

# Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)

October 4, 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  
Andy Ginsburg  
Charlie Hales  
Robert Drake  
David Lohman  
Craig Pridemore

## AFFILIATION

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

## GUESTS PRESENT

Bruce Warner  
Gary Katsion  
Clark Berry  
Danielle Cowan  
John Gillam  
Josh Alpert  
John Wiebke  
Jon Holan  
Louis Ornelias  
Jeff Kaiser  
Fred Patron  
Ron Papsdorf  
Dick Steinbrugge  
Tim Wilson  
Robin Roberts  
Rob DeGraff  
David Calver

## AFFILIATION

Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)  
Kittelson & Associates, Inc.  
Washington County  
City of Wilsonville  
City of Portland  
Commissioner Hales Office  
City of Hillsboro  
City of Forest Grove  
Oregon Health and Sciences University (OHSU)  
Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)  
FHWA  
City of Gresham  
City of Portland  
Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)  
Governor's Office  
APP  
Parsons Brinckerhoff

GUESTS

John Rist  
David Cox

AFFILIATION

Clackamas County  
FHWA

STAFF

Andy Cotugno  
Richard Brandman  
Francine Floyd

Mike Hoglund  
Chris Deffebach  
Ross Roberts

SUMMARY

The meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Chair Rod Monroe at 7:37 a.m.

CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There was no citizen communications at this time.

NEW BUSINESS

Rod Monroe introduced Commissioner Maria Rojo de Steffey, Multnomah County's representative to JPACT.

Andy Cotugno reported recent talks in Congress included the possibility of an economic stimulus package. Transportation funding has been mentioned as part of that stimulus package. He added that if there is a stimulus package, we might want to consider what to include. He went back and reviewed our February set of priorities we adopted for requesting appropriations for this fiscal year. On the road side, what we included back in February was a series of Preliminary Engineering (PE) projects. If there is a stimulus package, they will want to do construction, not PE projects. Construction projects that are already funded and ready to go are projects we might want to accelerate and move along quicker than planned. In turn, the money that was allocated for those projects would be freed up for other projects. The timing is also opportune for the HB 2142 program, because that set of priorities has a major emphasis on readiness. The decision-making on Congress' stimulus package program and the HB2142 program could possibly be treated together. This is another factor we may have to consider.

III. MEETING REPORT

Action taken: Bill Kennemer motioned and seconded by Charlie Hales to approve the September 13, 2001 JPACT meeting notes. The motion unanimously passed.

#### IV. RESPONSE TO FHWA LETTER ON RTP MOBILITY STANDARD

Bruce Warner referred to his letter addressed to David Cox, dated July 9, 2001 in response to David Cox's letter, dated March 7, 2001 regarding "Oregon Highway Plan Alternative Mobility Standards" (ivory packet). Mr. Warner said he took Mr. Cox's letter as an opportunity to get together with Metro, JPACT, Medford area representatives and FHWA staff to address Mr. Cox's comments and draft a response. Bruce Warner explained that Mr. Cox was concerned about some of the changes that the Oregon Department of Transportation and the regions (in Portland and Medford) made in terms of mobility standards and what impacts they may have on the National Highway System, as well as, the capabilities and capacity of the Federal-aid Highway System. Bruce Warner provided some of the region's background and history, and decision-making for a balanced transportation system. Mr. Warner said he was willing to work with Dave Cox in order to address his concerns on Oregon's highway mobility standards.

Dave Cox said he appreciated the opportunity to be invited to JPACT to explain his letter and go into detail regarding the concerns on what he sees as the lowering of mobility standards. He talked about congestion in Portland. Both transit and highway systems need to operate at peak efficiency in order to utilize our investments. What you do on local streets is your business. However, the national highway system routes and interstate routes were built with federal funds, in cooperation with the cities and state and federal government. Big decisions on how those highways are operated should involve those same partners. Mr. Cox said he hopes by being here today, to help involve all of the partners in these decisions. He said he was interested primarily in freight (i.e., the movement of freight in the region and the through traveler). Again, the decisions made here, impact people well beyond the borders of this State. Federal Highways has national standards on congestion reduction, transporting freight, and a system of interstate and defense highways. Mobility concerns can also become defense concerns.

Dave Cox referred to "The Public's Satisfaction With Transportation – What We Learned From Our Surveys" (handout). The report included excerpts from a national survey that Federal Highway Administration conducted. Some of the responders to the survey were from Oregon and Portland. The report included the top community transportation concerns and solutions to congestion. In addition, Mr. Cox provided excerpts from the Texas Transportation Institute's Urban Mobility Study with several of Oregon's urban areas included in the study.

David Cox said, as mentioned in his letter, he was willing to work together and get the most out of our transportation system. He wants to be more than someone who brings up concerns; he wants to be part of the answer. He said he doesn't see this as a choice between land use or mobility, nor a choice between highways or transit, nor moving travelers or freight, nor a local traveler or a through traveler. He would like to work together to solve these concerns. Mr. Cox said what's good for freight is good for the commuter, and what's good for transit is good for highways. The answer in working together is to get the most out of our system. He added that the change in mobility standards would not let us get the most out of the freeway system.

Chair Rod Monroe thanked Dave Cox's comments and said several members wanted to respond to comments. Further discussion followed.

Mr. Monroe commented on Mr. Cox's early statement regarding that he was a strong supporter of transit and transit development, but that transit doesn't help with the movement of freight. Mr. Monroe said that if more people use the transit system, and have a transit system that functions efficiently and takes people off the roads, that it opens up capacity for freight mobility which is critical to the economic vitality of this region.

Dave Cox explained that transit carries about 6% of the trips in Portland, which isn't enough to attract the attention of the freight community. Their goal is to fit their loads between the morning and afternoon peaks. However, that "window" is shrinking.

Karl Rohde referred to the opinion survey. Where is the survey from? Who are the respondents? What was the sample size? Dave Cox explained that the report was the second national survey done by the Federal Highway Administration. The first survey was done in 1995. The plan was to do a survey every five years. The report was done professionally under a contract to Federal Highways. Mr. Cox said he could provide a website address of the entire survey. The survey is statistically valid. Mr. Cox said they tried to get an equal representation across the country and within each state with a sample size of about 4,000.

Charlie Hales said he appreciated the opportunity to have this discussion today. He said what would help in this discussion is less gross data and more case studies. The gross data don't tell us what we should do. Find a place that has adopted the policy and made the investment that you are proposing; then we can look at how that has worked out. We can learn from the rest of the country. Dave Cox said he would look for useful examples.

Rex Burkholder said he surprised to hear the area's population has increased by 20% over the past 10 years. He commented that the rate was an unsustainable rate of growth. The fact that we have major congestion problems doesn't mean the only answer is capacity increases. Metro recently did a survey that showed public responses to better manage what we have rather than build more. One way we measure success is, how's the economy? What are your neighborhoods like? If we compare ourselves to other cities in the country, we do have a strong economy and vital cities and town centers.

Lou Ogden said the issue on the level of service isn't one that says a higher level of congestion is acceptable, rather it's a simple matter by our own methodology of being able to invest dollars into facilities. What is the rest of the nation doing to enhance or increase capacity so that your counterparts and regions aren't sharing the same concerns with their local elected officials and their inability to adjust capacity because it's largely funded by federal dollars? If JPACT agreed we needed more capacity, how would Mr. Cox propose we do it financially?

Dave Cox said that he sent one of our state transportation commissioners and DOT officials to go to South Carolina and look at South Carolina (a state comparable to Oregon in terms of size and transportation investment) which is handling this question of where the money is coming from. Mr. Cox said he would be glad to ask one of those people sent to South Carolina to give a presentation to JPACT on how South Carolina is dealing with the money question. It would be a

relevant case study. He added that there is money available in the private sector. In addition, the economic stimulus package may also be an available funding source.

Andy Cotugno said regarding the level of service standards, it isn't that we've adopted a gross reduction and accepted our congestion. We tried to be more targeted on how much and where we were going to tolerate more congestion, based upon the circumstances in those corridors.

Karl Rohde asked, what is the result from Mr. Cox's discussion today? Mr. Hales said case studies on policies and investments would be helpful. If South Carolina has a similar resource and population situation to us, then their information would be useful to share here.

Bruce Warner commented that over the past 20 - 30 years, the region has done much on transportation and land use plans and goals. He suggested having more discussions to include innovative financing. His conclusion from the discussion was that we don't have enough money to do what we want to do in this region, from a transportation standpoint. Additional sources of revenue are needed. Mr. Warner emphasized the following: 1) invest our revenues on the most important projects in the region, 2) focus on ways to get more money for transportation, 3) reevaluate, on a regular basis, where we are heading strategically and make sure our investments get us there.

#### V. OREGON TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT ACT (OTIA)

Andy Cotugno introduced this item which included three parts: 1) Approval List of Preservation Projects, 2) Guidelines for Modernization Projects, 3) Community Solutions Team Review. There were three components of action coming up relating to HB 2142. The Commission divided the money and set criteria in three categories: 1) Preservation Projects, 2) Bridge Projects, and 3) Modernization Projects. The action today was on preservation projects. The "ODOT Region 1 – Bridge Projects" (green packet) listed the applications for the Bridge Projects, but there were no ratings as yet from the State Bridge Committee. Next month, we will deal with modernization project prioritization. October 5, 2001 was the deadline for applications for the modernization projects. Mr. Cotugno briefly outlined today's agenda presentation. First, Kay Van Sickel was to report on the applications for preservation projects, how they ranked and what the recommendation on the prioritization was. Next, Robin Roberts from the Community Solutions Team would give CST's report and evaluation on the same projects. Lastly, Bruce Warner would discuss the next round on the modernization programs. In addition, Andy Cotugno referred to the draft letter to Steven Corey and OTC, dated October 4, 2001 regarding "2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act (HB 2142); Metro Area Preservation Projects" (green handout). He added that this letter is intended to communicate to the Commission what JPACT's priorities are for the preservation programs. He asked the JPACT Committee to take action on this letter today.

Kay Van Sickel referred to "ODOT Region 1 – Oregon Transportation Investment Act Recommended Pavement Preservation Proposed Projects" (green packet). Ms. Van Sickel summarized the 10 applications received for preservation projects. Next, Ms. Van Sickel referred to the "OTIA Pavement Project Proposals – ODOT Region 1 Ranking"(table) with project ranking scores and estimated state contributions for the projects listed. Also included in

the packet was “2001 OTIA Pavement Preservation Projects – Eligibility and Prioritization” which included screening eligibility and project evaluation points. Kay Van Sickle explained that of the 10 applications, ODOT staff recommends carrying forward all but three of the projects (see table). Those three did not meet the criteria.

Rod Monroe asked the committee for further questions and comments.

Lou Ogden referred to the letter addressed to JPACT from Vergie Ries, Forest Grove City Manager, dated October 4, 2001 regarding “Approval List of OTIA Preservation Projects” (white handout). Vergie Ries asked for further discussion with ODOT on the Forest Grove project scoring. Kay Van Sickle said they would be glad to work with Forest Grove in addressing their questions and provide them with the information they need.

Karl Rohde asked, were the rejected projects ranked? Kay Van Sickle answered, no those projects were not ranked.

Robin Roberts, representing the Community Solutions Team (CST), introduced herself. The Community Solutions Team is comprised of the five state agencies that are deemed to have impact on community development in the areas of housing, land use, environmental issues, economic development and transportation. The Community Solutions Team was asked to comment on the preservation projects. Later, this team would comment on modernization projects; however, they wouldn't be commenting on bridge projects. Ms. Roberts said CST was looking at the project ranking criteria, particularly C, D and F (C: community support; D: freight mobility; F: leverage and public benefit) because that was where CST had the most input. Robin Roberts referred to the memo from Vince Chiotti, CST, to Kay Van Sickle, dated October 2, 2001 regarding “CST Comments on OTIA Preservation Project Proposals” (green handout). The memo included CST comments on the 7 proposed preservation projects.

Rex Burkholder asked if this was an interim process? For the applications already submitted, could applicants add to their proposed projects? Could additional components be added into the applications (i.e., add in sidewalks, access management) in order to have their projects rank higher? Forest Grove and others would like the opportunity to clarify their projects. Mr. Burkholder asked, do we have time to encourage people to go back over their application and add any extra information needed?

Andy Cotugno commented on the recommendation letter to Steven Corey and OTC which states JPACT's preliminary ranking and would like ODOT to consider this ranking. JPACT would like to come back later and revisit the balance between bridge and preservation, particularly after determination on the bridge side of the program. The overall program is split in half (\$200M for modernization and \$200M for bridge and preservation; however, the split within bridge and preservation has not yet been determined). The Commission said that they want to first see what the applications are. Tentatively, the Commission has said, preservation would be \$50 - \$100M and bridge would be \$100 - \$150M. If we don't have much for the bridge program, we might ask them for a higher amount on preservation categories or vice-versa. Mr. Cotugno suggested that JPACT send a letter and make a modification to the letter saying this is our preliminary

ranking. When we come back in December, if there is a change to the preliminary ranking, we would incorporate the change at that time. This will allow for refinement to develop over the next month.

Bruce Warner said the Commission is looking for the input on project funding. He encouraged everyone to look at the criteria that the Commission has adopted and then try to make your arguments and discussions around the criteria that the Commission has adopted and by which they will judge all of these projects. Make sure the criteria are interpreted properly, in relation to your projects. Rather than adding new criteria, Mr. Warner encouraged everyone to make these projects and your arguments related to the particular projects, around the existing criteria. The Commission ultimately makes the final decision, but they would take your recommendations into consideration.

Andy Cotugno suggested approving the letter, after adding some modifications and the statement that JPACT would continue to review the rankings.

Action taken: Rod Monroe asked for any objection to the staff's recommendation. There were no objections by the Committee. The motion to approve the letter with modifications (as mentioned earlier by Andy Cotugno) was unanimously passed.

Bruce Warner reported that October 5, 2001 was the deadline for submission of the modernization projects. The process for the modernization projects would follow a similar process as used for the preservation projects.

#### VI. SOUTH CORRIDOR UPDATE

This agenda item was postponed until the next JPACT meeting on November 1, 2001.

#### VII. BI-STATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE REPORT ON MOTIONS REGARDING THE EAST END CONNECTOR PROJECT

Rod Monroe reported on the memo to JPACT dated October 4, 2001, regarding "Bi-State Transportation Committee Motions Regarding the East End Connector Project and the Delta Park – Lombard Project" (purple handout). He announced that Craig Pridemore would be the next chair on the Bi-State Transportation Committee. Discussion followed on the JPACT requested actions as listed in the memo.

Action taken: Charlie Hales motioned, and seconded by Craig Pridemore to approve the three JPACT actions.

The motion before the JPACT Committee was to approve the three actions as follows:

- 1) The Bi-State Transportation Committee requests that JPACT consider this motion when taking action to give direction to ODOT on the bonding program (Oregon Transportation Investment Act). *Note: The motion, as stated in the Bi-State memo to JPACT, was to designate the East End Connector in the Columbia Corridor as a priority project.*

- 2) The Bi-State transportation Committee request that JPACT approve a motion that would direct ODOT to accelerate an analysis of HOV operation in the Delta Park – Lombard area so that the information could be used to consider the future Washington and Oregon portions of the HOV system together.
- 3) The Bi-State Transportation Committee requests that JPACT consider the Bi-State Committee's motion to continue consideration of the Delta Park – Lombard Project as a priority as JPACT considers future action on reauthorization of the federal surface transportation act, state legislative programs and action on the I-5 Strategic Plan.

Vote: The motion to approve the three JPACT actions (stated above) unanimously passed.

VIII. ADJOURN

The next JPACT meeting was scheduled for November 1, 2001.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:08 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Francine Floyd  
Recording Secretary

I:\trans\transadm\staff\floyd\JPACT\2001\11-01\JPACT 100401 MTG MIN.doc