not solve it either.

Fred Hansen stated that the debate was if the things that came out of the Land Use Committee should be strengthened, and/or if it should it play a bigger role.

Charlie Hales stated that he felt that the JPACT committee could help solve the problem if they were to condition investments based on performance of land use decisions by the local jurisdictions.

OREGON TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT ACT – HB 2142

Chair Monroe stated that he presented the JPACT position to the OTC and was told that there would not be enough funding to pay for Boeckman Road and Sunnyside both. The OTC voted unanimously to request that JPACT prioritize the two projects and tell them which one they would prefer to be funded. He said that he explained to the OTC board that he felt that JPACT should not be forced to make that decision, that both projects are equal. However, it was implied to him that the OTC may decide to spend the funding dollars else where within the state and fund neither project if JPACT could not make the decision. So, it was with some urgency that he brings this action to JPACT.

Dave Williams stated that he would go through the full list of things that the OTC did:

- 1) Adopted a district highway rule that would consistently implement preservation on district highways.
- 2) Reconciled the \$20 million discretionary funds by splitting equally, \$10 million to bridge and \$10 million to preservation. They used the same formula as they did on the original split, 73/27. They placed \$2.8 million on local bridges, inflating all of the original figures; all of the bridges on the cut list remain and are going to be funded.

On the State side, they are fully funding Shady Bridge on I-5, funded an I-5 bridge in Josephine County which currently impacts the trucking industry. From the \$10 million preservation funds they added \$2.7 million to fully fund the Farmington Road Project. The remaining \$7 million funded four projects in Region 4 and one truncated project in Region 5.

- 3) Three legislators gave testimony. Dick Backland and Lane Shetterly spoke in support of the way the process ran and how the ACT's performed around the state. Donna Nelson said that more money should have been given the Newburg bypass.
- 4) Twenty different groups testified on behalf of different projects.

Rod Monroe stated that he tried to express to the OTC the position of the JPACT committee to the best of his ability.

Fred Hansen asked whether the OTC discussed why Region 1 was under funded.

Dave Williams stated that it's difficult to determine what constitutes a fair share because the bridge and preservation money follows the roads and pays for fixing the worst conditions.

Kay Van Sickle stated that ODOT did make their recommendation on use of the HB 2142 money and the \$10.4 million Sunnyside project was recommended. She said that it was recommended based on several factors. The project readiness; the environmental work was completed; it had a 51% local match; the immediate need on Sunnyside; and, the County is committed to phase one already. She stated that once phase one was completed, phase two would extend to 142nd. The Boeckman Road project's readiness was a factor; they also have a local match; but need the environmental work to be done. They are also waiting on the ongoing Community Solutions team process and that discussion to get finalized. Therefore, ODOT recommended Sunnyside.

Charlotte Lehan explained to the committee that the OTC Board stated to her that they had not made a decision and that both projects were still in play. The reasons for eliminating the Boeckman project are the same reasons JPACT has already addressed and resolved; the readiness, in terms of the environmental work. They are not required to do a full EIS and there are minimal environmental impacts. They have full support from the local environmental groups and 1000 Friends of Oregon. They have always said that they are committed to finishing the project in the timeline outlined, which is why JPACT had discussions concerning readiness before, with regards to the project. The interchange is a separate project; Boeckman is and always has been a stand-alone project. The Boeckman project is needed regardless whether there's an interchange or not. She stated that they are in an awkward spot with Clackamas County because Boeckman Road is part of Clackamas County and so is Sunnyside. It is hard for her to advocate for her project over Sunnyside. She stated that if she was to try and look at the two projects objectively, she feels Boeckman does all of the right things in term of transportation. They are very aggressive on transit and Boeckman Road is a key connection to commuter rail. Part of the reason that they're as aggressive as they are in their community regarding transit, is because trucking is their business in Wilsonville. Preserving truck capacity on I-5 is critical to the Wilsonville Chamber and the business community. Wilsonville fully funds a fareless transit service and full busses on I-5. They are also aggressive on land use with the Damasch development meeting 2040. There isn't a better project in terms of meeting

regional goals. On the other hand, Sunnyside is a huge congestion problem. She stated that the question is how does the region decide. Is a project chosen that meets all goals or is a project chosen that will continue to put their "finger in the dike". She stated that Clackamas County is the 3rd largest county in the state slated to accept the largest share of population growth under 2040 both in both sections of the county. Out of the whole \$400 million of these funds, less than \$15 million is coming to Clackamas County. Both projects have 50% match. Many of other projects have either no match or very little match. There is an equity issue for Clackamas County. She stated that JPACT needs to find a solution that will work for both projects. One suggestion would be to fund Boeckman Road since it is not a phaseable project and give the balance to the Sunnyside project or find more money to be able to fund both projects so that both can move forward. This will need the cooperation of JPACT, Region 1 and the OTC.

Bill Kennemer stated that he also attended the OTC hearing and was disappointed to hear that more money would not be added. He said that OTC's decision to send these two projects back to JPACT puts him in an awkward position because it essentially pits two Clackamas County projects against each other. There are strong merits for both projects and strong feelings run on all sides. He stated that the charge the commissioners gave him, as the message bearer is that they would not choose between the two. They will not advocate against either project and he will abstain from the vote. But he also doesn't know how to resolve this. He stated that fundamentally there are a couple of issues that concern him. His calculations show that if you add bridge, preservation and modernization, all three categories, Clackamas County ends up with the OTC recommendation, which would be the Sunnyside project, which is the more expensive of the two projects, receiving \$14.346 million or in another perspective, it represents 3.5% of \$400 million. It is also the view of the Clackamas County Board of Commissioners (BOC) that this represents a most unfortunate allocation of statewide resources. The second issue that Mayor Lehan addressed was that both projects in Clackamas County have 50% or better match. Mayor Lehan is proposing a 50% match for Boeckman Road and the BOC is proposing a 53% match for the full length of Sunnyside. He suggested that matches might be a way to help make up difference and establish more regional equity.

Rob Drake he stated that he was hoping to get some kind of direction from Bill and Clackamas County Commissioners because if this were happening in Washington County, he would look to his own people to assist with the decision. He stated that the Boeckman Road project includes an enhancement to the Damasch project and that Damasch is a poster child of what everyone is trying to do with 2040. Wilsonville is an industrial center but it is a city and he sees the Boeckman Road project helping Wilsonville become more of a city rather than a transportation hub. He would ask which project was going to enhance more community and which is not. He stated that the Boeckman project is offering more of where they are heading and that is why it is a better project of the two.

Larry Haverkamp stated that he has a slight problem with the timing. He understands that Wilsonville is a model of what everyone wants the 2040 plan to look like. He understands wanting to move ahead with the project quickly. But he sees the Urban Growth Boundary extending towards the area where the Sunnyside project is and if that project is held up any longer, than there will be more massive problems to deal with. He sees this as more of a timing issue than choosing one project over the other. He emphasized that there has to be something

done with that Sunnyside area before it is brought into the UGB and it is likely to be brought in soon.

Charlotte Lehan stated that Damasch is in now and she is afraid that if they are forced to wait, they will lose their shot at the best developer for the project.

Charlie Hales said to look at the whole list of what is being done; it appears to be unbalanced. How much money is being spent to chase past patterns and how much is being spent to influence patterns for the future? Things are very disproportionate, most of the money is being spent to fix things and not for new projects.

Rod Monroe stated that Metro is going to have to expand UGB late next year, state law requires that exception land be used first before higher quality resource land is used. Most of the exception land is in NE Clackamas County and Sunnyside Road is already over capacity.

Roy Rogers stated that there is \$10 million dollars left for one of these projects. Boeckman Road is \$7.8 million. Would the remaining \$2.2 million have to be returned to the OTC or would it remain in this region?

Rod Monroe stated that the \$10 million if given to Sunnyside Road would pay for the expansion from 122nd to 142nd, approximately one mile of expansion. The Boeckman project is \$7.8 million.

Roy Rogers stated that his preference is Boeckman Road but he doesn't want to leave \$2.2 million on the table for OTC.

Kay Van Sickle stated that yes, if Boeckman Road is chosen then the \$2.2 million remaining would be left for the OTC to use elsewhere in the region. JPACT could recommend a different project to use the difference, for example the full remainder to go to Sunnyside.

Rob Drake stated that there are two projects of varying successes or Sunnyside has segments. He would suggest that the Metro staff go back to see if they can possibly shift any dollars to get some phase of the Sunnyside project done.

Rod Monroe stated that although this needs to be brought to a resolution he would suggest sending it back to Clackamas County for a resolution. He asked Kay Van Sickle how soon the OTC needed JPACT's recommendation.

Kay Van Sickle stated that the OTC would make their final decision at their January 16, 2002 meeting. Therefore the recommendation needs to be there before then.

Rob Drake stated that there needs to be some kind of negotiation because the OTC has other places this money could go.

Rod Monroe stated that in order to meet the timing deadline on January 16, 2002 for the OTC, the JPACT meeting would need to be moved to January 10, 2002.

Fred Hansen said that if Clackamas County could give a recommendation or a set of options, as to their decision, then he is willing to wait for the 10th of January, otherwise the decision needs to be made at this meeting

Rod Monroe stated that the next MTIP process is scheduled for 2002 with the final decision by 2003. There is no other pile of money unless there can be more of a match forced out of somewhere.

Kay Van Sickle stated with all of the reasoning placed on the table, Sunnyside could be chosen because they are ready to go to construction on phase one and are committed to phase 2. She would prefer a decision soon.

Kay Van Sickle moved and Larry Haverkamp seconded to recommend the Sunnyside Road project to the OTC for funding.

Rob Drake stated that he feels that there hasn't been enough discussion and he would currently vote no. He stated that he has not heard whether or not Andy could shift any money and would prefer to wait and come back January 10, 2002

Andy Cotugno stated that although they have just finished the MTIP allocation they could certainly look at whether or not a project could be bumped and is picked up at the next MTIP process. He would recommend holding off on the motion and meet again January 10, 2002 to discuss a recommendation to the OTC.

Rod Park stated that he would also vote no on the motion because he would still like to see what JPACT could still push the state on. He would like to hear the recommendations out of Clackamas County. He doesn't feel that JPACT should make the recommendation just because Clackamas County won't do it.

Karl Rohde suggested withholding the motion until January 10, 2002 to give the Clackamas County Commission a chance to discuss.

Action taken: Rob Drake moved and Karl Rohde seconded to table Motion #2. The motion passed. The vote was as follows:

Yes:

- Rob Drake
- Karl Rohde
- Rod Monroe
- Annette Liebe
- Don Wagner
- Larry Haverkamp
- Dean Lookingbill
- Roy Rogers
- Charlie Hales
- Maria Rojo de Steffey

Rex Burkholder
Rod Park
Fred Hansen
Kay Van Sichel
Dave Lohman

No: None
Abstain: Bill Kennemer

Action taken: Rob Drake moved and Karl Rohde seconded to move the JPACT meeting from January 17, 2002 to January 10, 2002; instruct Metro staff to work with Clackamas County to discuss financial options; assist with their internal issues; and come back with a recommendation so that a coordinated message can be sent to the OTC for their meeting on January 16, 2002. The motion passed unanimously.

Rex Burkholder emphasized to Kay Van Sichel regarding the Jackson School Road project, which received HB 2142 funding to remember the RTP rural connector rules. There will need to be discussion about protecting capacity and working together.

Rod Monroe stated that it is also important to protect the surrounding farmland.

CLACKAMAS COUNTY TRANSPORTATION FUNDING INITIATIVE

The presentation will be rescheduled for a future JPACT meeting.

FEDERAL PRIORTIES PAPER

Andy Cotugno stated that he has handed out last years Federal Priorities Paper and stated that this is something that will be beginning again. He said that the next six months would become much more policy oriented.

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, January 10, 2002.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Renée Castilla