

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)

July 12, 2001
Meeting Notes

MEMBERS PRESENT

AFFILIATION

Rod Monroe, Chair	Metro
Lou Odgen	City of Tualatin, representing Cities of Washington County
Rod Park	Metro
Bill Kennemer	Clackamas County
Fred Hansen	Tri-Met
Rex Burkholder	Metro
Craig Pridemore	Clark County
Karl Rohde	City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas County
Kay Van Sickle	Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) – Region 1
Don Wagner	Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
Larry Haverkamp	City of Gresham, representing Cities of Multnomah County
Dean Lookingbill, alternate	SW Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC)
Lonnie Roberts	Multnomah County
Roy Rogers	Washington County
Stephanie Hallock	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Charlie Hales	City of Portland

GUESTS PRESENT

AFFILIATION

Karen Schilling	Multnomah County
Dave Williams	Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
David Cox	Federal Highway Administration
Bruce Warner	Oregon Department of Transportation
David Bragdon	Metro Council, Presiding Officer
Gary Katsion	Kittelson & Associates, Inc.
Ross Williams	Citizens for Sensible Transportation/CLF
Ron Papsdorf	City of Gresham
John Rist	Clackamas County
Judy Edwards	Westside Transportation Alliance
Bernie Bottomly	Tri-Met
Maria Rojo de Steffey	Multnomah County
Dick Feeney	Tri-Met
June Carlson	Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
Shelli Romero	Multnomah County, District 1
Susie Lahsene	Port of Portland
John Leeper	Washington County
Matthew Garrett	Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
C. J. Sylvester	City of Wilsonville

GUESTS (continued)

AFFILIATION

Tom Tushner	City of Lake Oswego
Lynn Peterson	Tri-Met
John Holan	City of Forest Grove
John Russell	Oregon Transportation Commission
Louis Ornelias	Oregon Health and Sciences University (OHSU)
Nancy Kraushaar	City of Oregon City
John Rosenberger	Washington County
Brian Newman	Milwaukie

STAFF

Andy Cotugno	Mike Hogle
John Houser	Gina Whitehill-Baziuk
Gina Whitehill-Baziuk	Marilyn Matteson
Terry Whisler	Bridget Wieghart
Francine Floyd	Richard Brandman

SUMMARY

The meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Chair Rod Monroe at 7:40 a.m.

MEETING REPORT

Action taken: Lonnie Roberts moved, with a second by Fred Hansen to approve the June 14, 2001 meeting report. The motion passed.

(Fred Hansen requested (for clarification), inserting "from the farebox" on page 5, last sentence of last paragraph in item #3. The sentence was changed to read: "Operating costs were about 33% on light rail from the farebox.")

RESOLUTION APF NO. 1562 – FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORSING THE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CORRIDOR INITIATIVES PROJECT

Richard Brandman explained when the RTP was adopted last year, 16 corridors were identified as needing further refinement studies over the next 20-year timeframe. The "Map Corridor Initiatives Program – Location of 18 Corridors for Study" (map on wall) showed those 16 corridors. The need for transportation improvements is throughout the region. In addition, the State (Transportation Planning Rule) mandated completing some kind of refinement study or show progress in a three-year timeframe. A process was initiated over the past year, to look at each of these corridors in detail and to give the projects technical rankings in terms of their needs. Metro staff talked with jurisdictions and public to: 1) get input on their priorities for these corridors, 2) come up with a plan on how to address the 16 corridors over a 20-year timeframe, and 3) determine the highest priorities needing to be addressed sooner than later. We established

a process to include a project management group, a technical advisory committees, and the public, in order to create a recommendation.

Lonnie Roberts asked for clarification of the 16 corridors, since the wall map identified 18 corridors.

Richard Brandman explained the 18 corridors. One of the corridors, I-205 was actually broken into two corridors because of its length. For analysis purposes, there is an I-205 north corridor and the I-205 south corridor. I-205 North Corridor is I-5 from Highway 224 to Vancouver; I-205 South Corridor is I-205 from I-5 to Highway 224. Barber Boulevard was not listed as a corridor needing further refinement in the RTP, which was an oversight, so this was added into the process. That's how 16 corridors became 18.

Mr. Brandman referred to "The Corridor Initiatives Project" (gray handout). He briefly explained this report "Corridor Initiative findings and Recommendations" (table). The table showed how the corridor projects were rated technically, and from an interest standpoint by the community. What they looked at was support of key land uses, and how these corridors supported the 2040 concept. In addition, they looked at congestion and how congested are these corridors both now and in the future. Staff looked at other 2040 goals, (i.e., future transit needs, freight needs and safety issues) which would make some corridors more important to address sooner than later. Staff also looked at the community considerations. Metro received quite a few comments and letters on this process and conducted a public meeting, and got further comments from the county coordinating committees and jurisdictions. This is shown in the "Summary of Community Planning Considerations" with rankings of high, medium, low. The recommendation that JPACT was asked to adopt was Resolution APF No. 1562 – Exhibit A "Work Program for Corridor Refinement Planning Through 2020" (buff handout). Mr. Brandman said that the 18 corridors showed that there was activity already taking place in many of the corridors (as shown in the first six corridors listed under "Corridor Planning On-Going").

The recommendations before JPACT were to have the Powell/Foster Corridor and the Highway 217 Corridor move forward and progress to major corridor studies in the first five-year period of the RTP implementation phase (2001-2005). For the remaining corridors (listed under "Other Corridors"), they suggested further work be conducted in those corridors--- but not a major corridor study in this first five-year timeframe. The capacity at Metro to address a major corridor study is usually about two studies. We are very interested in assuring that the rest of these corridors get addressed. TPAC had that same desire. This resolution adopts the Corridor Work Program (Exhibit A), and would be monitored and updated yearly. In addition, the resolution added the Barber Boulevard/I-5 Corridor to the list of corridors needing further refinement. It also states that the Highway 217 and the Powell/Foster Corridors would be the two corridors addressed in the first five-year timeframe. Mr. Brandman pointed out that there were still funding and budget issues on how to perform these corridor analyses. He said they had applied for TGM grants and there was a request in the MTIP process for funding this. Lastly, Mr. Brandman said they weren't amending the RTP today. An ordinance would be prepared later this fall to amend the RTP.

Lou Ogden said assuming this work plan is adopted; he wanted an explanation on the evaluation methodology. Is that “cast in stone” regarding your findings? Richard Brandman suggested that Mr. Ogden could give his comment now, and/or to the project managers’ group that would be meeting again for further refinement issues.

Action taken: Fred Hansen moved, with a second by Lonnie Robert to approve Resolution APF No. 1562. The motion unanimously passed.

Richard Brandman thanked all the jurisdictions, as well as Metro staff, for their participation and contribution to this project.

COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS: DISCUSSION REGARDING HB-2142 AND MTIP RECOMMENDATIONS

Rod Monroe commented on the MTIP recommendations from Metro Council to JPACT. Mr. Monroe said there was considerable concern from the Metro Councilors, that often on these important transportation decisions, the Council only weighed in at the end. Since Metro Council was in partnership with JPACT, and Metro Council and JPACT must agree on the final MTIP recommendations, the Metro Council decided to make some recommendations early on in the process, while leaving some flexibility for JPACT’s work on MTIP as well. Hopefully this would help JPACT reach unanimous agreement on the final product. Councilors Burkholder and Monroe were given the task of identifying Council priority projects. The target was between 60% and 70% of the \$38M available. Councilors Burkholder and Monroe identified and Council approved a list of about \$27M worth of projects. These projects were rated very highly and considered highest priority for projects to be funded out of the \$38M.

Councilor Burkholder explained that in January, the Council adopted a set of administrative criteria that should apply to all projects that come through. Which ones are the most strategic set of projects that we can reward, that would help advance the region 2040 plan?

Rex Burkholder briefly explained the “Council MTIP Project Ranking Matrix – Enclosure D-1 (canary handout). The matrix listed projects using Council MTIP project evaluation criteria (6) and Council ranking. They took the six criteria and staff applied the administrative criteria. The ranking was not out of the six criteria, but rather out of number of applicable criteria for the project. They were directed by Council not to go for the “150% list” but rather go for what were the most strategic investments. Through their analysis, there were four different areas that Council needed advice from JPACT before we deciding whether these types of projects should be on the list. Mr. Burkholder referred to the memo dated July 10, 2001 to all Councilors from Councilors Burkholder and Monroe regarding “Proposed List of Council MTIP Priority Projects – Enclosure C” (canary handout). On page 2 - “Corridor Planning Projects,” there were 18 corridor planning projects that we looked at. The question was, was this something that should come out of MTIP wholly, or should it be funded in partnership with local and state because all of these project affect local and state facilities? What does JPACT advise? Do you want this source of money (the MTIP money) to fund all of the corridor studies or should we look for state matching funds?

Next, Mr. Burkholder referred to the Page 2, "Tri-Met" listed under "Projects Requiring Further Policy Review." This included Tri-Met's request for service expansion increases. Two years ago, there was a request for two projects to provide expanded transit services in certain corridors. This year, there is a request to continue those two and a request for two new ones. So the question is, what do we want to do? Do we want to use the money here for the service expansion of Tri-Met.

The "New State Funding Availability on page 3 of the memo, referred to the new state transportation-bonding program (HB2142). One of the criteria that Council had in January was, is there any other readily available source of funding? In January there wasn't money for many of the projects that were on state highways, but now there is. The question was, is it the obligation of the State to pay for projects like widening US 26 or I-5 Newberg interchange? Should those projects on major state highways be the State's responsibility? Or should the region be paying for part of the expense?

The last item on the memo "Boeckman Road," was an example that didn't fit into their criteria. It was a facility that is not here at the present, but is needed to achieve access to the Dammasch State Hospital site that was destined for major and intensive development. Although this project was ranked 0 (because it doesn't exist now), the project is critical for 2040. Rex Burkholder said Council wanted JPACT's assistance and input in answering these critical policy questions in order to go forward with a funding recommendation on these areas. He asked JPACT to help answer these questions.

Lou Ogden asked about the "Industrial Center/Intermodal Connectors." Under what situation would one apply versus not apply? Rex Burkholder explained that the criteria was recognizing that there was some critical projects that deal only with freight movement that would not be located near region 2040 Tier 1 areas and which was at the main focus of all these criteria. It was saying that we wanted a criteria that would help us prioritize those projects, too. Otherwise, they would disappear. Mr. Burkholder added that this is open to refinement.

Lou Ogden asked what was the "Existing Transportation System?" How did you get a yes or no on that? Mr. Burkholder explained they looked at projects that enhanced or maintained the existing transportation system. ITS was a classic example of something that actually made the existing transportation system work better without modernization or widening.

Karl Rohde asked, was the expectation of council that these influence the decision on the 150% cut list that we make today? Or was this to be considered as we proceed past the decision that we were making today?

Andy Cotugno explained that later in the agenda, the 150% list was up for approval. There were two pieces that Rex Burkholder just reviewed. Enclosure D-1 was the ranking of all the projects; Enclosure D-2 was the Metro Council's short list. The request from Council was that the "Council Recommended MTIP Project Priority List – Enclosure D-2" should be included on the 150% list. All but two of Council's recommendations were on the 150% list. Mr. Cotugno said

when we got to the 2002 – 2005 MTIP agenda item #8, he would point out the two exceptions not included on the 150% list. Then JPACT can decide whether to propose including those two projects, or does the committee want to add them to the list.

Karl Rohde asked if the expectation from Metro Council was that the criteria established here, be used to whittle down to the 100% list? Rod Monroe answered, not necessarily. Metro Council is weighing in and saying they would like to see these recommended projects on the final list. Metro Council identified those \$27M worth of projects as a very high priority, regionally. They would like to see those projects on the final list.

Karl Rohde said JPACT approved a set of criteria for the determination of MTIP projects this round. Metro Council seemed to have created a separate set of criteria. Is the expectation for JPACT to apply Metro Council's set of criteria to this round in the MTIP process?

Rex Burkholder explained that there are the technical ranking criteria which Metro Council used to form their decisions. There are JPACT administrative criteria that you adopted and there are Council administrative criteria that are parallel. There are slight differences.

Karl Rohde asked Mr. Burkholder if he could explain those slight differences. Mr. Burkholder said, no, not without them in front of him. Rod Monroe said they have used a completely separate set of criteria. Council took JPACT criteria and added additional criteria. Council weighed projects based on the criteria that JPACT had set and also looked at the additional criteria.

Karl Rohde said that it was good that Council was involved; but in terms of timing and expectations of Metro Council, he was unclear. He was concerned that there was not a "compare and contrast" between the criteria traditionally used and the criteria established by Metro Council.

Andy Cotugno explained that back in January when they started this process, JPACT approved a set of criteria to solicit projects. Metro Council concurred in those criteria. Those criteria included the technical rankings, scoring criteria, as well as, administrative criteria. Administrative criteria that were called out, were called out as examples. The administrative criteria that we are accepting are any factors that cause a project to be considered higher ranking than this technical score illustrates. So we have examples of criteria, not a limited set of administrative criteria. JPACT approved those two criteria – administrative and technical criteria. Metro Council also said when they have a package of projects; they will weigh their decision based upon those six criteria. When the solicitation went out for application, both sets of criteria were included. So this was not an "after the fact" set of criteria. It was a "going in" set of criteria. Council adopted those criteria, not JPACT. Council has ranked the projects based upon these criteria, and they are giving JPACT the short list of projects. Rod Monroe said they are not asking JPACT to adopt Metro Council's criteria. They are asking JPACT to look favorably upon the projects that Metro Council has identified using both JPACT and Metro Council criteria.

Lonnie Roberts said he was concerned that Metro Council used a lot of criteria, but it still comes down to the perception of Council, which is separate from JPACT. In east Multnomah County, the 223rd project was not included on the list. Metro Council comes to JPACT with a lot of influence. He doesn't want to see Metro Council as overbearing, or projects left out because of this.

Rod Monroe said he understood Lonnie Roberts' concern. That was why Metro Council agreed, and insisted that the Council Priority List not take up the whole \$38M, but leave flexibility for adjustments and omissions to the list.

Bill Kennemer said that there hadn't been much time to look at this information. Mr. Kennemer said that it's good that we put it on the table, the issue between the relationship between JPACT and Metro Council. He thought that fundamentally, that is what the document was about. He appreciated that Metro Council was "up front" early in talking about what their priorities were. He said this tended to unhinge a lot of the process that had been used for regional cooperation over the years. He pointed out the last sentence on first page of Enclosure C. No consideration was given to geographic balance, modal splits, or the level of past commitments. Regional cooperation, as he understood it, was credited on those basic issues. Part of the way we work together, is we meet each others needs and work toward consensus. He was also concerned with Metro Council's suggestion to put 9.4% towards road funding---without not a single capacity project included. There's one PE project. On bikes and multi-use trails, which he thought were the same thing, 30.6% of the funding recommended. His county came out with 4.5%. He said we needed some extensive discussion about who makes the decisions here and how do we work together. Who makes the rules? What are the rules? We need to work on the rules.

Rod Monroe explained in Enclosure C, it stated that the Metro Council, in making this first cut decision, didn't consider geographic balance and modal balance. That wasn't to say that Metro Council was insisting or even recommending that the final product not consider modal and geographical data.

Karl Rohde said that he understood that and he appreciated that. On the other hand, those were the fundamental tenants on which much of what occurs in JPACT is credited.

Commissioner Hales thought it was certainly appropriate that the Metro Council weigh in at this stage of the process. He thought this type of debate was necessary.

Rod Monroe said JPACT was only being asked to approve the "150% list" which will be presented later in the meeting. He reminded JPACT what the process was for transportation decisions in this region, which is absolutely unique. It doesn't work like this anywhere else in the world. JPACT will make a recommendation finally, on the 100%, \$38M. The Metro Council cannot amend but rather approve the list. The Council agreed and Rod Monroe concurred, that it was appropriate for the Council to give JPACT an indication of what it considered to be of the highest importance early in the process. It's rare that JPACT makes a transportation recommendation that is turned down and returned by the Metro Council. He

hopes it didn't happen this year on this package. Mr. Monroe was hopeful that the action that the Council had taken in providing JPACT with this list would help facilitate final agreement.

Kay Van Sickel asked regarding the policy issues listed in the cover letter, were we going to discuss them more as a group or what was the intent? Rex Burkholder said that Council was seeking the advice of JPACT. In terms of timing, did these policy issues need to be on a future agenda? Rod Monroe said the questions were just being raised today.

Larry Haverkamp asked Rex Burkholder, did he anticipate coming back with this ranking matrix? There are other things besides these criteria that are very important; but the matrix omitted those items. Are you going to correct the matrix or let them stand as is and assume that part of the matrix isn't correct? Rex Burkholder said the technical ranking criteria they used were from two or three weeks ago and there were some pieces, at that time, that were still not complete. There would be some changes because the information was incomplete on the technical end. Therefore, Council couldn't make decisions about those projects, so they just "fell out." Council attempted to look at everything, and tried to get a core program of projects that met this criteria well. Rod Monroe said that the 223rd Project was on the 150% list. Mr. Burkholder said as the process progressed, JPACT would be developing the 150% list first, then later the 100% list.

Rod Park said the Metro Council represents the region. Council is trying to facilitate their duty.

Lonnie Roberts said that Metro Council came out late afternoon, on the day before the JPACT meeting, with suggestions and changes; that was unfair. He said JPACT should have this information a few days before the meeting. Rod Monroe explained that Council approved this two days ago. That's why JPACT didn't get it until yesterday. Council isn't asking JPACT to approve it. If we were asking you to approve it, then it would be absolutely unacceptable. Metro Council is asking JPACT to look at the information, and think about it.

Fred Hansen said he was trying to understand how the criteria got applied to projects. In the cover memorandum (from Councilors Burkholder and Monroe), in the last paragraph, first page the overall technical rankings were the sole determining factors. JPACT needs a better understanding on what Council was thinking on this. This is a unique relationship (Council and JPACT) but we need to find ways to make it work.

Rod Monroe said for those of JPACT that had concerns about specific projects that were left on, added or excluded, to please feel free to call Rod Park, Rex Burkholder or Rod Monroe.

Discussion Regarding HB-2142

Andy Cotugno referred to the letter dated July 10, 2001 to Bruce Warner from Rod Monroe regarding development of a regional priority list required under HB-2142.

Rex Burkholder explained that the passage of House Bill 2142 on July 3 provided a new source of money. The time schedule on Enclosure B-3 "Draft Timeline and outreach process for HB-

2142” showed a tight deadline. The July 27 deadline was for comments on criteria. A key one we identified so far was bridge projects based on a state method of building bridges. We are not sure if that applies to bridges that move. That is obviously important to this region. The next deadline is August 9 when recommendations for criteria will be adopted. August 10 is the deadline for the first group of bridge projects. The process moves very quickly. We have lots of questions and this was what this letter addressed. JPACT functions as an Area Commission on Transportation (ACT) in ODOT processes. So we need to submit a project list by August 10. How do we meet this challenge?

Bruce Warner, Director of ODOT introduced John Russell, Oregon Transportation Commission. This schedule (Enclosure B-3) was very aggressive. HB-2142 established the deadline of February 1, 2002 for the Oregon Transportation Commission to select projects. So they worked backwards from that deadline date, in setting up the the schedule. Yesterday, the Commission made some revisions. The September 7, 2001 date will be the due date for bridge, preservation and highway projects. The biggest thing JPACT can do is engage on the criteria. OTC needs to hear some ideas on criteria in order to screen projects, above and beyond the ones outlined in the law itself. Enclosure B-1 “2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act Project Screening and Prioritization Factors Applied by Oregon Transportation Commission – Draft) showed the various categories and type of projects, and outlined the criteria that was included in HB-2142. It’s important first to focus on criteria. Those criteria will determine again how projects are ranked. OTC is looking to JPACT to 1) develop those lists of projects, and 2) forward your suggested list of projects to OTC. OTC wants to know what projects are out there and they need to start looking at those projects and see where the demand is. For example, they do have an inventory of all of the bridges statewide, both local bridges and state bridges and they have a ranking system. The law was very clear about that. There are other criteria the commission may want to consider in terms of selecting bridges for example. He said JPACT needed to get engaged in the criteria, and put your lists together by the dates listed. He pointed out that the \$400M---one of the givens to take into consideration was that, although not in law, at least half of those dollars needed to go to preservation type projects. The other half of those dollars would go toward modernization type projects.

Lonnie Roberts asked, on the highway budget, was there a certain percentage of that dedicated to bridge maintenance or was that to your discretion? Bruce Warner said it was up to the discretion of the Commission as to where it placed the priorities. Our commission has made bridges a priority in the past.

Roy Rogers said one of the issues that Washington County had, was we’ve been looking at some strategic investments with you in regards to some certain facilities. They don’t seem to be making the criteria here. As a county, they were reluctant to put the kinds of money on state facilities if they were not going to rank high here and there was not going to be a strategic investment here. Mr. Rogers said he was curious as to what Bruce Warner was going to look at. If this region is willing to step up and strategically place funds to assist in capturing local match, the state might want to look at how they want to place their priorities on the 2040 also, to better utilize those of us in local government who are willing to assist you with matches.

Bruce Warner said they don't have the ability to address all of your needs.

Charlie Hales asked, was this new program as authorized by the legislature and as customized by the Commission, is it similar to the STIP? Was it the same basic philosophy and prioritization process or were there differences in approach and prioritization from what would normally be prioritized as a STIP? And if the later, could you tell us what were the differences?

Bruce Warner said this new infusion of dollars had criteria that were different from what the Commission has used in the past. The House Bill authorized the Commission to develop additional criteria as they desired to rank projects. So this was different than the normal STIP process. Ultimately, when they are done, we will need to amend the state transportation improvement program (STIP) to reflect the projects that come out of this prioritization.

Charlie Hales asked Mr. Warner to qualitatively describe the difference?

Bruce Warner said it was much quicker. Now we have the opportunity to look at many different criteria based on consultation with JPACT, which may not have been criteria that we had considered in the past.

Fred Hansen asked, what would look different than if it had gone through the original process, qualitatively?

Bruce Warner said probably what you would see is we are going to ask JPACT to engage with this money on bridge and preservation project selection, which in the past you haven't been able to do. In terms of modernization, this is an opportunity for us to look at these dollars in terms of some of the things we talked about when we developed \$600M bond list and to improve on the mistakes that we made when we developed that list. The Commission needs to address these concerns at the next meeting in August as they develop criteria for this program.

Lou Ogden asked, what is uniquely different in this process? You could get local projects done with state funding. It doesn't have to be on the state system.

Bruce Warner emphasized that this House Bill made specific mention to highways. This is a highway bill. It talks about improvements, modernizations, lane capacity, interchange improvements on multi-lane roadways. The word "highway" means not only state highways, but also county and city roadways.

Dave Lohman addressed Bruce Warner (and Metro Council), given that industrial areas and intermodal facilities are given high priority both in the 2040 plan and the RTP, and access to them are given considerable importance in the Transportation plan---it seems like a significant omission. Neither the draft criteria nor the letter refers to access to intermodal facilities. He asked that it be added to the letter.

Roy Rogers asked regarding preservation---that's not boulevards, sidewalks---that's purely pavement? Bruce Warner said "preservation" is defined essentially as preservation of the

pavement. What we need to do is figure out on the modernization side, is how to deal with some of the other things.

Andy Cotugno asked for closure from JPACT on how to proceed. He said that Bruce Warner had a deadline of July 27 for receiving comments on the criteria. That was the immediate deadline. JPACT doesn't have a meeting scheduled between now and July 27 and JPACT doesn't have comments ready today on these criteria since this has only been out for a week or so. How do you want to proceed? Do you want to meet prior to the deadline for criteria comments? Do you want to submit comments to staff to compile? There's a TPAC meeting on July 27, do you want to submit comments to them to finalize something? Do we want to comment as a group on the criteria, or individually? How do you want to proceed?

Rod Monroe said JPACT could submit comments to Andy Cotugno, and he could forward them to Bruce Warner, or we could have a July 26 meeting.

Karl Rohde said that the other ACTS in other regions of the State would be commenting on the criteria collectively; it was important that JPACT do so, too. If, in fact, JPACT was going to have another meeting on July 26, then TPAC should meet before that to make their recommendation to JPACT so that on July 26 we were not making a recommendation to TPAC. Rod Monroe said that TPAC doesn't meet until July 27.

Fred Hansen said that we needed to speak as a group.

Lou Odgen asked to see the final result before it goes to ODOT. Andy Cotugno said he would get the drafted recommendation to JPACT as soon as possible. If JPACT got their comments to Andy Cotugno by next Tuesday or Wednesday, then he could do a first draft early the next week. TPAC could then add comments at their July 27 meeting. The committee agreed to have TPAC finalize a set of comments for JPACT.

RESPONSE TO FHWA LETTER ON RTP MOBILITY STANDARD

Andy Cotugno said that Mr. Cox from Federal Highway Administration was at this meeting because we have had communications back and forth on a number of TRP related issues. Mr. Cotugno asked to skip this item on the agenda for now. He invited Mr. Cox back in September for discussion.

TCSP REQUEST

Andy Cotugno referred to the City of Milwaukie's request to add into the federal priorities, funding to acquire Milwaukie Middle School (letter dated July 2, 2001 to David Bragdon and Mike Burton). Mr. Cotugno explained that JPACT adopted federal priorities back in February. JPACT asked for two projects in the TCSP category, as the category emphasized the land use connection to transportation. This request was to add a third TCSP earmark (the junior high site in the City of Milwaukee). The junior high was closing and the community wanted to maintain the site as a community and transit center because the location was where the light rail options

are being examined. This is an opportunity for a good combination of community and transit objectives and in that area.

Lonnie Roberts said to put it on the list for consideration. Rod Monroe said that he strongly urged JPACT to do so. As chair of the South Policy Steering Group, Mr. Monroe said he was impressed with Brian Newman, Mary Kane and Jim Bernard working with neighborhood groups in Milwaukie. This project was important to that community.

Action taken: Lonnie Roberts moved, and seconded by Karl Rohde to approve the City of Milwaukie's request. The motion passed.

2002 – 2005 MTIP TECHNICAL RANKINGS, DRAFT “150% LIST”

Andy Cotugno referred to the “Priorities 2002 MTIP Update – Planning Program” (the canary color packet -legal size included in the mailout). Mr. Cotugno explained the projects and rankings. The organization of this list is that each of the modal categories was ranked by in a modal category. He highlighted two projects that were on the Metro Council list and asked if JPACT wanted to add those projects to this list. Comments received from various publics were compiled into “Priorities 2002 – Project Ranking Public Comments” and supplemental comments.

Mr. Cotugno said the “Road Modernization Projects” matrix, the top of the list (shaded area) was changed. The Tualatin project (I-5 Nyberg Interchange Widening), after further review of the technical scoring, the total Project Points was 72 (not 55). The recommendation was to include it in the 150% list, construction not just right-of-way. The previous recommendation was for right-of-way. This recommendation, because of that change, would include construction. That would be an added \$3.4M federal funds request for construction on this cut list. The three projects listed at the bottom of the matrix were: 1) US 26 Widening PE – Murray/Cornell (wm1), 2) Sunrise Corridor PH 1 PE: I-205/Rock Creek Junction (cm5) and 3) Boeckman Road Extension (Dammasch Urban Village) (cm4). Mr. Cotugno asked that those three projects be retained on the list at this time. The Boeckman Road Extension is one project that Metro Council suggested be included. JPACT needs to decide whether to recommend it, with a score of 0 on the technical rankings. Those three projects changes would be appropriate to take up as amendments. The “Road Reconstruction Projects” matrix is unchanged. The “Bike Projects” matrix is unchanged. The “Pedestrian Projects” matrix needed further consideration by JPACT on whether to amend. The “Forest Grove Town Center Pedestrian Improvements” (WP7) was also a project that TPAC raised questions on. Based upon additional information, this project was looked at, and agreed that the score should be higher. This project should have a total project ranking of 70 (not 60). The recommendation was to add this project to the 150% list. JPACT would have to decide whether to add it to the 150% list. The Butner Road Sidewalk Project (WP3) was another project on the Metro Council list. Does JPACT want to recommend the project to be included on the list? On the “Boulevard Design Projects” matrix, the Boones Ferry Rd Boulevard Project (cbl2), TPAC raised questions on this project. The total project points should be 68 (not 60), which placed the project at a similar ranking to the other projects grouped in the cut list. The “TDM Projects” matrix was unchanged. The “Transit Projects” was unchanged. The Transit Oriented

Development Projects” was unchanged. The “Pedestrian Projects” was unchanged. The “Freight Projects” was unchanged.

Andy Cotugno suggested a motion on the overall package; then address a series of amendments to be voted on individually.

Action taken: Lou Odgen moved, with a second by Rex Burkholder to open for discussion.

Rod Monroe said JPACT would entertain amendments. Amendments were now in order.

Friendly amendment: Roy Roger moved, with a second by Lou Ogden to approve an amendment to add the Washington County, US 26 Widening PE – Murray/Cornell (wm1) \$.359 federal funds request to the 150% list. The motion passed.

Roy Rogers said this was a high priority project to the region. He would like to see some regional prioritization of this project. Is there some regional interest in this project? Is there other dollars that could be traded out?

Fred Hansen said this project should be categorized as a modernization project. Until further determination on where this project would be funded, leave it on the list.

Action taken: Rod Monroe called for a vote to add the US 26 Widening PE – Murray/Cornell (wm1), \$359,000, to the 150% list. There was one no vote by Rex Burkholder; all others voted yes. The motion passed.

Rod Monroe called for any other amendments.

Roy Rogers requested an amendment for “Boulevard design Projects” the Cornell Road Boulevard Project – Murray Blvd/Saltzman (wb11). Washington County, under local funds, is proposing to put \$5.7M on this project. Mr. Rogers referred to a letter from John Leeper, from Commissioner District 2. Without the MTIP funding, this project would be built with Washington County’s standard because they wouldn’t have the money to build to Metro’s standards.

Friendly amendment: Roy Rogers moved, with a second by Rex Burkholder to approve that the Cornell Road Boulevard Project (wb11), \$3.5M, be added to the “150% List.” The motion passed.

John Leeper, Washington County Commissioner, commented. The CPO in conjunction with the board, did pass an ordinance to approve a town center plan for this area. It included a boulevard treatment for the portion of Cornell Road that is under consideration today. The MSTIP program has been in progress for a considerable period of time; however, those improvements don’t include many of the amenities and right-of-way requirements that are in the Metro boulevard standards. He made a plea to JPACT, that as the work moves forward on improving this portion of Cornell Road in Washington County, that money be made available to start the process to

have this portion of that road improved as was anticipated when the town center plan was approved by ordinance last fall. Mr. Leeper thanked JPACT for the opportunity to address them.

Fred Hansen asked for clarification, is the \$3.5M if approved, does that buy a boulevard? Or does it merely take steps toward buying a boulevard?

Mr. Leeper said yes, the \$3.5M would complete a boulevard, along with the money (approximately \$5.7M) that Washington County and the MSTIP program were already putting into the project. This \$3.5M would bring the project up to Metro boulevard standards.

Roy Rogers said Washington County had a voters' approved project list before Metro's standards were ever approved. Washington County allocated \$5.7M to do the project. Mr. Rogers can't go back and get more money for the project, or come up with more funds. After voter approval of the fix, Metro and JPACT adopted standards that required additional improvements. Washington County doesn't have the money to do those improvements. Maybe additional improvements could be done later; however, it would be very expensive. If Washington County adopts the new provisions and town centers, they don't have the money to do it. So they either do the project, retrofitting it at some point, maybe 20 – 50 years later; or the option suggested here: don't build it if you don't have the money. Mr. Rogers said he didn't have that option. He already told the public that he would build \$5.7M worth of improvements.

Rod Park asked, would this project be put through an exceptions process?

Charlie Hales said rather than to create an exception to build a road the old way; try to figure out a way to grant the request without creating a precedent that all of us would be tempted to follow in the future.

Roy Rogers explained that the MSTIP list is done, and this project puts us in that dilemma.

Charlie Hales asked, are there any other situations like this? Comments around the table were no.

Lonnie Roberts asked what project is more important to Washington County? Roy Rogers answered that both projects were important.

Action taken: Rex called the question for those in favor of supporting the motion to add the Cornell Boulevard Project (wm2)/Washington County to the list. The motion unanimously passed.

Action taken: Lou Ogden motioned for the reevaluation (72 total project points) of the Tualatin project (I-5 Nyberg Interchange Widening) with inclusion of construction (\$3.4M) into the 150% list. Seconded by Roy Rogers. Rex Burkholder voted no; all others approved. The motion passed.

Friendly amendment: Bill Kennemer moved to add the Sunrise Corridor Ph 1 PE: I-205/Rock Creek Junction (cm5) to the 150% list. Seconded by Karl Rohde. The motion unanimously passed.

Bill Kennemer said this was a fundamental threshold issue about growth in Damascus. This issue is about the second busiest intersection in the State and a safety problem in the Corridor. It's a matter of whether or not we can move people and have some level of liveability. He said they have been talking in Clackamas County about concurrency. They think its fundamental to provide reasonable service to this new area that the region has designated for growth. Frankly without it, the Commission believes if the region chooses not to do this project, then the region needs to find a different location to place the growth. In order to move freight, have jobs and liveability; you've got to have roads. This freeway is absolutely essential and if it's to open in the timeframes we have been talking about in the 2020 and 2040 plan, we have to get the project underway now. They are at the point of trying to secure some property, putting some of their own money into it because we believe we have to help the State in order to gain momentum and get this project underway.

The question was called: Rod Monroe said the motion was to add the Sunrise Corridor Ph 1 PE: I-205/Rock Creek Junction (cm5) to the 150% list.

Karl Rohde said this project was very eligible for the HB-2142 funds as an issue of statewide modernization concern. Roy Rogers added if there was HB-2142 money for this project, he was questioning that maybe it should be funded from that money.

Fred Hansen asked if Bill Kennemer cared where the money came from for this project? Mr. Kennemer said he was more concerned about timing. Mr. Kennemer said the project might need both funding sources; that is why they have made this request.

Fred Hansen said this was a HB-2142 project. He didn't think it should be funded from the MTIP. However, Mr. Hansen supported the project at this stage of the process in order to have the discussion later on.

Kay Van Sickel added that since HB-2142 was being discussed, she offered some parameters to that money. With that money, timing would be important, as well as, having the project ready for construction. The "pot of money" is limited.

Action taken: Rex Burkholder voted no; all others voted yes on the proposed amendment to add the Sunrise Corridor Ph 1 PE: I-205/Rock Creek Junction (cm5) to the 150% list. The vote passed.

Karl Rhode said that the under "Boulevard design Projects," the staff memo included the Boones Ferry Road Boulevard Project (cbl2) as moving up in rank but not making the 150% cut. He asked to argue in favor of that project as being added in. The City of Lake Oswego was going to reduce the amount requested to \$500,000 which was suggested to TPAC, but wasn't included in the memo.

Action taken: Mr. Rohde moved to approve \$500,000 in PE money only for the Boones Ferry Road Boulevard Project in Lake Oswego, and seconded by Charlie Hales. The motion unanimously passed.

Dave Lohman commented on how small the funding was for freight. He acknowledged that freight moved on some of the other roadways that were getting funding. Mr. Lohman added that freight was an important part of making this region work. Andy Cotugno said Mr. Lohman didn't propose an amendment nor did staff coming into this meeting. Mr. Cotugno asked that JPACT consider an amendment to add the Columbia/Killingsworth East End Collect (PF1) into the 150% list.

Action taken: Charlie Hales moved, and seconded by Dave Lohman to add the Columbia/Killingsworth East End Collect into the 150% list. The amendment unanimously passed.

Friendly amendment: Karl Rohde moved, and seconded by Rod Park to add the Wilsonville and Boeckman Road Extension (cm4) to the 150% list. (Mr. Rhode said they have \$12M of private investment that will go into that project with the \$1M regional match).

Rod Monroe said Metro Council is also interested in this project. Mr. Monroe asked for further debate.

Lou Ogden asked if that was a road extension that relates to the interchange there. Karl Rohde said no, there's not an interchange there and he didn't think it was in ODOT's plan. Rod Monroe asked, so the interchange issue is not tied to the road extension? Mr. Rohde answered no.

Action taken: Rod Monroe called for a vote on the Boeckman Road Extension project. The vote unanimously passed.

Andy Cotugno said the staff recommendation was to reconsider the Forest Grove Town Center Pedestrian Improvements (WP7). The ranking had improved on this project.

Action taken: Roy Rogers moved, and seconded by Rod Park to add the Forest Grove Town Center Pedestrian Improvements (\$400,000) to the 150% list. The vote unanimously passed.

Rex Burkholder said the Butner Road Sidewalk Project (WP3) didn't have strong merits to it. There were some pieces missing on it. He said he wasn't going to move to add the project to the list; leave it off.

Fred Hansen moved that when we go to the 100% list, no new projects be added, unless they are "dollar for dollar" replacement (trade) for projects taken off the list. Seconded by Karl Rohde.

Andy Cotugno said no new projects "out of the blue" could be added. Any project proposed would have already been from the list and received public input. If a project comes back onto the list, it should have already been on this list.

Action taken: Rod Monroe stated the motion as follows: Once the package was approved, any additions to the list had to come with retractions from the same jurisdictions, and had to be from the original list of projects “dollar for dollar.” Any new proposal of projects, had to be projects that lost earlier on this list. Mr. Monroe called for a vote. Rex Burkholder and Bill Kennemer opposed; all others approved. The motion passed.

Action taken: Rod Monroe called for a vote to approve the 150% list, as amended several times. The motion unanimously passed.

IX. ADJOURN

The next JPACT meeting was scheduled for September 13, 2001. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:43 a.m.

Respectively submitted,

Francine Floyd
Recording Secretary

I:\trans\transadm\staff\floyd\JPACT\2001\8-9-01\#3 JPACT 71201minutes final.doc