

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

August 9, 2001

Corrections to the Meeting Notes

At the JPACT meeting held on September 13, 2001, two corrections were requested before final approval of the August 9, 2001 meeting notes. They were as follows:

1) Roy Rogers requested a correction on page 8, first paragraph —

“... they have a \$1 ½ billion budget.” Should read
“...they have a **\$1/2** billion budget.”

2) Fred Hansen requested a correction on page 4, the paragraph should read as follows —

“Fred Hansen said that \$16 million was originally requested for TCL but not granted. \$6.4 million would be needed to fund existing TCL programs and accomplish requested expansions. Tri-Met has additional projects that it would like to pursue, but will need additional funds to do so.”

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

August 9, 2001

Meeting Notes

MEMBERS PRESENT

Rod Monroe, Chair
Lou Ogden
Rod Park
Bill Kennemer
Fred Hansen
Karl Rohde
Kay Van Sickle
Royce Pollard
Larry Haverkamp
Mary Legry, alternate
Lonnie Roberts
Roy Rogers
Annette Liebe, alternate
Robert Drake
David Bragdon, alternate

AFFILIATION

Metro
City of Tualatin, representing Cities of Washington County
Metro
Clackamas County
Tri-Met
City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas County
Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) – Region 1
City of Vancouver
City of Gresham, representing Cities of Multnomah County
Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
Multnomah County
Washington County
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
City of Beaverton
Metro Council, Presiding Officer

GUESTS PRESENT

Dave Williams
Ross Williams
Ron Papsdorf
John Rist
Bernie Bottomly
Susie Lahsene
Lynn Peterson
Louis Ornelias
Brian Newman
Bill Brandon
Steve Dotterrer
Mike McKillip
Charlotte Lehan
Linda Floyd
Brion Barnett
Danielle Cowan
Mecky Blizzard
Stephan Lashbrook

AFFILIATION

Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
Citizens for Sensible Transportation/CLF
City of Gresham
Clackamas County
Tri-Met
Port of Portland
Tri-Met
Oregon Health and Sciences University (OHSU)
City of Milwaukie
City of Happy Valley
City of Portland
City of Tualatin
City of Wilsonville
City of Wilsonville/SMART
City of Milwaukie
City of Wilsonville
Citizen
City of Wilsonville

GUESTS (continued)

AFFILIATION

Ramsay Whaite	Washington County MTAC
Frank Angelo	Angelo Eaton & Associates
Betty Atteberry	Westside Economic Alliance
Marta DeToledo	Citizen
David Calver	Parons Brinckerhoff
Neal McFarlane	Tri-Met
Ron Weinman	Clackamas County
April Siebenaler	Multnomah County
Robert Paine	Multnomah County
Harold Lasley	Multnomah County
Clark Berry	Washington County
Bill Stewart	The Oregonian

STAFF

Andy Cotugno	Mike Hoglund
Gina Whitehill-Baziuk	Marilyn Matteson
Terry Whisler	Renee Castilla
Richard Brandman	Tom Kloster
Ted Leybold	Kim White

SUMMARY

The meeting was called to order and a quorum was declared by Chair Rod Monroe at 7:36 a.m.

No public comments.

MEETING REPORT

Action taken: The July 12, 2001 meeting minutes were unanimously approved with the following correction and notation: on page 15, 2nd paragraph, *Dammasch* corrected to *Damascus* and *Karl Rohde* requested his named be spelled consistently and correctly.

MTIP POLICY ISSUES FROM METRO COUNCIL AND JPACT – DIRECTION TO TPAC - DISCUSSION

Andy Cotugno stated he had several things to refer to, but that first he would start with the big pink packet and then move on to the MTIP items: memo from the Metro Council answering policy questions that were raised by TPAC in a memo to JPACT and a list of House Bill 2142 candidate projects. Andy Cotugno raised a question concerning exactly how much MTIP money JPACT wants to allocate to bond eligible projects.

Andy Cotugno stated that Attachment 1, the TPAC analysis of the Metro Council's comments refer to the Attachment 5 survey of where JPACT members would allocate MTIP funds. There is currently \$68 million worth of project requests for MTIP funds and the question is how to get that \$68 million down to \$38 million.

He stated that a TPAC recommended "150% Cut List" was attached.

Andy asked the JPACT members to analyze the list of projects, rank and eliminate projects and get made recommendations back to staff so it can go back to TPAC and then on to JPACT as a final program recommendation in September.

Karl Rohde stated that the transit projects appeared twice and that the planning projects did not appear. They each had separate descriptions but are not labeled correctly.

Andy Cotugno replied that the summary descriptions should be the same as the tabular list of the cut list projects and that a corrected copy of the summary list would be provided before the end of the meeting. Andy Cotugno wanted to emphasize that after completing the survey chart, the "keep" projects may not total more than \$38 million. He stated that also attached is the summary of various public comments. Andy Cotugno wanted to reiterate when members are considering projects, please remember what is funded and what is not funded, that most of the time we need to spend on the issues and that the committee needs to concur with what TPAC is suggesting or revise accordingly.

In Attachment 1, TPAC identified the Highway 217 and Powell Street Corridors, as the two prospective corridors to which the \$600,000 requested for "Corridor Study" would be allocated. The question put by TPAC is whether allocating \$600,000 of regional funds to corridors sets a precedent since there are other sources that could be used for corridor studies. Because of the shortage of funds it has become a necessity to use these funds. There is no local or state money to begin the planning. The bond measure will pay only for implementation of projects. Tri-Met has funded Corridor Studies, ODOT has before...therefore Andy Cotugno stated that it is his position that it is not necessarily setting a precedent but it may be a necessity due to limited funding.

Lonnie Roberts asked the members if they would define MTIP priority "road modernization" and "road reconstruction."

Andy Cotugno replied that projects for modernization equal expansion with specific applications coming from different jurisdictions and road reconstruction is mostly the surface overlay.

Karl Rohde asked that since the current funding from MTIP for corridors is \$600,000, was this the estimate for both corridor studies that will be completed in 2004 and 2005.

Andy Cotugno replied that it is a ballpark estimate of funds needed to conduct a single corridor study over two years, including another \$600,000 of Metro planning funds (is a total need of \$1.2 million per corridor).

Andy Cotugno asked if this funding source continues to be the funding source at \$1.4 million a year. Tri-Met assisted with the funding of McLoughlin Corridor and Barbur Corridor, and used capital dollars on buses and the general fund on operating expenses. Approximately two years of those funds are already allocated and now two expansions have been proposed in Beaverton and Gresham at a 2-year cost of \$2.8 million. What is the right approach for use of funds? Should the MTIP fund ongoing operation in addition to start up costs? TPAC is recommending that for transit, the purpose of MTIP funds should be for capital or service start-up costs: Tri-Met has already begun service improvements on McLoughlin and will be implementing improved service on Barbur this year from the 2000 allocation of MTIP funding. If JPACT agrees with TPAC's recommendation, it should provide funding that allows Tri-Met to transition funding of the McLoughlin and Barbur service from other revenue sources. Another policy issue is whether there should be a fund established for pedestrian to transit projects resulting from plans developed between Tri-Met and local governments.

Fred Hansen stated that utilizing MTIP dollars for transit operations is reasonable if that service is a regional priority. Regarding the pedestrian to transit funding, he emphasized that Tri-Met did not want to make those decisions alone and prefers to work with local governments as partners. Tri-Met would make investments such as bus shelters and allow local government to invest in sidewalks and safe crossings. This allows the ability to maximize dollars, and it would be a regional team to help administer funds.

Royce Pollard asked whether there was an application for I-5/Delta Park improvements.

Andy Cotugno replied that it was not an application, that the engineering is being done now and it was never a part of the discussion for MTIP funding.

Rod Monroe asked is it eligible for Bond Measure funds and was answered yes by Andy Cotugno.

Robert Drake agreed with Fred Hansen on matching dollars, leveraging dollars, TCL process, the issue to wait for buses (top three and five issues), start up money on Barbur and match funding.

Karl Rohde asked of Fred Hansen if, with respect to the Gresham and Beaverton TCL requests, he is looking for startup funding as well as an ongoing commitment?

Fred Hansen answered that \$16 million was needed for continuing efforts and \$5.5 million on TLC. Tri-Met has road projects they would rather do and they can make up some of that. But it will depend on additional revenue. Tri-Met can expect a 1-½ percent increase of service hours to absorb new TCL operation costs but this takes away any expansion of other service in the region. When things go back to TPAC, there needs to be a lot more conversation about what the tradeoffs will be.

Karl Rohde asked if initial startup costs can't be covered but once rolling would be as a start up fund.

Fred Hansen replied that it would depend on money. Legally where they are able to put out

current 1 ½ increase in hours of service, extensions to Gresham and various other places. Tri-Met doesn't have dollars left to continue McLoughlin and Barbur. These are the choices that can be made. The Tri-Met Board did their part by raising a nickel on the fare and raised \$1.6 million to match MTIP funds to provide the additional service.

Karl Rohde stated that Tri-Met will see money when the FTA money comes down for the region. He asked Mr. Hansen whether Tri-Met would use this money to fund ongoing operation of existing lines?

Fred Hansen stated that they want to expand service faster than the Tri-Met revenue base currently allows. The priority is on ongoing operational expenditure but they need to work that through the next several years.

Rod Monroe asked Fred Hansen if Tri-Met could live with the TPAC recommendation.

Fred Hansen replied that yes they could since it will be a split view decision from JPACT and not a Tri-Met decision.

Andy Cotugno asked which of these MTIP applications could be funded through the House Bill 2142 funds source and how does that effect the rest of the applications.

Andy Cotugno stated that on this list they need more detail on bond measure for possible funding, there are 20-25 different projects and a couple that might be MTIP projects; for example, the bond measure provides money to improve district highways transferred from ODOT to local government. The Farmington project would do exactly that. Pavement for preservation may not be technically eligible, but the North I-5 works is a modernization project to increase lane and interchange capacities. Whether it becomes a priority is another question. Two projects as possible crossovers have been Sunrise, (application for \$4 million) and Sunset Highway, (PE application). These are not very good projects for the Bond funds because they are farther out, with a lot of question marks before they can go to construction. They should stay in the MTIP process because they wouldn't do well under the bond measure funding.

Lou Ogden asked that the cut list table clarify what projects meet the criteria for the ODOT Bond money. On the modernization side, why wouldn't you expand the pot to include the MTIP dollars and fit the projects to categories, such as preservation. That plus the \$15 million, this group is the one that will decide.

Andy Cotugno replied that these two pots have been set-aside for different purposes. The bond measure relates to bridge and pavement rehabilitation and different kind of projects.

Lou Ogden asked what does it matter regarding the money. If you have a project that ranks high on the list and is eligible for state money then compete it - not through MTIP but through the Bond Measure program. It makes sense to make a predetermined commitment, to the extent that the project meets the criteria.

Rod Park stated that the decision is OTC's but that OTC will rely heavily on JPACT for

assistance in making those decisions. But to remember that these are two different piles of money and we don't have authority to obligate the bond measure money; only OTC can do that.

Rod Monroe said with the restrictions in place on both parts of the money, maybe some projects that are a higher priority but with limited funds would want to also pursue the OTC money.

Lou Ogden emphasized that the I-5 project could move from MTIP to OTC because it does not meet the state's criteria for MTIP money.

Kay Van Sickel reminded the committee that there are added factors: the bonded money from HB 2142 allocation to the region is for the entire Region 1 area. Coming from the outside you have to be careful because the money goes to the commission as to what statewide allocation will be done.

Lou Ogden replied that the OTC Commission would rely heavily on JPACT and the Metro Council's recommendations.

Andy Cotugno stated that that Boeckman Road in Wilsonville rated poorly because the road doesn't exist within the 2040 point of view. The emphasis is on certain design types, regional centers, and town centers and industry areas. In extreme cases of urban areas, they treat that village like a town center and assign points on that basis. Is this a road that could relieve another road for traffic and safety and can the scoring be more closely related?

Charlotte Lehan stated that she was here mostly to answer questions and to talk about the policy shift to Boeckman road, which is critical. The commuter rail issues are very time sensitive, they are interviewing developers August 20 and 21 and they need to have the understanding that there is a regional commitment. 2040 shows that commitment, the city is prepared to commit, and the regional government seems interested as well as willing to commit. They are prepared to move forward immediately. The time sensitive issue on commuter rail needs to be tied down. Importance seems to fall on Washington and Clackamas Counties and other things get overlooked. South I-5 and South Metro corridor, its not considered a high priority compared to Sunrise and Sunset Highways. I-5 corridor going south is a critical junction - Wilsonville is not really the end but serves Canby and Salem and points south. Because South Metro corridor - Canby and Wilsonville is not considered a high priority and it services parts of Marion, Washington and Clackamas counties and it needs to have a commitment from the region.

David Bragdon stated to the committee that he has been in conversation with the community planning level on how criteria is applied and how it is viewed for this pot of money. Wilsonville should be included in the mix. Historically these types of things, intersections that are failing, move up slowly. Wilsonville is asking what are opportunities this money can unlock? The developers are putting in their money. They need to make retail work. There, its more than a road project; it is slowly moving through the process. When it is described as a corridor with more circulation that unlocks retail and housing - it starts to meet 2040 requirements.

Charlotte Lehan stated that the State of Oregon is on board with the 2040 goals to date and they are on board with knowledge of project importance, rather than just obtaining the most money

for land. Just in last month or so, the importance of this as the model project for regional and state has surfaced. Before property owner can become more engaged it needs to be demonstrated that Metro is also engaged.

Rod Monroe stated that the Metro Council was very active in not wanting a prison built on that site because it had potential for a 2040 village. They wrote letters and they were successful in that endeavor. It needs to be carried through and he is very supportive of the upgrading of those criteria. The date of the final cut would be September 13, 2001. Wilsonville would know firmly by then.

Rod Park stated that projects like these are a small example. The Gresham emphasis was on vision and what the land use was supposed to be and what it was supposed to support. And use of Civic Drive as an example of a project that anticipates land use changes. What land use is desired and how does this infrastructure support other uses we want to do. Adapting criteria is very important

Larry Haverkamp asked the committee what was the difference between a town center and an urban village. Andy Cotugno replied that a town center is the downtown.

Andy Cotugno stated that there were additional TPAC questions. TPAC asked how the Metro Council priority list fits into this determination of TPAC/JPACT priorities. TPAC begins the process with JPACT developing the recommendations and submitting to Metro Council for approval. When did the process change – and will the Metro council continue to develop their own priority lists and submit them to TPAC and JPACT?

David Bragdon answered that the role of Metro Council is to support the entire region and that they do things with a regional perspective. They link transportation with land use decisions. They are an elected regional government; they have an equal vote in terms of seven members. JPACT allocates the money and the Metro Council is trying to make sure all areas are given the same attention. The Metro Council is considered the guardian of local and regional planning and how the region wants to grow. The Metro Council's role is where those things come together. With the opportunity to fund in light of Measure 7, which puts planning on a much more regulatory basis, functional planning and zoning, investment component to match private, or other agencies. The Metro Council is involved to provide a regional perspective. The Metro Council wants to do that in a partnership and the memo was not an attempt to change that partnership; they just wanted to have discussion early rather than at the end. There was very good discussion around this table in early January and they are working the long path that we started at the beginning of year.

Robert Drake replied that his only issue was page 2 - #5 starting with MTIP allocation process. His support for issues is very regional in perspective. Whether its Boeckman Road for Wilsonville or I-5 either North or South. He stated that this was his ninth year on the JPACT council and that they see the big picture as much as the Metro Council does. The important thing is what's good for the region and what's good for transit, modernization and freight movement. Washington County supported the airport light rail because he personally saw a need for it. He can think broadly.

Roy Rogers stated that our concerns are geographically balanced. He feels JPACT has always been in partnership with the Metro Council and he thinks they have been good partners. Everyone on the committee supports other issues with Clackamas and Multnomah Counties. Things have always been a slippery slope for a long time, but they have only been effective because they can balance everyone's needs as strategic partners. He stated that Washington County is not a small government, they have a \$1 1/2 billion budget. Things can be damaged around this table by policies issued by other governments. If you have three of your counties beginning to feel less than equal, there will be a problem. Things need to be very clear on issues; they all come here because it is a collaborative effort and it would be a disaster for this region if they all go their separate ways. The Metro Council needs to carefully re-communicate exactly what the relationship to JPACT will be and if it is to be inferior to Metro Council they need to understand or be co-partners. He also stated that he understands that the Metro Council may not like the way they hammer out everyone's interests.

Lonnie Roberts stated that in Multnomah County they have different districts. Some areas are rural and do not deal with the situation with Multnomah County. It is the largest county and contains the state's first and fourth-largest cities. There will be a problem convincing the numerous smaller cities to support JPACT if they are not getting anything out of this process because the Metro Council is perceived to be the dominant factor.

Lou Ogden asked everyone to please keep in mind that Metro redistributes federal dollars not Metro dollars. The small cities get direct dollars and only get federal money through the MPO. It is not just regional funding. Metro is regionally elected to look out for everyone and it's not valid with regards to MPO's. It still requires team planning. The region, cities and counties all deal with this.

David Bragdon stated that the Metro Council was concerned because the JPACT MTIP list at 177 percent contains a geographic balance that is out of whack. It lists Washington County receiving 32 percent of the funds while Clackamas County is only getting 16 percent. The Metro Council list at 70 percent contains more geographic balance over the entire region. The Metro Council realizes that things are not just about downtown Portland and are respectful of the other cities and counties in the region.

Fred Hansen commented that he believes what David Bragdon has outlined is that the Council feels remiss in not being as involved. There will be birthing pains because this is a new process that everyone will have to work through. MTIP is one voice – the spiraling effect is not normal formula allocation. JPACT speaks with one voice in Washington DC and has the ability to work as a region at this table. This process makes receiving funds much easier.

Bill Kennemer stated to the committee that he thought they were having a good debate. He agreed with what Roy Rogers was saying but had a couple of thoughts. He feels that JPACT is a broader group than Metro. It contains Clark County, ODOT, DEQ, Port of Portland, and Tri-Met. The fact that it contains three Metro members and three county commissioners proves there is an effort to look very carefully at things regionally. This is everyone's money and that makes the distribution of it tough and political. The success has been because they have worked within

a broad framework. They rely on their staff to do the technical work. JPACT tries not to look at the list politically or technically. TPAC works on this list and gets it to a 100 percent list. They figure out the focus on technical pieces and this in some ways help get outside boundaries. The success that Fred Hansen was alluding to is the way that they have been able to lay aside jurisdictional jealousies and come to consensus, sometimes painfully. Sometimes proportional shares are not equal but they know it will be when's it their turn. JPACT continues moving with one voice.

Rod Park stated that in this process the question is if there is ever a right time for the Metro Council to provide input. Metro Council in its own work took a position regionally and they try to communicate that position as a regional body. The difference in the process is that they have provided that input up front and some might be comfortable or uncomfortable with the Metro Council providing input. They realize that JPACT's border is larger than just Metro.

Rod Monroe stated that TPAC on August 28, 2001, staff will come out with 100 percent list and will be presented to this group on September 13, 2001. The recommendation will then go to the Metro Council.

OVERVIEW OF HB-2142 PROCESS, SCHEDULE, CRITERIA, CANDIDATE PROJECTS

Rod Monroe introduced Oregon House of Representatives member Bruce Starr, author of House Bill 2142 and Oregon Senator Vern Duncan. They explained how the legislation worked through the senate, how they accomplished this and came up with transportation funding money. They were asked to attend and explain to JPACT what the legislative intent was with this small pot of money and how they would like JPACT to proceed?

Representative Bruce Starr apologized for having never been to a JPACT meeting before and thanked JPACT for allowing him to observe. He stated he was glad to see House Bill 2142 approved. He stated that he understands that \$400 million is small, but it's \$400 million more than has been approved during the last decade. He hopes to continue to be involved in this debate and said that this was the first step in a long series of investments in transportation infrastructure. In the beginning of the legislative session, they talked about infusion of cash into the system, and they were told no way is it going to happen. They worked through the process of a \$.02 increase in gas tax as the funding base. The Attorney General came to them and said that spending tax money alone is unconstitutional. So they had to raise fees to allow extra money to be spent on the roads. There were a couple of things he wanted to stress. The first is at the legislative level and they are looking for significant results. They want to see the majority of the money being spent on roads and projects and making sure the public tax dollars are being spent right. He wants to be able to show the legislature that here is the list of projects and here is the list that still needs resources. In order for him to argue for additional money in this bill they had to have an ambitious timeline for identification, what projects can be built in a relatively short time. He understands that local governments need time to go from drawing board to a public hearing to getting projects on the road. Getting some projects started and actually seeing fruits of labor is pretty important. The other thing is to recognize the statewide perspective. The need in transportation statewide, alternative modes for transportation, the needs for eastern and southern Oregon, bridges, and roads so money can be spent in eastern/southern Oregon? They spoke with

the trucking industry regarding the fact they have to drive around bridges they can't cross. \$400 million is not a lot of money and they specifically didn't include the traditional split between state, local, and counties and one of the reasons they did this is so that OTC is required to have a statewide perspective. Where they see the most benefit is for the entire state, basically more bang for the buck.

Senator Vern Duncan thanked Representative Starr for his efforts. He stated that for the first time in the Senate the various groups came, large truckers, small truckers, AAA, all testifying on behalf of House Bill 2142 to the committee in the Senate. He had them all up to the table together in the end and had a photographer come in because he knew this probably would be the only time they were all there together. He said that he also sits on the Judiciary Committee and spoke about the Supreme Court talking about legislative intent and for the legislature to write what you mean, don't let the Supreme Court guess the legislature's intent. This bill said exactly what Representative Starr intended it to. House Bill 2142 states what the legislature wants to have happen and its pretty clear what you can and cannot do. It is a very well written bill. The Senate knew early on that transportation was a non-issue and no one thought there would be anything going on. But after a little work, all of our colleagues were pretty supportive of the concept and clear of intent on this bill. This is really going to be a great start. The Senate was very happy to be a tag a long.

Roy Rogers thanked Senator Duncan and Representative Starr for their efforts. He then asked them what was their intent for House Bill 2142.

Representative Starr replied what he wanted to do with the attack of the legislature on all state departments was to change the discussion. Secondly, what he wanted to accomplish was to get that first funding package passed. One debate on the conservative side was that ODOT wants to waste money on alternative modes of transportation. He wanted House Bill 2142 to address that concern. The money spent on highway needs to include extra lane capacities, modernization, fixing congestion. In order to deal with these problems, he had to sell that side of things and make sure that not all of the money was spent on bike paths. The money spent on roads needs to deal with transportation needs, criteria, the weight limitation issue. The committee had hearings across the state and there is a need for unlimited weight on highway and bridges (moving freight). It is an item on the bill because it is a need across the state and this bill needed the votes. There are over 2,600 bridges in the state of Oregon and many are coming to the end of their life span. Included in this bill is money to be spent on interchanges on multi-lane highways, Jackson School Road on Highway 26, which is a highly used intersection and many other dangerous intersections throughout the state. An overpass solution for one year and minor safety work doesn't address the real need. There is clearly a lot of flexibility in this bill where the money can get spent. There is not a list of projects in this bill. There is no project listed specifically in his district; OTC will do their job. He stated that he had great trust in OTC to do their best job and to develop the kind of relationships necessary to move forward on policy. OTC will spend \$400 million within the state on congestion, safety, maintaining current infrastructure, roads that require preservation, (city and county) roads that have been built to preserve and allows money to be used. In order to get the Governor to sign the bill, he had to allow half of the money to be spent on modernization. He got money to modernization, dealt with the need of congestion and new roads. Clearly this package deals with problems all over

the state.

Roy Rogers asked about the matching part of the house bill and local area's supporting their needs.

Representative Starr replied that OTC is required to move up on the priority list those projects that have a local match. He reiterated that the transportation dollars have to balance the needs of all jurisdictions. Washington County has been willing to put money on the table, but cannot expect the Highway 26 expansion to be all county money when its entirely a state facility. There was a bill that wasn't passed by the Senate, which allowed for \$25 million for matching. But state law says that projects, which have a local match, have to move up in the priority list.

Senator Duncan stated that some have been attacking ODOT. He is also on the Audits Committee, and feels that ODOT is doing a great job. They have had a bad image. He stated that he recently came into this particular position when he moved in as chair of a new committee called Public Affairs. He is in complete agreement with Representative Starr, but that doesn't mean they don't support alternative means of transportation. That is good practical policy.

Rod Monroe stated that he is the Chair of the Bi-State Committee and works with Clark County and the state of Washington. The Delta Park bottleneck which federal money was used to study developing a third lane (HOV) northbound and the state of Washington constructing a third lane south-bound now: is that the kind of project that could reasonably be funded under House Bill 2142?

Representative Starr replied that yes, they intended the money to be used on roads and expansion that creates new capacity.

Fred Hansen stated that Tri-Met was not an alternative mode and has some help in the Governor's Office. They want to be able to get projects funded within House Bill 2142 but the projects are in fact touchable and visible.

Representative Starr replied that he would love to get another road bill passed, but needs to see some projects that he could point to and say that they could get done. Projects that just need some money to get them over the top. Allocate this money to them rather than other projects. One of those is the Dundee bypass, right-of-way and PE on the federal level; \$15 million of state money is flexible and can allow this to be done. All things need to be done sooner than later. They need to see where this money was spent. It will help when they don't have to do a \$400 million bond levy to obtain additional money in the future.

Fred Hansen stated that he appreciated the hard work by Representative Starr and Senator Duncan.

Rod Park asked, do the projects have to be the kind you could see and feel? For example, ITS projects coordinate signalization, assisting more traffic and increase the current efficiency so commuters are not waiting at signal lights.

Representative Starr replied that the ITS project is not the kind of project he had in mind when drafting this bill. He wants to see additional lanes on roads.

Fred Hansen stated that the ITS system allows commuters to get from point a to point b faster.

Rod Park stated that a lot of time people are waiting – the current signalization system cannot handle the capacity.

Rod Monroe elaborated that what House Bill 2142 intends is for more visible projects and ITS is not that visible.

Bill Kenemer thanked Senator Duncan and Representative Starr for coming and stated that they are looking at Sunnyside Road because it contains a lot more congestion and that they have \$22 million of match money. He stated that Sunrise would be in the next step. He asked if Sunnyside Road is considered a state highway.

Representative Starr replied that the way House Bill 2142 is written any public road is considered a highway.

Karl Rohde asked if boulevard projects could be funded under House Bill 2142.

Representative Starr asked what exactly did Karl Rohde mean by boulevards.

Andy Cotugno answered that boulevard projects don't add lanes. Boulevards are supportive of downtown; have more amenities, sidewalks, trees, crosswalks, and makes pedestrian crossing easier.

Representative Starr replied that money needs to be spent on district highways requiring preservation. Because of the jurisdictional transfer and the criticism involved, it would not look good to have all of the road money spent on trees and sidewalks. He also reminded the committee the time line that those projects will need to be built.

Dave Williams stated that he needs to explain some things for clarity and the process involved because the commission was meeting. The lists of the projects will go out to the JPACT members as we have them and the process that has to be gone through. He reminded the committee that this is an application process, they have to be prepared and submitted to the region, with letters to Kay Van Sickel. He called to attention the House Bill 2142 calendar. The other thing that is referenced is the Oregon Highway Plan and if a copy is needed to give him a call to obtain one. He stated that to defend projects, make proper references to sections in the bill. Senator Starr's memo on page 2 describes putting together the recommendations, inventing criteria, applying criteria they have in place and the final decisions to make. The decision that the commission will make today is that 50 percent of the \$400 million will go to bridges and preservation and 50 percent to modernization. In the same paragraph of the highway plan is the notion to maintain the system before it is expanded. On a system basis that goal will have been met. The next one down is the split of modernization funds. There is no mathematical target. Sub-allocated by traditional modernization. Region 1 including Hood River County, etc. will get

around \$70 million to get to split up. Will not have a split on bridges, but will wait for submitted projects first.

He stated that Attachment A is the timeline and that the timeline is very tight but it is legislatively mandated. On September 7, 2001 we have to submit by 5:00 p.m. for bridges and preservation. On October 5, we are obliged to submit lane capacity projects, etc.

On October 8, 2001, OTC will refine draft recommendations. Then they have to go to Metro and have a turnaround time of two or three days. A statewide committee will select the bridge projects. They merely pass to the committee any applications that come through on bridges. Then JPACT meets to decide which projects could best meet criteria. There is a quick scramble to get the recommendation from JPACT. The Region 1 decisions will probably come to JPACT for recommendation. On October 16, 2001, JPACT will present the final selection.

On November 2, 2001, OTC needs something from JPACT on modernization and interchange projects. The commission reacts to those and makes draft recommendation and then obtains public comments.

On December 1, 2001, reconsider how you want to argue points, and remember that the commission has to approve applications by January. On the next page there are eligibility criteria and prioritization factors. The criteria have to be consistent with adopted plans and highway plans. The focus is on project readiness. OTC will be screening for these. The projects need to be able to make it to construction, and by the final date of 2008 everything must be done. Regarding pavement preservation, OTC will provide a list of district highways in this region and what their pavement conditions are. Pavements must be deteriorating to qualify and OTC will determine whether you have candidates in those jurisdictions.

Rod Monroe stated that with the timeline, it will require moving the JPACT October and November meetings to the first Thursday of the month. October 4, 2001 and November 1, 2001 are the new meeting dates.

Annette Liebe asked if the projects needed to be included in the TIP, OHP and Regional Transportation Plan.

Andy Cotugno replied that statutes require those projects be in the fiscally constrained list of the RTP. He reminded the committee that this is an application process due September 7, 2001 and modernization projects are due October 5, 2001.

Dave Williams stated that they make the application to ODOT – anyone on their facilities share preparation on application and somebody is assigned responsibility.

Andy Cotugno stated that he has supplied a compilation list of what's going on around region.

Lou Ogden handed out a letter from the Tualatin TMA regarding the MTIP process and repeated his annual call to action concerning long-term funding for TMAs in the region. In the beginning they had come and asked for money – and as a region we need to determine how we are going to

fund TMA. He stated that they are currently funded through start up and then are dropped off the funding but this policy is not self-supporting. MTIP needs to decide if it is funding TMAs partially or not starting up at all. The Tualatin TMA will be funding done in two years if there's not a change and he is very concerned. This issue was raised at the MTIP process by the TDM Subcommittee.

Andy Cotugno stated that they are questioning TMAs and the funding and whether it should be start up or ongoing. The funding allows for only some ongoing funds but mostly start up. MTIP set aside a certain amount of money for TMAs.

Lou Ogden stated that the MTIP process takes a lot of time. MTIP shouldn't be allowed to fund new TMAs unless it can fund the ones in existence.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:32am.

Respectfully submitted,

Renee Castilla