

MEETING NOTES

DATE OF MEETING:

January 18, 2001

GROUP/SUBJECT:

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rod Monroe, Chair
Rob Drake
Rod Park
Fred Hansen
Bill Kennemer
Jim Kight
Rex Burkholder
Andrew Ginsburg, alternate
Dave Lohman, alternate
Craig Pridemore
Roy Rogers
Karl Rohde
Grace Crunican, alternate
Don Wagner

AFFILIATION:

Metro
City of Beaverton, representing Cities of Washington County
Metro
Tri-Met
Clackamas County
City of Troutdale, representing Cities of Multnomah County
Metro
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Port of Portland
Clark County
Washington County
City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas County
Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)

GUESTS PRESENT:

Clark Berry
Lonnie Roberts
Larry Haverkamp
Mary Legry
Tom Mills
Bernie Bottomly
Debbie Elven
Deb Wallace
David Bragdon
V. Chatterjee
Jessica Hamilton
Mark Lear
Beckie Lee
Kathy Lehtola
Louis Ornelas
Lynn Peterson
John Rist
Karen Schilling
Jason Tell
Kay Van Sickel
Ramsay Weit
Dave Williams
Ross Williams

AFFILIATION:

Washington County
Multnomah County, to represent Multnomah County
City of Gresham, to represent Cities of Multnomah County
Washington State Department of Transportation
Tri-Met
Tri-Met
C-Tran
Washington State Department of Transportation
Presiding Officer, Metro Council
Calcutta Tramways Ltd.
U.S. Representative David Wu's Office
City of Portland
Multnomah Commissioner Serena Cruz's Office
Washington County
Oregon Health Sciences University
Tri-Met
Clackamas County
Multnomah County, TPAC Member
ODOT
ODOT – Region 1
Citizen
ODOT
Citizens for Sensible Transportation/CLF

MEDIA:

Bill Stewart

The Oregonian

STAFF:

Andy Cotugno

Richard Brandman

Gina Whitehill-Baziuk

Mike Hoglund

John Houser

Rooney Barker

SUMMARY:

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

Councilor Jim Kight, City of Troutdale, introduced Councilor Larry Haverkamp, City of Gresham, who will be the new member representing the Cities of Multnomah County, beginning at the February meeting. Councilor Kight said he would continue his representation as the alternate member to Councilor Haverkamp. Chair Monroe and the members welcomed Councilor Haverkamp.

Chair Monroe then introduced Commissioner Lonnie Roberts who will be representing Multnomah County on this committee, and the two new committee members from the Metro Council, Councilor Rex Burkholder (who will be Vice-Chair to Chair Monroe on this committee), and Councilor Rod Park. Again, Chair Monroe and the members welcomed Commissioner Roberts and Councilors Burkholder and Park.

MEETING REPORT:

Action taken: Councilor Rohde moved, with a second by Councilor Kight, to approve the November 9, 2000, meeting report (the December meeting was cancelled due to inclement weather). The motion passed unanimously, with the new members abstaining.

RESOLUTION REF. NO. 1479 – FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) TO APPROVE TRI-MET’S FY 01 APPROPRIATION

Mr. Cotugno briefly described the projects included in this resolution, and said that in order to receive the federal funds, the projects need to be included in the MTIP, which is what this resolution would accomplish.

Action taken: Fred Hansen moved, with a second by Councilor Rohde, to approve Resolution Ref. No. 1479 with a technical correction to amend references to the Jobs Access Program regarding the Rockwood Transit Hub in the staff report and the resolution to read Rockwood Jobs Access Transportation Hub. The motion passed unanimously. (Mayor Drake was not present for this vote.)

RESOLUTION REF. NO. 1487 – FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE PROCEDURES
AND CRITERIA FOR THE PRIORITIES 2002 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION
IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) UPDATE

Mr. Cotugno called attention to the staff report and resolution (the tan sheets) that were recommended by TPAC at their last meeting, the three proposed amendments submitted by members of the Metro Council Community Planning Committee (he asked them to look at the January 17th pink version rather than the January 11th purple version), and the summary of public comments sheet (gold) dated January 17th which summarized testimony from the Council public hearing on January 16th as well as the e-mail and letters received. Mr. Ginsburg called the Chair's attention to the January 16th fax to the membership that included staff revisions to the staff report and attachment 3 to that report.

The purpose of this resolution, Mr. Cotugno said, is to adopt a set of criteria and a process and schedule to be followed for allocating the next round of MTIP funds. Those funds are a portion of the funds that come into the metropolitan region; they are the dollars that this committee and the Metro Council have the greatest degree of discretion over, and they are fairly flexible dollars. There are two categories: approximately \$20 million are STP funds, which can be spent on virtually any transportation oriented purpose – roads, transit, or any other transit alternative. There are \$18 million of CMAQ funds, which can only be used for things that reduce vehicle emissions, and generally are only used for transportation alternatives, not roads. Responding to a question from Commissioner Roberts, Mr. Cotugno said bridges could be included in the STP funds, but that there were other funds strictly dedicated to bridges. Commissioner Roberts expressed concern about the bridges crossing the Willamette River in Multnomah County.

This resolution does not deal with some other federal funds that come into this region, Mr. Cotugno continued. ODOT's spending in the region mostly goes toward preservation-type projects. The staff report to this resolution, on page 2, reflects ODOT's intent to program one modernization project in this next two-year time period (the next phase of the US Hwy. 26 project in Washington County). In addition, this resolution doesn't reflect the federal dollars that come into Tri-Met for routine transit capital purposes. By the end of the year an overall Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) will be adopted that will include all of those funds, but this resolution only addresses the \$38 million.

Responding to a question from Councilor Rohde regarding the first paragraph on p. 2 of the staff report, Mr. Cotugno said that even though the OTC is cutting back as mentioned in the report, they aren't cutting back funds that were already committed. They're cutting out funds from 2004-05, and since the allocation being dealt with in this resolution is for 2004-05, their comment is relevant but they aren't cutting anything that has already been allocated.

Issues that have been discussed over the past few months were the next subject Mr. Cotugno spoke to, as outlined in the staff report on p. 2-3 under *Process Goals* in the series of bulleted principals are those agreed by TPAC that be followed.

Next, Mr. Cotugno addressed the Base Package which TPAC recommended, made up of the unfunded projects from the previous "150 percent list." They've already been ranked but were not funded in the last round. However, TPAC recommended that the process not be restricted to just those projects because things change, and deletions need to be allowed if jurisdictions have different priorities with substitute projects accepted. The organizations listed on the bottom of p. 3 would be those allowed to submit projects for consideration. Process acknowledgement recommendations are on the top of p. 4 of the staff report. TPAC also noted that a lot of benefit can come out of some fairly small projects and there should be an allowance for some additional "low cost" projects. It was also requested that the projects be submitted with a letter from the approving jurisdiction's governing body.

Freeway projects was the next issue addressed in the staff report. There aren't enough federal dollars to go around any more, so the issue, Mr. Cotugno said, is whether or not to start using these funds toward freeway projects, which was discussed at TPAC. TPAC made three distinctions in this category: 1) Preliminary Engineering to get a project ready so it could, perhaps, compete at the state level for state modernization funds or at the federal level for earmarked funds; 2) Interchange-related projects – this has been done in the past, i.e., Greenberg Road/Hwy. 217 ramp and signal modifications; and 3) Freeway lane construction itself. TPAC recommended unanimously to allow projects to be applied for through this process. They recommended in a split vote on construction projects, so there is that distinction in their recommendation.

TPAC then looked at the process, Mr. Cotugno continued, and whether the process should target the money towards a few big projects (regardless of mode) or spread it around. They didn't have a recommendation because some jurisdictions in the region want to do little projects and some jurisdictions want to do big projects. Consequently, they're recommending not to restrict the projects, to let the applications stand on their own.

Previously we have funded projects as stand-alone allocations and have also funded programs, over time (TDM, ITS, etc.). TPAC's recommendation is to continue to fund these first and figure out how much to commit to those programs on a continuing basis, and then go through the allocation process with individual projects.

On p. 5, Mr. Cotugno pointed out two areas that were discussed at TPAC, which are related to the criteria. First, the criteria now is based on the 100 point scoring system and is tailored to individual modes – boulevard projects are ranked against boulevard projects, transit projects against transit projects, etc. Grace Crunican asked if, in the large vs. small projects, there would be a large against large and small against small categories for the ranking. Mr. Cotugno said no, but there were generally four categories of criteria: effectiveness, cost effectiveness, safety, and support of the 2040 land-use goals, which predominantly emphasizes the degree to which a project supports regional centers, town centers and mixed-use areas. The exception to that is freight projects which are ranked based upon their access to industrial areas and terminals. Those are quantitative rankings that produce a score for a project. In addition to these criteria,

it's recognized that there are other factors that affect the importance of a project. Anything that reflects the importance of a project, we want on the table.

Two issues discussed about this criteria were: 1) recommendation from the Metro Council that the weighting between the points be flipped, that is, now the criteria are based upon 40 points for 2040 support and 60 points for other factors (the four listed above); they recommend that the 2040 support be weighted 60 points and 40 points for the other four factors. TPAC recommended they stay the same with recognition of the first principal Mr. Cotugno mentioned earlier, that the whole program needs to be targeted to 2040. 2) The other issue discussed was the Endangered Species Act. Mr. Cotugno said we now have better information regarding culverts, which ones create fish blockage problems and where the biggest benefits are. This information wouldn't really affect the points but would affect the additional information provided on the projects.

Chair Monroe said he would entertain comments on the TPAC recommendations. Councilor Rohde asked, on p. 3 of 6 (from the faxed version), why the language changed in the staff report and not the resolution, "funding" vs. "programmed due to a lack of funds." Since the resolution is the instrument being adopted, he suggested that, for clarity, this be included in the resolution. Mr. Hoglund said he had made this change for clarity; Mr. Cotugno said the narrative change in the faxed document should be included because it's descriptive and the more explanation the better. They said they would discuss it later the language for clarity.

Fred Hansen, referring to p. 4, under *Freeway Projects*, asked what had been done in the past. He said when he studied the *Freeway Projects* section, it spoke to him of minor interchange modification, and this paragraph reads simply "interchange projects." His question was, did this mean projects that constitute a greater level of activity on an interchange. Mr. Cotugno replied that the sense was that this was an attempt to distinguish between the kinds of things that have been funded out of this money vs. the kinds of things that haven't been. The things that have been funded have been on a relatively small scale, like \$1, \$2 or \$3 million projects, unlike the I-5/217 interchange of \$38 million, which was not funded with this money. The point was that while there was a split view at TPAC about funding freeways themselves (which do tend to be more expensive projects), there really wasn't a split on doing relatively minor interchange related projects. Mr. Hansen then asked if the PE in that same paragraph referred to each of the three categories, and Mr. Cotugno said it was.

Commissioner Kennemer disagreed. He said it was not PE for intersections, but for freeways. Mr. Cotugno said it was for interchanges or freeways, but it was to fund the PE, not the subsequent construction of that interchange or freeway. Commissioner Kennemer said his understanding was that it was PE for freeways, or more specifically, the Sunrise Freeway. Mr. Hansen and Mr. Cotugno clarified: it was PE and construction of relatively small interchanges, but not construction of large interchanges; and on lane construction it would be the PE, not the construction. Mr. Cotugno said the reason this was called out separately was rather than simply asking the question of should we spend this money on freeways, it was felt that we ought to ask the more specific question of should we be able to spend this money on Preliminary Engineering

to develop new freeways, yes or no. The recommendation from TPAC was yes. Then the question was, should we be able to spend this money on construction of interchange-related improvements – in the past we have, typically fairly small – should we do this or not. The recommendation was yes, we should allow that to happen. Here, Mr. Hansen interjected that it would be to continue the way it has been done before, to which Mr. Cotugno replied, exactly. Then Mr. Cotugno said a third question was asked: should we spend this money on freeway expansion, as in the past we have not typically used this money for that. The recommendation was that we consider allowing local governments to apply for at least one or two projects, which may or may not rank well, but they would be allowed to apply for them, for construction. TPAC's "yes" recommendation was a split vote. If criteria was going to be set on who can apply for what, TPAC recommended that you decide what they can apply for, individually. Can they apply for Preliminary Engineering on freeway projects? Yes or no. Can they apply for interchange improvements? Actual construction of interchange improvements related to freeways. Yes or no. Can they apply for freeway expansion construction projects? Yes or no. If you decide to deal with freeways in the criteria, be specific about which kinds of projects will be allowed to be applied for in this process.

Chair Monroe clarified: the discussion was about what would get considered, not what would get funded. TPAC said yes, PE for any freeway project could be considered and ranked. TPAC said yes, interchange projects could be funded (and typically, we've only done small interchange projects). And, on a split 7-6 vote, TPAC said the actual building of freeways or adding lanes to freeways can be considered. Considered means applied for funding, not yet funded, he stressed. Today's decision was to decide the criteria, not the actual funding.

Chair Monroe called a short recess at this point.

When the committee reconvened, Chair Monroe announced that Ms. Crunican would soon be leaving her position as the Director of the Oregon Department of Transportation, and presented her with a card signed by the membership. He invited her to speak. Ms. Crunican said the Oregon Department of Transportation is full of people who try to do the right thing, and the only thing she did while there was to get them to look more outward. ODOT is very much attuned to the public and the governor and his livability agenda. ODOT understands that transportation is not an end, but a means to livability and economic opportunity. Every locality around this state is different and we need to look at what this means for each. The Oregon Transportation Commission basically replicated the JPACT process by forming area commissions on transportation around the state, she said, and most of the counties have assimilated into groups of three or four. They're trying to accomplish what JPACT does. While she looks at JPACT, she sees challenges, she sees factions in the region going one way and others moving another way. Looking back ten years, she thought there was a better regional perspective. Her parting words here, she said, would be to tell JPACT that ODOT supports them, but the real test is that they come together, knowing they come from one area, and they need to use the JPACT table, all of them, to look after the whole region. They need the compact development. They need a regional plan. They need to be able to get around and through the region. Industry needs to meet its needs. All of those are legitimate. They'd be better off as a group if they left their hats behind at

the door and came in and acknowledged as a group all of the things that need to be done, even though there's never enough money to do all, so it all needs to be prioritized. This is the challenge that remains before the committee. Ms. Crunican was warmly applauded.

Chair Monroe then introduced Jon Kvistad, prior year's chair to JPACT. Mr. Cotugno said Mr. Kvistad's parting gift to JPACT had been to cancel the December meeting which was when he had planned to present Mr. Kvistad with a farewell gift of a print of the Hawthorne Bridge, the most multi-modal road in the region, signed by well wishers. Mr. Kvistad then turned the tables and did a humorous reverse-roast of the committee, person by person, with the exception of the Port of Portland representative. Chair Monroe wondered why Mr. Kvistad couldn't dredge anything up to say about the Port. On the serious side, Mr. Kvistad told the committee that it was an honor and a privilege to have served with them, and to accomplish as much as they had. He thanked them for the opportunity to work with them, and for the gift.

Back to the MTIP discussion, Mr. Ginsburg brought forward some procedural items, hoping they might help clarify the discussion. On the pink sheet, there were three important amendments to the resolution. The second amendment dealt with limiting the total size of additions to the project list. Mr. Ginsburg said he thought that directly related to some of the questions raised earlier about whether it was appropriate to apply for funding for lane construction and whether that would swamp the overall list of projects. Rather than spend a lot of time talking about whether lane constructions could apply or not, he said the committee might want to deal with the question of limiting the total size of projects which would address that concern. The other two amendments were also good and he suggested those be discussed. In the staff report, as the criteria for applying for projects, he said he noticed there was no attachment to the resolution that actually listed the criteria, that they are only in the staff report. He suggested the committee might want to direct staff to create a new attachment for the resolution that lists the criteria as recommended by TPAC and amended by this body before an actual vote takes place on any amendment.

Mayor Drake said there was a requirement that there be public input on any project; he assumed that was for any additional project as opposed to any that were already on the 150% List. Mr. Cotugno replied that the recommendation was to actually have the jurisdiction's/agency's board endorse any project submitted. Chair Monroe said that was in the amendment, and would soon be addressed but that he was entertaining questions at this point.

Councilor Kight said the subject of the 60/40 weighting has come up and his understanding from ODOT was that this weighting would lean more toward the regional center, i.e., Portland. Mr. Cotugno said the 2040 points were not just toward downtown Portland, that they emphasize mixed-use centers which includes regional centers, town centers, light rail station areas, and the central city. It does include the central city but not exclusively. There is a bias toward large regional centers, but it doesn't exclude town centers, main streets and light rail station areas. The scoring is based upon the size of the project. Chair Monroe added that flipping these numbers was not part of the recommendation. Councilor Burkholder said the issue mentioned in the staff

report in *Freeway Projects* from last November clearly stated that it needs to be solved. He wasn't certain of the process to resolve it, however.

Mr. Cotugno said Mr. Ginsburg's point was well taken, that there were places in the staff report with TPAC recommendations, and those should be collected and made an exhibit to the resolution so that they're adopted. For the purpose of committee action, he suggested the base action of the committee be to approve the resolution with the TPAC recommendations that are outlined in the staff report which will be folded into the resolution, and then if there is a series of amendments the committee wants to entertain, entertain them one at a time.

Action taken: Dave Lohman moved, with a second by Commissioner Kennemer, to approve the resolution with the TPAC recommendations folded into the resolution, said amendments to be entertained one at a time.

The proposed amendments were as follows:

Amendment #1 – Action taken: Councilor Park moved, with a second by Fred Hansen, approval of the revised (underscored) text from Metro Council Community Planning Committee Amendment #1 as listed in the January 17, 2001, memo to JPACT from John Houser and which gave the amendments that came out of the Metro Community Planning Committee meeting of January 15th.

There was discussion on how this affected projects from the 150% list that had already gone through the public process.

Andy Ginsburg moved, with a second by Councilor Kight, a friendly amendment to the motion on Amendment #1 clarifying that this amendment referred to projects from the 150% list, i.e., adding the underscored text, "The list of proposed new or substituted projects shall be submitted . . ." This friendly amendment was accepted by Councilor Park and Mr. Hansen. Mayor Drake felt this still was onerous and reopened projects that didn't need to be reopened. If it's on the 150% list, he said, it's already made it, i.e., leave it there. If it's something new, or if a project has changed, he understood fully that that project would need public input.

Councilor Rohde clarified that this Amendment #1 includes changing the timeline for submittal of projects. The question of multi- and interjurisdictional issues was raised by Commissioner Rogers, particularly the county vs. the city being the submitting agency. Chair Monroe said this isn't spelled out because it's assumed that the jurisdictions will work together on these projects as they probably would anyway.

Commissioner Kennemer said he was going to vote no because he felt it was up to the jurisdictions to define their own processes, that this was another unnecessary layer.

Vote: The motion to approve the Metro Council Community Planning Committee Amendment #1, including Mr. Ginsburg's friendly amendment passed. Those voting in favor – Mayor Drake,

Councilor Park, Mr. Hansen, Councilor Burkholder, Mr. Ginsburg, Mr. Lohman, and Councilor Rohde (7). Those opposed – Commissioner Kight, Commissioner Pridemore, Mr. Wagner, Commissioner Rogers, and Commissioner Kennemer (5). Ms. Crunican was not present for this vote.

Amendment #2 – Action taken: Per the amendment submitted, Councilor Park moved, with a second by Mr. Hansen, the inclusion of the additional text shown in Metro Community Planning Committee Amendment #2 to the section on *Project Additions*.

Councilor Bragdon explained that this amendment came out of the TPAC discussion of trying not to get people's hopes up and then having to whittle the list back down to a comfortable level. Another reason was to use a dollar figure rather than the number of projects so as to allow a good and fair substitution of projects. Commissioner Kennemer expressed frustration that the list was already oversubscribed, and to put more into the mix only complicated it. Councilor Bragdon said the intent was to be responsive to local jurisdictions, not the other way around. A multijurisdictional project shouldn't be handled any differently from the way it's done now, he said, replying to a question from Councilor Rohde.

Commissioner Rogers had three points to make: he agreed with Commissioner Kennemer that two or three would make more sense than five; he thanked the Chair for clarifying the \$2 million referred to the aggregate, not \$2 million per project; and he said the 10 percent seemed to be arbitrary and may be a problem. Chair Monroe agreed that that was an arbitrary number, and said it may need to be modified, that this would be something to look at. Mr. Ginsburg asked how the 10 percent and \$2 million work together. Chair Monroe said the 10 percent is if a substitution was being done; the \$2 million would get added onto the base. What's substituted could be up to 10 percent more than what you substituted for. Councilor Rohde asked for example if a multijurisdictional project had a \$2 million or \$6 million cap. Chair Monroe reiterated the ten jurisdictions allowed to submit projects; Mr. Cotugno added that if they want to use these funds for interjurisdictional projects, the portions could be worked out. Chair Monroe asked that the record show, to clarify, that it is the aggregate that's being discussed. Responding to a question from Andy Ginsburg, Mr. Cotugno replied that the DEQ was one of the ten entities listed to submit projects and that this would also be for CMAQ funds.

Vote: The motion to approve Metro Community Planning Committee Amendment #2 passed unanimously.

Amendment #3 – Action taken: Councilor Park moved, with a second by Councilor Burkholder, to approve Metro Community Planning Committee Amendment #3. Vice-Chair Burkholder briefly explained the amendment. Commissioner Kennemer said the amendment worked against where he felt Clackamas County's best interests lie, as their fundamental priority now is PE on the Sunrise Corridor. They're scheduled for a big piece of new urbanization and are committed that there will not be a repeat of Sunnyside Road. He said this amendment just didn't apply to Clackamas County, except for possibly one or two criteria, as they do not anticipate advancing urban development without infrastructure, and infrastructure is, principally, transportation.

Commissioner Rogers concurred with Clackamas County, saying that Washington County was a mixture of highly urbanized areas and highly rural areas and this amendment fit well for some of these areas but not at all for others, and this caused him concern.

Mr. Hansen said this committee recognizes that the Metro Council had the responsibility to review the list and that it may return it to the committee, but he felt it would hurt everybody if their perspective was to do an evaluation. He asked if, instead of having this as an amendment, we could make sure that in the information that goes out it be clearly described that the Metro Council, when they exercise their independent review, will look at these issues and that people will need to be able to present those for that process, but not have it as an amendment.

Councilor Park was comfortable with that concept, adding that he thought that this criteria actually would benefit Clackamas County. He understood Mr. Hansen's advice, that acting in an advisory capacity would be more appropriate in this circumstance. If Councilor Burkholder agreed, Councilor Park said he would withdraw this amendment. Councilor Burkholder agreed. He then asked the committee to look at p. 3 of 7 on the January 19th faxed document to the *Process Goals* that this committee has already adopted. He thought Amendment #3 was reiterating these goals. Also, he said to Commissioners Kennemer and Rogers that this discussion was about a very special and particularly small pot of money and that half of it couldn't be used for some of the things they mentioned, and that it was being looked at as to how to use the money strategically to leverage the 2040 development as best as it could. Some of the issues raised were way beyond the ability of this money to do anything about. We can't control ODOT money, he said.

Vote: Amendment #3 was withdrawn by Councilors Park and Burkholder. The Metro Council, by its action the following week and by resolution or letter, would make it clear that they would be considering these criteria when making their final determination of the projects that will be funded. Mr. Hansen said he had requested that this also be clearly conveyed to everyone. Councilor Bragdon agreed, and said it was important that the important elements be stressed: 1) industrial areas are as integral to 2040 as town centers; also 2) regional town centers are as integral to 2040 as downtown Portland. These all need to work, he said, they all have transportation challenges. The Metro Council's intent was to serve all of those with no geographic bias.

Chair Monroe said it was extremely critical to enhance the industrial base in Clackamas County and he felt this was the way to do it. Also, he said, by Metro Council action most of the new land brought into the UGB was in that area and needed to be developed or it was a worthless action. Commissioner Kennemer appreciated Chair Monroe's comment and said he'd like this committee to keep that in mind. He thought the PE for Sunrise Corridor would be feasible within this pot of money. Also, in the spirit of how the prioritization would be done, he was grateful that the recommendation was not to go to the 60 point system instead of the 40 point system. Inherent in that, though, he wanted to ask that that be looked at again because he thought there was some bias there that didn't do justice to the goal for the region of moving out into the urban areas.

Commissioner Rogers asked for clarification on p. 3 of the resolution, Resolve 5. regarding the procedures and criteria summarized in Exhibit C. He said Exhibit C showed the 60/40 point value which was indicated earlier in this discussion as not to be considered. He asked that this be removed from Exhibit C, in the second column under Step 3. Mr. Cotugno said that the motion on the table now was to adopt the TPAC recommendation, and that recommendation was to retain the current point value split. Mr. Cotugno quoted Mr. Mike Hoglund, who said Exhibit C would be corrected, depending on the outcome of the vote.

Mr. Hansen, referring to p. 4 of the staff report regarding *Freeway Projects* in the italicized language which was the TPAC recommendation, said his understanding from what Commissioners Rogers and Kennemer had said earlier, was of the projects that are the ones at issue, which are Sunset Highway 26 and the Sunrise Corridor, that these are what the two Commissioners want to be able to put forward in this process as covered in the freeway-related PE. He asked them if his understanding was correct. Commissioner Rogers replied, yes, that they want to be able to advance PE, that was correct, and the interchange and land construction projects, as it reads. Mr. Hansen said the work they were looking for was covered under the freeway-related PE; Commissioner Rogers agreed, no question. Mr. Hansen then went on to express his issue and why Tri-Met's TPAC representative voted no on this, which was the issue of adding lane construction may or may not be a good idea but he thought it was a significant policy shift around this table, and that he needed more debate on this. As long as there are no projects that are coming forward that need that language, he said he would prefer, and would therefore offer an amendment to delete, to have a broader discussion before this committee took action on adding lane construction. That was what Tri-Met's vote at TPAC represented. This was a big issue. This would then make the TPAC amendment read, "*Permit submission of freeway-related PE, and interchange-and-lane-construction projects by local governments as one of their few allowed add projects in the allocation process.*" Mr. Hansen said the two issues at hand here were covered under freeway-related PE. He said he expected that there would be a process that would bring this back for further JPACT debate about whether they could take a small regional pot of money and go to areas they haven't been before and ask for these large construction projects. He said this would allow PE for lane construction.

Action taken: Mr. Hansen moved, with a second by Councilor Rohde, that lane construction be removed, as stated above (italics).

Mayor Drake asked, using the Sunset at Camelot as an example of an overall plan for Westside light rail and other projects, how Mr. Hansen's amendment would affect that. Mr. Hansen said he wasn't sure because his understanding was that it would be covered under the PE for freeway-related or under the interchange construction language. He asked Mr. Cotugno if he was correct; Mr. Cotugno said there were about eight phases of Sunset Highway-related construction, about five of which have been funded through ODOT's program. To take out lane construction would not advance any more of those construction projects through this program. Camelot was programmed out ten to twelve years, per Ms. Van Sickel. She said this proposed amendment wouldn't affect ODOT's program, as she understood it, just the pot of MTIP dollars being

addressed today. Dave Williams added that Washington County should not have a problem with their projects; Mr. Hansen's amendment simply stated that MTIP money will not be programmed for fiscal years 2004 and 2005 for freeway lane construction. The Washington County projects cannot move before 2006, so they can come back to the next MTIP if they need to make that project whole, but MTIP money for freeway lane construction (not PE) will not be funded for the next two years.

Mr. Hansen said he wanted it clear that his amendment needed to come back to this body as a policy debate.

The vote on Mr. Hansen's amendment to delete "and lane" passed unanimously.

Mr. Ginsburg asked for clarification that Exhibit A would be the criteria used in nomination, ranking and selecting, and all the items in the TPAC recommendation that are in the staff report need to be in a new Exhibit which would be the criteria for proposing projects. Chair Monroe concurred. Mr. Ginsburg asked what the difference was. Chair Monroe said nominating and proposing were synonymous and Mr. Ginsburg then suggested removing the word "nomination" from Exhibit A. It was agreed to delete the word as a technical change, with no motion required.

Action taken: The motion to approve Resolution Ref. No. 1487, with the TPAC recommendations and the above amendments, passed unanimously.

BI-STATE TRANSPORTATION MEETING WITH STATE LEGISLATORS

Chair Monroe, as Chair of the Bi-State Committee, briefed JPACT on the Bi-State Committee action of scheduling meetings with legislators, especially transportation leaders, from Olympia and Salem, to meet with the Bi-State Committee members in the next two months to discuss regional transportation priorities, specifically dredging of the Columbia River, high-speed rail, the I-5 Corridor, etc. The Southwest Washington RTC has approved this proposal and the Bi-State Committee is asking that JPACT also approve it.

Councilor Rohde, referring to a previous vote on expanding the powers of the Bi-State Committee, asked if this was appropriate. Chair Monroe said that was why JPACT was being asked to anoint this project. Councilor Rohde said he understood that and he was willing to approve, as long as there was some assurance that JPACT have a review process of what they are doing. Chair Monroe said this would have been brought before this committee in December, but that meeting was canceled. He added that there needs to be more communication between the Oregon and Washington key legislators and transportation leadership. Mayor Drake said he supported any effort toward understanding between the two states and their elected officials and he encouraged others to give their support. Councilor Rohde asked what the process was for JPACT review; Chair Monroe said he regularly reported, together with Commissioner Pridemore who was the Vice-Chair of the Bi-State Committee, the actions of that committee, and any recommendations and/or action from that committee comes before this body automatically for approval.

Action taken: Mayor Drake moved, with a second from Councilor Rohde, to approve the Bi-State Committee scheduling the bi-state transportation meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

ELDERLY AND DISABLED TRANSIT UPDATE – PROGRAM PROPOSALS; LETTER OF SUPPORT TO OREGON LEGISLATURE

Due to time constraints, this agenda item was deferred to the February meeting.

FEDERAL PRIORITIES POSITION PAPER

Mr. Cotugno asked the committee to review the January 11, 2001, draft of the federal priorities position paper as it would be up for approval next month. The lobbying trip was scheduled for March 6 – 8, so this was time sensitive. Also, the March JPACT meeting would be scheduled for March 15th rather than March 8th.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:42 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rooney Barker
Recording Secretary

I:\trans\transadm\staff\barker\jpact\2001\1-18-01\Final Meeting Notes.doc