

Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)

November 1, 2001

Meeting Notes

MEMBERS PRESENT

Rod Monroe, Chair
Rod Park
Bill Kennemer
Fred Hansen
Rex Burkholder
Craig Pridemore
Karl Rohde
Kay Van Sickel
Larry Haverkamp
Royce Pollard
Maria Rojo de Steffey
Robert Drake
Bill Wyatt
Roy Rogers
Stephanie Hallock
Vera Katz, alternate
Neil McFarlane, alternate

AFFILIATION

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

GUESTS PRESENT

Lynn Peterson
Robin Roberts
Ron Papsdorf
Nancy Kraushaar
Ross Williams
Deb Wallace
Clark Berry
Danielle Cowan
Shelly Romero
Brian Newman
Linda Floyd
Charlotte Lehan
Mike McKillip
Betty Atteberry
Dean Lookingbill
Kathy Lehtola
Lou Ogden
John Rist
Karen Schilling
Gail Achterman
Dave Williams
Bill Stewart

AFFILIATION

Tri-Met
Governor's Office
City of Gresham
City of Oregon City
CST/CLF
Washington State Department of Transportation
Washington County
City of Wilsonville
Multnomah County
City of Milwaukie
City of Wilsonville/SMART
City of Wilsonville
City of Tualatin
Westside Economic Alliance
RTC
Washington County
City of Tualatin
Clackamas County
Multnomah County
Oregon Transportation Commission
Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT – Region 1)
The Oregonian

Dave Lohman	Port of Portland
Susie Lahsene	Port of Portland
Dick Steinbrugge	City of Portland
John Morgan	City of Wilsonville
Connie Kratovil	Parsons Brinckerhoff
Bernie Bottomly	Tri-Met
Josh Alpert	Charlie Hale's Office
John Gillam	City of Portland
Robin Katz	Port of Portland
Thayer Rorabaugh	City of Vancouver
Dennis Lively	City of Milwaukie
Gary Katsion	Kittelson & Associates, Inc.
Ed Abrahamson	Multnomah County

STAFF

Andy Cotugno	Mike Hoglund
Richard Brandman	Ross Roberts
Bridget Wieghart	Renee Castilla
Francine Floyd	

SUMMARY

The meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Chairman Rod Monroe at 7:35am.

CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were no citizen communications.

MEETING REPORT

Action taken: Bill Wyatt motioned and seconded by Karl Rohde to approve the October 4, 2001 JPACT meeting notes. The motion unanimously passed.

SOUTH CORRIDOR UPDATE

Richard Brandman explained that the South Corridor (SC) Policy Group had gone through an alternatives analysis and looked at a variety of measures including busways, high occupancy vehicle lanes, commuter rail, river transit and bus rapid transit. Everything option was looked at but light-rail because as they were going through this process they had made a determination, based on the 1998 vote and subsequent public listening posts, that light rail was not going to be a project they would proceed with in this corridor. They completed the alternatives analysis process and are now initiating a supplemental draft environmental impact statement. The draft is a federal document and they hope to have it completed next fall. They are trying to develop a project in time for the next federal re-authorization, which is in October of 2003. He stated that the Policy Group is in development of a finance plan. He thanked the JPACT committee for the \$4 million dollars that they received through the

MTIP process and explained that the money will assist them in completing the environmental impact statement.

He further stated that the Policy Group added Milwaukie and I-205 light rail options to the study due to the public's request, particularly in S.E. Portland and the City of Milwaukie. The public requested that the Policy Group make these projects cheaper. They asked if Metro could change the alignment, routes, and stations. Also, if there were things that Metro could do that would enable light rail to be significantly less expensive and be able to move forward without a vote? This is what the South Corridor Policy Group is looking at currently.

Mr. Brandman stated that the Policy Group is currently studying several different options and all of those options are equally viable because there is no money that has been defined to build them and all have different costs associated with each of them.

- Portland-Milwaukie segment: Bus Rapid Transit, Busway and Light rail.
- Milwaukie segment: Baseline and Bus Rapid Transit, there has already been a determination that no other high capital cost project makes sense, the result of the technical process as well as the public process.
- Gateway-I-205 segment: Baseline and Light Rail.
- Milwaukie/Clackamas Regional Center: Baseline, Bus Rapid Transit and Busway.

He explained that bus rapid transit is a low capital project that can be implemented to improve the flow of buses through the corridor at a far less cost than most capital projects. The light rail alternatives in this corridor can cost between \$350 to \$400 million dollars. The bus rapid transit projects in this corridor cost between \$65 and \$70 million dollars. Improvements include: time signal system through newer technology, bypass lanes for buses, extended right turn lanes for buses and more park and ride lots. The busway option is designed to try and give some of the benefits that can be obtained from a light rail line at less costs than light rail.

The South Corridor Policy Group has initiated a more grass roots public involvement process for this project than they have had in the past. Prior efforts had large citizen advisory committees. In this effort, local advisory committees in S.E. Portland, Milwaukie and Clackamas Regional Center are looking at very specific issues in each segment of the corridor. This was set up in response to the citizen's request. In the end, all of the information from the public process will go to the Policy Group. From that Policy Committee, the recommendation will be set forth and will go to City Councils in both Portland and Milwaukie, to the County Commission for Clackamas, the Tri-Met Board, and the ODOT Commission. Then, they will make their own recommendation, which will come to the Metro Council where the locally preferred alternative will be adopted. By the time all studies are completed and finalized, this project should be ready for funding by re-authorization in 2003.

Councilor Park stated that the local committees would like not having a bus stop at every corner. How is the Policy Group trying to balance the number of stops against the thoroughfare?

Richard Brandman replied that the number of stops is always an issue and they are looking at dense urban areas, the stops at ½ mile intervals.

Fred Hansen stated that for light-rail, people will walk farther. For buses, they prefer stops at ¼ mile intervals.

Karl Rohde asked Mr. Brandman what is being discussed to achieve the local match?

Richard Brandman replied that the Policy Group is looking at a variety of funds, and will be looking at different alternatives.

Mayor Katz suggested to Mr. Brandman that the Policy Group include the Gateway and Lents Urban Renewal Citizen Advisory Committee. Richard Brandman replied that they have contacted them and they are involved.

OREGON TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT ACT (HB 2142) RECOMMENDATIONS – ACTION REQUESTED

Dave Williams went through the points on the memo from Kan Van Sickel to Rod Monroe, Chair of JPACT, subject line OTIA Priority Funding.

- 1) ODOT has evaluated all submitted project applications, ranked them according to adopted criteria and evaluation factors and provided them to JPACT.
- 2) Region 1 extends beyond Metro's boundaries to include a portion of NWACT and some rural areas including Hood River County.
- 3) OTC is sub-allocating the \$200 million portion of the package: \$120 million for bridges, \$60 million for preservation and \$20 million non-allocated to be divided at a later date among the programs.
- 4) The OTC and ODOT must meet the legislature's intent when choosing projects and allocating money. ODOT supports the inclusion of two JPACT "priority" projects including US 26/Hwy 217 to Camelot and the East Columbia Blvd. – Lombard St. Connector. In addition, ODOT supports the inclusion of the Jackson School Road Interchange.
- 5) A "B" list of projects developed through ODOT ranking include:
 - US 26: Murray Blvd – Cornell Rd.
 - I-5/Nyberg Interchange widening
 - Powell Blvd: 174th to Burnside
 - US 26/NW Cornelius Pass Rd Interchange
 - Murray Blvd. Extension: Scholls Ferry Rd – Barrows Rd.
 - S. Leg of SW 208th/Hwy 8 Intersection
 - Sunnyside Rd: 122nd to 172nd
 - Boeckman Rd – Tooze Rd Connection

Vince Chiotti, Chair of the Metro/Hood River Regional Community Solutions Team and Robyn Roberts of the Governor's Office addressed their memo to JPACT regarding HB 2142 Modernization Projects. They stated that the Metro/Hood River Regional CST is generally satisfied with ODOT's application of

the criteria and evaluation factors. They stated that they feel the I-5/Victory Blvd./Lombard Project should await completion of development of the I-5 Trade Corridor Plan before it is allocated any funds. They also stated that they feel certain projects may be under evaluated in ODOT's ranking. They include:

- US 26 – Cornelius Pass Interchange
- Sunnyside Extension and Foster/162nd Intersection
- Boeckman Road Extension
- SW Bancroff/Macadam

Councilor Park asked what are some of the projects Region 1 is looking at that are outside Metro's boundaries. Robyn Roberts stated that those projects include:

- Improvement at 213 and 211 in rural Clackamas County
- Signal project in Sandy
- 2 Safety/Signal Light Projects in Hood River County
- Pedestrian Park in Columbia County
- Interchange improvement at Glencoe Road
- Bridge in Hood River County
- Safety Issue at Jackson School Road Crossing on US 26.

Councilor Monroe noted that Jackson School Road Crossing is outside of this jurisdiction.

Andy Cotugno stated that the memo regarding "Oregon Transportation Investment Act Recommendations" has been revised because the Broadway Bridge amount was listed as \$.29 million when it should read \$2.9 million.

He also explained the statewide funding programs, which established:

- \$200 million for Lane Capacity and Interchange projects, of which \$70 million is targeted for ODOT Region 1.
- \$120 million for Bridge projects of which 73% (\$87.6 million) is targeted for ODOT bridges and 27% (\$32.4 million) is intended for local government bridges statewide based upon the state bridge ranking system.
- \$60 million for Pavement Preservation projects, of which \$21 million is targeted for ODOT Region 1.
- \$20 million uncommitted, at the discretion of the Oregon Transportation Commission.

Andy Cotugno then explained that the projects included in this memo were the projects TPAC recommended for funding. He also stated that Region 1 is not receiving its equitable share of funding due to high priority for upgrading deficient bridges outside Region 1, principally on the interstate system. He stated that currently, Region 1 stands to gain about 26% of the funding. Depending on what indicator is used, Region 1 should be between 30-45%. Therefore, he explained that TPAC would like to see some of the projects receive additional funding from the discretionary fund of \$20 million. TPAC also included those projects that are the next on the list but did not get funded, for example, Boeckman Road (Wilsonville) and Sunnyside Road to 152nd Ave. (Clackamas County). He emphasized that by

allocating funds from the discretionary fund it would result in Region 1 receiving more funds, but still well below its equitable share. He also explained that the projects in this memo are in the ranking by technical order not by prioritization of importance so obviously the ranking could change.

Karl Rhode asked what is the normal percentage if they reflect regional equity?

Andy Cotugno replied that the equity share that is being used for the modernization and preservation category is 35% and this is derived by the average of five indicators. These include population, the number of registered vehicles, gas tax, truck tax, and one other. Thirty five percent is the average amongst all of those indicators. The bridge portion is very heavily weighted in one direction, there is no target, and that is why Region 1 received \$0 out of the state bridge category. The emphasis is on I-5 and I-84 where load limits are having significant impact on bridges. A large majority of trucks come out of this region and get impacted by those load limits.

Karl Rhode stated that he has been working with this organization for 4 years and it seems that there is always a prior commitment need for Highway 26. Is this the last project for Highway 26?

Andy Cotugno stated that this is not the last project for Highway 26. The EIS for westside light-rail/highway project defines what was committed to and this project is one of the phases of that project. The last project that remains unfunded is the section of Highway 217 from Sunset down to Beaverton, which is still outstanding. There are remaining Sunset highway projects that are in the mix but they are not part of that past commitment. The reference to US 26 to Cornell funded PE out of MTIP and was funded based on merits not based upon past commitment.

Rod Monroe asked why does the documents state that there is a zero interchange bridge problem in our area, but there was a news article recently that stated they are reverting heavier trucks around Mt. Hood to avoid the Troutdale Bridge westbound.

Kay Van Sickle replied that there are two bridges in Region 1, which pose a problem right now. There is one in Troutdale (Highway 84 westbound) and one in Hood River. ODOT is currently in the process of preparing an estimate for those repairs.

Roy Rogers addressed the committee and asked them to look at Andy's memo, item C, the first priority list. He stated that it appears that Washington County is well represented, but he feels that it is somewhat of a misnomer. If the JPACT members were to talk to Washington County's Cities and constituents they would hear that those are regional projects and not necessarily the highest priority for Washington County voters.

He also stated that in regards to the US 26/217 Highway project, it has been a long standing project in this region and serves Multnomah County as well as the City of Portland, probably as much as it does Washington County. He emphasized to the committee that there couldn't be an argument that regional facilities are only the responsibility of one county. He said that if Washington County were to prioritize their projects they would go and pick a number of projects that are not being funded and that affect this region significantly. In terms of dollars for importance, i.e. meaning Intel and others, he stated that JPACT cannot stop accommodating their growth needs or frankly those companies will choose not to remain in this area. He also wanted to draw some sensitivity to Clackamas County, the 2nd bullet wher

it is stated that they are severely under-represented. He said that Washington County will agree that Clackamas County has been under-represented for a long time and would encourage the expenditure of funds there, but it is somewhat politically difficult, when Washington County has a number of projects prioritized for funding that were not necessarily the picks they wanted.

Larry Haverkamp asked if JPACT is going to want a joint resolution on the entire package or an endorsement on a piece meal basis?

Chair Monroe replied that the package before JPACT could either be adopted or amended and then adopted but there must be some action taken.

Larry Haverkamp stated that some of these projects have been very highly ranked within the previous month or so, for example the modernization projects. He would like some justification from JPACT that these jobs that were highly ranked receive high consideration during the next round of any type funding.

Chair Monroe replied that JPACT is dealing with one time state money and the first state money that JPACT has had in a decade and he doesn't know if there will be more money but he is thankful to the 2001 Legislature. He also emphasized that JPACT must be very cautious in selecting projects that will meet legislative criteria. The projects must be ready to start, be able to be built in a short time, come in on budget and make a difference that is visible to the public. There are a number of projects that cannot be funded due to the limitations on this money.

Andy Cotugno stated that every person on the JPACT committee could make a motion on what the next priorities are to be. Since there is already a motion in place that says that Delta Park is a high priority project for JPACT and there are outstanding issues on Sunrise Corridor and Powell Blvd. He would suggest there be a future agenda to define how priorities are chosen and suggest that there be categories begun for the next priorities. There are categories that should be the focus of ODOT and there are projects that should be the focus of the freeway systems. JPACT has a set priority for light rail corridors and there is the question of the arterial system. He further stated that there are different kinds of things that JPACT ought to be re-examining. Particularly how JPACT does the funding allocation process and he proposes starting as soon as this current allocation process is concluded.

Larry Haverkamp stated that this discretion money ought to look at those priorities that will help regional centers, in places where the urban growth boundary is also going to go out. According to the 2040 plan, transportation must be included along with the actual planning of that area. Therefore, those projects should receive a great deal of credit in this discretionary funding.

Rods Monroe stated that there is one other viable funding option for transportation funding. There are ongoing talks with leaders of the business community and others of the possibility of a regional transportation fund. If this is successful then some projects could be funded there.

Fred Hansen asked if the projects listed in the memo in section C3 are in priority order.

Andy Cotugno replied that no they are not in priority order. There is no declared order. They are in the technical ranking order that ODOT presented and TPAC did not re-prioritize them.

Fred Hansen asked if JPACT would rather put those projects in priority order in case OTC does allot some of that discretionary funding to modernization or will that come with the discussion?

Andy Cotugno replied that the recommendations that JPACT has made regarding the discretionary funding to OTC amounts to \$14 million out of the \$20 million available.

Karl Rohde asked what is the process by which JPACT will answer OTC if they request priority of those discretionary funds.

Fred Hansen replied that there would need to be a commitment discussion among the JPACT members.

Lou Ogden stated to the committee that he agrees the projects included on the list. He stated that in conversations he has had with ODOT is that there seems to be a strong predisposition at least from ODOT that they go \$60 million preservation, \$120 bridge and leave the other \$20 million to determine later. However, our understanding that the legislative intent was that no more than 50% of the money be spent in modernization, which is the \$200 million number which sorts the other \$200 million in preservation and bridge. Andy Cotugno asked ODOT to respond.

Kay Van Sickle replied that they are looking at preservation and bridge as a way to gain statewide equity. There is a tremendous need to have in this state for bridge requirements. In that discussion that is where the shift has gone as far as the \$120 million and \$60 million. The discussion on the remaining \$20 million is where can that money be shifted in that area (bridge and preservation.)

Gail Achterman stated that it is OTC's understanding that the legislative intent was that it wanted 50 percent of the money to go to modernization and 50 percent to bridge and preservation. OTC did the fund allocations consistent with what they understood to be the legislative intent and what is consistent with the Oregon Highway Plan, which puts a higher priority on preservation and a lower priority on modernization. If OTC followed the OHP to the letter, than all \$400 million would be placed into preservation projects. But the legislature wanted 50 percent of that money to go to modernization as well. Therefore, she believes it will be difficult to allocate any of \$20 million discretionary money to modernization projects but she agrees with Dave Williams that the presentation made to OTC is very helpful to them in determining the overall balance of funding allocations.

Bill Kennemer addressed concerns he has regarding the importance of JPACT's strong support to lobby other efforts regarding discretionary funds. He is pleased about the discussion regarding regional equity, which is a requirement of the bill, and also about the basic fairness issues. He did however state that there needs to be talk about equity within the region. He appreciates Roy Rogers' comments regarding Washington County and that it is not quite what he would have allocated. He commented that when looking at the base amounts, 44.4 percent goes to Washington County and its cities, the City of Portland gets 11.8 percent, Multnomah County gets 28.4 percent and Clackamas County gets 15.1 percent, which he stated is hardly equitable. He also emphasized that Clackamas County's infrastructure is in need of improvement. He also stated that when there is talk about future growth it is projected to go to Clackamas County. He emphasized to the committee that there needs to be regional and statewide support. The discretionary funds do help move Clackamas County up to 21 percent but it doesn't fund Sunnyside Road out to the urban growth area. Mr. Kennemer informed the JPACT members that Clackamas County has \$23 million available that can be used, therefore, Clackamas County has

overmatched the \$21 million requested on Sunnyside Road. He also wanted to point out to the committee that they are the only jurisdiction that received less than 100 percent on any given project. For example, the \$21 million request for Sunnyside road, only \$4.5 million was allocated. He would like to see a very strong and united effort for discretionary funds, which will move JPACT in the right direction.

Karl Rohde addressed his concerns with the OTC comments with regards to how the discretionary funds will be reviewed. He stated that his earlier question, how JPACT will respond to a request to prioritize amongst the two projects on the list that are listed as secondary priorities was never answered. He stated that JPACT should be responsible for making that decision and the recommendation to OTC. He stated that Roy Rogers's comments regarding Washington County should become a matter of record that those issues are of regional concern as opposed to just local concerns. This is a program designed to address capacity issues and modernization issues as insufficient infrastructure and Jackson School Rd is not a project that will significantly address a capacity issue in the region.

Mayor Drake stated that the JPACT members need to be cautious in "questioning" the Jackson School Road project. He stated that he has not always agreed with Representative Starr on every issue but Representative Starr did something that no one would have expected. Representative Bruce was responsible for HB 2142 and if Jackson School Road Project is a project that is important to Representative Starr, then so be it. Mayor Drake stated that the discussion regarding Jackson School Road should be off the table. Secondly, he stated that there are projects that he is broadly supporting even from his county. Beaverton is part of Highway 26, and there are a lot of people going in and out on Highway 26 everyday that are not his constituents and yet Washington county in some ways is certainly a financial bread basket for the region and the state. Those roadways are critical. He would recommend that JPACT take the TPAC recommendation as a starting point and JPACT be mature enough to recognize the job the Transportation Commission has to do. He realizes how critical the bridge problem is in this state. He stated that Oregon is one state. Oregon is rural and urban and he doesn't think that JPACT should feed the urban and rural split that so often permeates what goes on in Salem.

Chair Monroe stated that with the TPAC recommendation, and if JPACT goes through them again, will some of those projects lean toward preservation rather than modernization? Perhaps JPACT should be looking at those projects again as a way to bridge the gap for OTC to be able to fund them under the preservation allocation.

Rex Burkholder stated that he wanted to express his appreciation to ODOT and the legislation for providing this opportunity to the Region. He further stated that JPACT needs to try and balance the Regional needs when looking at funding and how can JPACT can be strategic with that. He stated that JPACT needed to look at the issues of where things are going, where the infrastructure is needed and where economic development is done. This needs to be part of the MTIP discussions.

Bill Kennemer asked for clarification of the motion that is before the JPACT committee. What does the motion do? Chair Monroe replied that it is asking for \$14.297 million from the discretionary fund, \$8.460 million for modernization, \$4.973 million for bridge, and \$.864 million for pavement preservation. It does not distinguish between priorities nor does it distinguish between priorities for Boeckman Road or Sunnyside.

Chair Monroe stated that in the message to OTC, is critical to the overall balance between regions that this Region get beyond 26 percent and up to that 30-31 percent, which is still below this region's equitable factor of 35 percent. He hoped they would look seriously at allocating a portion the \$20 million discretionary fund to this region to bring about that balance. He hopes that the message goes to OTC that if this region ends up at the 26 percent level that JPACT will be very disappointed and will not be able to fund the projects it needs to do for this region.

ACTION TAKEN: Robert Drake motioned and seconded by Fred Hansen to approve the TPAC recommendations. The motion unanimously passed.

Maria Rojo de Steffey briefly announced the project they are doing regarding the Broadway bridge, and distributed information regarding the survey they are currently conducting to obtain the public's opinion regarding the closing of that bridge.

Andy Cotugno stated that there is a handout regarding the Economic Stimulus project at the federal level. He stated that the project could be tax-break oriented or it could be infrastructure-investment oriented. This handout is simply a compilation of Metro's assessment of what has been heard from various local governments on what projects could move quickly and go to construction quickly. He stated that JPACT would be kept posted regarding any further developments.

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 13, 2001.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:16am.

Respectfully submitted,

Renée Castilla