

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: October 19, 2000

GROUP/SUBJECT: Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jon Kvistad, Chair
Serena Cruz, alternate
Rob Drake
Charlie Hales
Fred Hansen
Bill Kennemer
Jim Kight
Mary Legry
Annette Liebe, alternate
Dave Lohman
Rod Monroe
Royce Pollard
Craig Pridemore
Karl Rohde
Roy Rogers
Kay Van Sickel
Ed Washington

AFFILIATION:

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

GUESTS PRESENT:

Martha Bennett
Gary Katsion
Stephan Lashbrook
Dean Lookingbill
Tom Markgraf
Tony Mendoza
Ron Papsdorf
Thayer Rorabaugh
Karen Schilling
Phil Selinger
Dave Williams
Ross Williams

AFFILIATION:

City of Milwaukie
TPAC Citizen Member
City of Wilsonville
Clark County
Congressman Earl Blumenauer's Office
Tri-Met
City of Gresham
City of Vancouver
Multnomah County
Tri-Met
ODOT
Citizens for Sensible Transportation/CLF

STAFF:

Andy Cotugno
Mike Hoglund

Richard Brandman
Chris Deffebach

John Houser
Rooney Barker

SUMMARY:

The meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Chair Kvistad at 7:41 a.m.

MEETING REPORT:

Action taken: Fred Hansen moved, with a second by Commissioner Kennemer, to approve the minutes of the September 19, 2000, meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 00-2990 – FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING AMENDMENTS TO THE FY 2001 UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM

Referring to the buff colored staff report and resolution, included in the agenda packet, Mr. Cotugno outlined the proposed amendments to the Unified Work Program (UWP). The salmon colored sheet, distributed at this meeting, Highway 217 Corridor Study, was an amendment replacing the buff colored sheet of the same name. These proposed amendments, Mr. Cotugno said, reflected the shift in direction for this fiscal year, in particular recognizing some additional requirements that have to be met relating to Environmental Justice under the new federal Planning Regulations, specifically participating in Tri-Met's Elderly and Disabled Service plan, Metro's participation with Clackamas County, Portland, Damascus/Pleasant Valley planning area for the urban growth expansion, and Metro's participation with ODOT in the I-5 Trade Corridor study.

The most significant change in the UWP is to incorporate activity necessary for RTP business outreach. That direction was set when the RTP was adopted, and wasn't included in the UWP because the RTP was adopted after the UWP. This adds the resources necessary to support that. Dick Reiten's Transportation Summit 2000 group also set that as one of their priorities, he added.

Finally, Mr. Cotugno said, this resolution would accomplish putting off initiation of the Highway 217 Corridor Study that was included in the budget as there do not appear to be the resources for it at this point. Instead, it is proposed to develop an overall program for how corridor studies are initiated. This new program would study such things as what's next, which are the corridor studies that need attention, and what should be the framework for how to do this, how to fund recommended strategies, what kinds of alternatives and issues will also need to be addressed.

The buff material included in the agenda packet showed the Highway 217 Corridor Study as being delayed and substituted with the broader Corridor Initiatives Program. The amendment deletes the FY 2001 funding on the Highway 217 project. Highway 217 is a corridor study that needs to be addressed, pending availability of funding in the future, and it may be something this committee may want to restore in the future.

Mayor Drake asked Mr. Cotugno if he knew when the Highway 217 Corridor Study might happen, adding that Highway 217 was a disaster and, speaking for the cities of Washington County, he said it was certainly a priority. Mr. Cotugno said he couldn't answer the question

because the desire was not the issue, the study funding was, and he couldn't predict when funding would be available. Mayor Drake said that while he understood that, there is so much congestion on Highway 217 that this clogged artery badly needed bypass surgery. He stressed that he would continue to bring this up because it needed to be done. Mr. Cotugno agreed, saying that was the tenor of the proposed amendment, that the project would not be gone but that these issues would be tackled and the funding determined when and if it comes back.

Mr. Hansen pointed out the last sentence of the first paragraph of the amendment, "The study will be reconsidered for funding in the FY 2002 UWP." He said this would formally force the issue to once again be addressed, although it did not guarantee that the funding would be there.

Commissioner Kennemer reminded the committee that the I-205 Corridor was another important corridor in the same position. Mr. Cotugno said that was why the Corridors Initiatives Program has been proposed, to know how to approach priorities as they vary, and to look at funding strategies as well. He agreed with Commissioner Kennemer that the I-205 Corridor was another important corridor issue.

Councilor Rohde said his only experience with corridor planning was when Highway 43 was done, around six years ago, and said he believed the study was gathering dust at ODOT, so he found the process of corridor studies suspect and said he questioned the reasoning of pumping more money into them. Mr. Cotugno said that's was a fundamental issue for ODOT. Why spend the money to generate projects that you don't have the funds to build, he asked. Councilor Rohde then asked if this wasn't spending more on studies that absolutely accomplish nothing. The program was intended, Mr. Cotugno replied, to provide the framework for how to approach planning these corridors and how to find financing for them. Highway 43 didn't have a financing plan with it, he said. It had a project, that was it. Councilor Rohde asked what percentage of corridor studies had financing plans attached to them; Mr. Cotugno replied that all the major transit corridor studies do and all future corridors will.

Councilor Rohde then asked about the Other Projects of Regional Significance amendment. Mr. Cotugno replied that two years ago, when MTIP funds were allocated across a variety of different projects, at that time funds were allocated to Clackamas and Washington counties to develop their master plans for ITS. This body has already made the commitment for funding these projects; this simply incorporates that into the UWP so that the dollars can flow to those jurisdictions.

On the RTP Business Partnerships amendment, Councilor Rohde asked if public outreach was actively ignoring the business community. His concern was that another \$164,000 was being requested to be spent toward something he felt had been done already. Mr. Cotugno responded that the resolution coming out of the RTP adoption directed Metro to be proactive, to go out and solicit that kind of participation and these funds are to do that. That takes time and energy to do that. His sense from the Transportation Summit 2000 meeting last week was that that it could be done. The business community sounded energized, he thought, in providing the jurisdictions with that forum, but staff still needs funding to operate. Councilor Rohde said that the business

community was now aware of the fact that the Regional Transportation Plan has an affect on them, and that Clackamas County was working to organize their business community as Washington County had done such a fine job of doing.

Mayor Drake responded that Metro came up with a good plan recently to engage the business community in the RTP process, and agreed that at the Transportation Summit 2000 last week that the business community was certainly engaged. He said he thought this has been dealt with and believed this was headed in the right direction.

Commissioner Hales said Councilor Rohde's questions raised a larger issue that this committee hasn't spent any time on and that he had no understanding of how we, in our overall transportation appropriations framework, acknowledge the constrained reality and deal with the size of the overhead. He said he didn't know the answer to that question. The City of Portland struggled with that issue at PDOT and has only partially succeeded in compressing the overhead portion of spending to reflect the fact that there isn't as much money to put into asphalt, curbs and sidewalks. It's very difficult to do because it means people and positions and momentum. He said he didn't have a good feeling, regionally, for this process or for ODOT's Region One overhead. He said he doesn't know the extent to which the funding reality to the size of the overhead has been acknowledged, and that it's a huge, ugly issue. Councilor Rohde's question on this particular expenditure raised that point. After all the years he's been on JPACT, Commissioner Hales said, he still didn't have a good sense of how much of overall spending goes into research, process and staff vs. construction, project management, PE. He said he should know, he should have asked, and that he would not be able to answer a citizen's question about whether we're being business-like in cutting management and overhead first before we cut on actual transportation, maintenance and construction.

Dave Lohman interjected that recently, in a conversation about TDM measures with some CEOs – one from Washington County and two from Multnomah County – who complained about not being able to get data from Metro staff, not because the staff was unwilling but because they didn't have the time to put into it. There's the opportunity now, with the business community showing some real interest, to be able to respond. He said he feared if JPACT didn't respond, it would look as if they had on blinders and didn't care what anyone else thought.

Action taken: Councilor Monroe moved, with a second by Mayor Drake, approval of the Highway 217 Corridor Study amendment. The motion passed, with a no vote from Councilor Rohde.

In discussion of the resolution, Mr. Hansen asked if Mr. Cotugno or his staff could display for the committee in easily understood terms what level of work is put into design on projects, broken down by those already funded or identified in the RTP. He suggested something that would give a perspective on how much is being spent vs. where the project is in the pipeline. Mr. Cotugno said he will provide what he can.

Mr. Hansen said that would be helpful as he found it implicit in the point Councilor Rohde was raising. Councilor Rohde said he was so concerned about some of the proposed amendments and the dollar amounts because he was dealing with quite a few small, basic projects in his own jurisdiction, and yet there's a proposal on this table for \$166,000 for an outreach program to the business community. He said he thought Metro had some of the finest outreach programs in terms of producing good product of any jurisdiction in the region, and that was why he could not support the amendments.

Mr. Lohman said if Mr. Cotugno would provide the requested information, it would be helpful to answer people's questions about how much "real work" gets done. He said he also pushes back when questions like that are asked. There seemed to be a growing assumption that a road project was built by getting out the paver; planning is part of a project and you can't do it without that. There seem to be a lot of people who think every transportation dollar has to go into asphalt or you're wasting their money. People need to be educated about planning. This body needs to make sure there are better alternatives.

Mayor Drake said he was concerned about this committee micromanaging individual city's and county's projects. He said some of the jurisdictions will spend more money in one area than others. Beaverton spends a great deal of money to involve its citizens, and it seems Beaverton's consultant budget at times is higher than it should be because a neighborhood wants more input or wants to handcraft a project. In the end, he felt they got a better project that way. He may spend more money on citizen involvement than another jurisdiction, but it's an individual choice for the jurisdictions; his citizens are his customers and he has to listen to them. Just like this committee reaching out to the business community, whether they were there or not over the last five or ten years, the point is, they're here now. Is it a good expenditure or a bad expenditure, he posed. So far, we haven't succeeded well in getting a funding package through the legislature without a great deal of pain and misery, and the citizens haven't voted for any funding either. If we're not engaging the business community, we need to be very careful about how we micromanage some of these projects. Mayor Drake said we still have autonomy as agencies and as cities and counties, and he doesn't want to lose that.

Commissioner Hales said, if he heard Councilor Rohde correctly, that the Councilor's concern was whether this body was spinning its wheels on planning projects that aren't built or reaching out to people we're already talking to. Councilor Hales reiterated his own point, made earlier, where the City of Portland just spent a year-and-a-half dismantling financially and trying to understand their local improvement district (LID) process. The projects were getting so expensive that they were failing in Council because the citizens who were petitioning to build the LID were running into resistance from other citizens on their street who simply couldn't afford the cost. The City discovered they were spending too much on engineering and overhead on those projects. There were other issues, like street standards and drainage standards, that they had to struggle with, but they discovered that a major ingredient in the inflated and therefore unacceptable cost of those projects was overhead. They would not have done that exercise and found that overhead problem if they hadn't run into a brick wall with their citizens. Because bureaucratic inertia and avoidance of pain being what they are, they wouldn't have looked at the

issue. When they did, it was because they had to. The point he was raising, he said, was not to make accusation of City of Portland efficiency over any other jurisdiction, or to say let Metro do everything, but as a transportation policy maker he was saying he didn't know. He said, and he suspected there were others at the table who could make the same confession, that he could not answer a citizen's question about what's been done to the rest of the transportation spending system about how much is spent on overhead and engineering, whether a project is over-engineered or over-processed, therefore raising the cost by 30% and therefore reducing the expenditure efficiency of their scarce gas tax dollars by 30%. This is why the gas tax failed, he said. Voters don't have a strong belief that government is efficient.

Mr. Hansen said his request of Mr. Cotugno was a narrow one. It's a first step toward another direction in being able to have a sense, on a project basis, of what do we spend on projects that are realistically in the pipeline vs. those which really aren't, and get a general feel so we'd know where that was. He hoped it wouldn't be a big project for staff, just a fairly rough cut to give JPACT some perspective on it. Then the committee can decide if they want to have additional study on it.

Chair Kvistad said it sounded like two separate issues were being discussed, so he said he and Mr. Cotugno would see what they could do to get the basic framework of that for next month's meeting, and then the committee could discuss it next month. He asked for the discussion to the resolution before them.

Councilor Rohde said part of this committee's responsibility was to look at the package as a number of elements, and he supported the vast majority of the elements in this resolution. He said he could probably be persuaded to support the Corridors Initiatives Program but if it meant he would have to support the RTP Business Partnerships Program when Metro already does an enormous job of addressing public outreach, then he could not support the entire package.

Action taken: Councilor Monroe moved, with a second by Commissioner Rogers, to move the approval of Resolution No. 00-2990, including the above-approved amendment.

Councilor Monroe said this was a balanced package. The money Metro was going to contribute to the Highway 217 Corridor study was not adequate since ODOT made the decision not to contribute to it, leaving the study with inadequate funding. The money from that was now proposed to be spent in the UWP amendments in the resolution. No additional dollars were added, the funding on the project that was not being used was being delineated out and reworked. To take something out of this package would put it out of balance and it would then need to be reworked. JPACT can either move the package as it is or they need to move it back to staff or to the Metro Council with specific recommendations to change it so that it still balances.

Friendly amendment motion: Councilor Rohde moved a friendly amendment to the motion on the floor, with a second by Commissioner Cruz, to allow the RTP Business Partnerships Program (from Exhibit A to Resolution No. 00-2990) to be withheld until it could be discussed at next month's meeting.

Commissioner Rogers said he understood that Lake Oswego and Clackamas County were doing great outreach now, that Washington County had been involved for some time, and commended Dick Reiten's group for engaging the business community. He said Washington County understands they have to put some investment money, although he preferred to think of it as study money, into the future for collaboration and on how to resolve issues we're all facing. If all the jurisdictions took their cut of the federal money and went home, they would talk to each other sparingly and do their work in their own way. As Mayor Drake said, he commented, it's difficult to understand sometimes when we cross borders why you all do what you do and you probably have the same feeling about what we do. Councilor Monroe's comments about the \$166,000 being a balanced program would allow us to continue on, and would be an investment. This was a way of looking at what the alternatives are going to do in the various corridors, and how to be engaged in the process. Commissioner Rogers said he didn't want to go back to his county to say JPACT is reevaluating this. We're all having problems with the overhead rates and that is an issue. He said he hoped that this body would not consider not engaging the business community, that they are a vital part of this community. It's not that they weren't paying attention; they anticipated that the government could get the job done, and unfortunately in today's climate, we can't, so they're stepping back in to be our partners. They're putting their shoulder to the wheel.

Commissioner Kennemer said there were some good questions being asked today. One issue that he wanted to bring forward was that Clackamas County was making the effort to work with their business community in new and more strategic ways. Clackamas County faces issues well beyond transportation although transportation is fundamental to what's going to happen with urban growth expansion and jobs/housing balance. Part of their thinking has been that some of the outstanding things that Washington County has achieved has been through their business alliance. Clackamas County believes the business community needs to be at the table, it's entirely appropriate, essential, and he said they will have a big impact. He would like to move ahead, and supports the entire package.

Councilor Monroe said one of the advantages of being in this area was the active, progressive business leadership, particularly apparent in Multnomah County. Because of that, there is a successful transit project being built; without that strong, progressive leadership that project would be dead. Like support, activism and leadership was needed from the business community in all four counties of this region – Washington County, Clackamas County, and Clark County as well as Multnomah County – if there was going to be any chance at all of finding solutions to the region's transportation needs. This is absolutely critical. Government alone cannot do it, he said. This relatively small amount of money to keep the faith with the Washington County business leadership is a good investment. To pull this money at this time sends the wrong message, and they will step back from what we're trying to accomplish.

Councilor Rohde said his proposal was not to remove the Corridor Initiatives Program; his proposal was to remove the RTP Business Partnerships issue. Washington County's business community, Clackamas County and its business community, and Multnomah County with their

already active business community leading to the successful transit project going forward, were his point, that point being that it was already happening and it was unnecessary to fund something that's happening.

Mr. Hansen said he was sympathetic to Councilor Rohde's motion in that if you snooze, you lose. However, in the long run, he said he's more interested in getting the success we all want. Whether it should be necessary or not could be debated, but he said he believed it was an investment that would get the region to the long-term goal that he believed this committee wanted. Therefore, he would be an opponent and a no vote on the Councilor's motion, although he was sympathetic to the issue.

Commissioner Cruz said she would support the amendment, not because she didn't hear every argument about why business partnerships are important and critical. The Governor's task force on the I-5 Trade Corridor has made it completely clear why these partnerships are critical in addition to the partnerships with the rest of the people in the community if we're going to be successful in actually getting the funding and getting all the pieces together to make these projects successful and to move them from planning into implementation. She said there's no argument about whether or not these partnerships are critical, but questioned why we would separate out and fund specifically 1.3 FTE in order to build those partnership when, presumably, those partnerships ought to be integrated fully in all the different things we're doing. She also said she wasn't sure why this model was put forth as the best model for building partnerships. Why wouldn't they promote having businesses, two or three from the different counties, as ex officio members of JPACT as a part of integrating them into the process, she asked. If you segment them and have a separate business partnership track, what you're doing is creating people who, in fact, aren't actually engaged in the entire process, who aren't actually engaged in seeing the complete weighing and balancing that goes on in JPACT, who are only seeing their issues and are going, then, to be very tied to those issues and will then come to JPACT with those issues that are going to have to be granted, some of them without having had input and process. That's not real partnership, in her view. When there are other transportation efforts, regional transportation efforts that seem far more important, she had a difficult time seeing \$166,000 going toward this. Not that the business partnerships weren't important, but that they can be accomplished in a more integrated fashion and much more connected. Resources shouldn't be spent on this, she concluded.

Action taken: Those voting in favor of Councilor Rohde's friendly amendment to allow the RTP Business Partnerships Program to be withheld from the Resolution No. 00-2990 package until it could be discussed at next month's meeting – Charlie Hales, Carl Rohde, Serena Cruz, Annette Liebe (4).

Those opposed: Jon Kvistad, Rod Monroe, Bill Kennemer, Rob Drake, Fred Hansen, Craig Pridemore, Mary Legry, Royce Pollard, Kay Van Sickel, Jim Kight, Ed Washington, Dave Lohman, Roy Rogers (13).

The motion failed.

Action taken: Those voting in favor of Resolution No. 00-2990, as a package, and including the Highway 217 Corridor Study amendment: Jon Kvistad, Rod Monroe, Bill Kennemer, Rob Drake, Fred Hansen, Craig Pridemore, Mary Legry, Royce Pollard, Kay Van Sickel, Jim Kight, Ed Washington, Dave Lohman, Roy Rogers, Charlie Hales, Annette Liebe (15).

Those opposed: Karl Rohde, Serena Cruz (2).

The motion passed.

RESOLUTION NO. 00-2994 – FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) TO INCLUDE \$370,000 OF STATE TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT FUNDS FOR THE LINNTON GATEWAY PROJECT

Mr. Cotugno called the committee's attention to the pink staff report and resolution, and gave them a briefing on the background of the enhancement funds, as explained in the staff report. These funds are not available to spend on construction of transportation projects other than bike and pedestrian projects, but are intended for enhancement projects. This particular proposal deals with a section of US 30, north of the St. Johns bridge, through the community of Linnton to provide some treatment to slow traffic down to at least the speed limit and to provide sidewalk and crosswalk locations. He said a RESOLVE needed to be added to the resolution to amend the RTP with the MTIP, and before this is submitted for approval the air quality determination needs to be incorporated into it as well. That will be submitted separately. Annette Liebe said she would prefer that the air quality conformity issue be included in the RESOLVE amendment.

Mr. Cotugno stated the amendment earlier proposed to add to the resolution: RESOLVED, The 1995 Interim Federal RTP (adopted) and 2000 RTP (adopted and pending a federal air quality conformity determination) are amended to include the Portland Gateway Project in Linnton; and to also add to the current RESOLVED, Metro Staff is authorized to coordinate programming of the funds with respect to work phase, obligation date, and air quality conformity.

Action taken: Councilor Washington moved, with a second by Annette Liebe, to approve with the above amendment, Resolution No. 00-2994.

Councilor Rohde asked who was championing this project and where else might the funds be used on the large list of projects of a few months ago. Kay Van Sickel responded that this was grant money, that there had been a competitive process and Linnton ranked highest in the statewide ranking, so they were selected. Dave Williams of ODOT interjected that if JPACT didn't want to do this project, the dollars would be given to another state project. Councilor Rohde asked what, if anything, JPACT had to do with in the statewide ranking as far as involvement in reviewing which projects were competing for these funds. Ms. Van Sickel said this was a separate ranking process for ODOT and that she'd be willing to share that information if the Councilor would like to see it. She mentioned projects throughout the state. Chair Kvistad

said \$70,000 of this project comes from Metro's Enhancement Grant program which was money from transfer station revenue, and was not money that would be allocated elsewhere. Councilor Rohde said he wondered why JPACT was being asked to approve funding for a project when they weren't involved in any way in reviewing the project competition. Chair Kvistad said it's just a request to add it to the MTIP, that JPACT is not being asked to review the project.

Mr. Cotugno said JPACT must approve all federally funded transportation projects to incorporate them into the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program. However, he said, the funding that encompasses all federally funded transportation projects really fits into three categories: 1) there's the money that Congress says goes to transit, and the Tri-Met Board proposes how to spend that money, and JPACT must agree and incorporate it into the MTIP. 2) There's other money that goes to ODOT, and the Oregon Transportation Commission has the prerogative of deciding where that money goes, and they can choose to spend it on half a dozen projects in this region or elsewhere in the state, but JPACT has to accept or reject those projects. 3) Then there's a portion in the middle that is regional-flexible funds where JPACT has to decide where to spend that money, and that's the STP, CMAQ, and Enhancement, and JPACT went through that process last year. That's a separate agenda item for today, for that process and schedule for the next time. JPACT has full discretion on that middle portion of money, they have an agree or disagree roll on the other two portions. This resolution was one that fit into the agree or disagree roll. You can reject it and send it back, but you can't reallocate it to another source.

Thanking Mr. Cotugno for the explanation, Councilor Rohde said this went back to the issue of explaining to a citizen of where the money is spent and why.

Councilor Washington said he'd spent time over the years in Linnton and appreciated the difficulties they face there with Highway 30. This was a long overdue project, and anything this committee could do to help alleviate the traffic problem in this community would be greatly appreciated.

Vote: The motion to approve Resolution No. 00-1994, including the WHEREAS amendment as stated above, passed unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 00-2991 – FOR THE PURPOSE OF MODIFYING THE EXISTING INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT SPECIFYING ROLLS AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR THE BI-STATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Chris Deffebach briefed the committee on Resolution 00-2991. After one year of meeting, she said, the Bi-State Transportation Committee recommended for approval a few changes to their Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) to keep it more in line with the way they have been operating. The three changes would clarify that the Bi-State Transportation Committee may select items for consideration, that the IGA name the agencies that will serve on the committee, and finally that the IGA will state that the Bi-State Transportation Committee shall alert JPACT and the RTC Board on issues of bi-state significance when issues arise, such as the I-5 HOV lanes, instead of on a semi-annual basis. She explained that this would mainly clean up the IGA.

Action taken: Council Monroe moved, with a second by Commissioner Pridemore, to approve Resolution No. 00-2991.

In discussion, Chair Kvistad said the only area of concern to him would be having the Bi-State Transportation Committee putting items on the table at this committee and setting a different agenda could possibly pose a problem, but his concern wasn't enough to make an issue of it. Councilor Monroe said the IGA that created the Bi-State Transportation Committee said that all transportation issues before JPACT or that affect the region in the corridor said they must go before the Bi-State Transportation Committee. It was moot on the question of whether or not members of the Bi-State Transportation Committee could bring forth other issues. This resolution and amendment to the IGA didn't change that, it just clarified. He also stated that almost all of the members of the Bi-State Transportation Committee were either members of JPACT or the RTC or both. He said he thought it very unlikely that issues would be brought to the Bi-State Transportation Committee that would be in conflict with the position of JPACT and/or the RTC since the membership was so overlapping. This amendment did not change the intent nor the purpose of the committee.

Vote: Those voting in favor of the motion to approve Resolution No. 00-2991 – Jon Kvistad, Rod Monroe, Bill Kennemer, Rob Drake, Craig Pridemore, Mary Legry, Royce Pollard, Kay Van Sickel, Jim Kight, Ed Washington, Dave Lohman, Roy Rogers, Charlie Hales, Annette Liebe (15).

Those voting against the motion – Fred Hansen, Karl Rohde (2).

The motion passed.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE BI-STATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

The Bi-State Transportation Committee First Annual Assessment memorandum, dated September 29, 2000, was included in the committee's agenda packet. Councilor Monroe said the most significant positive accomplishment of the committee was the HOV recommendation that has since been adopted by JPACT and the Southwest Washington RTC. The WSDOT moved forward quickly with a plan to add a southbound lane on I-5 through Vancouver. Since the policy is that a general purpose lane cannot be converted to an HOV lane, that an HOV lane must be an added lane, there was concern that the new lane being added be constructed as an HOV lane. The Bi-State Transportation Committee came forward with a policy, that JPACT adopted, that said the HOV lane northbound in Oregon should be made permanent (that action was taken by ODOT), that a new southbound lane being constructed in Vancouver be constructed as an HOV lane (this was happening), that ODOT and others be urged to study the possibility of building an HOV through Delta Park southbound in Oregon (and there's money to study that although no money yet for construction). The Bi-State Transportation Committee also recognized that the existing Interstate Bridge cannot accommodate HOVs, and they also recognized that HOVs northbound in Washington would not be effective nor needed at this time.

Action taken: Council Monroe moved, with a second by Commissioner Pridemore, to approve Resolution No. 00-2991.

In discussion, Chair Kvistad said the only area of concern to him would be having the Bi-State Transportation Committee putting items on the table at this committee and setting a different agenda could possibly pose a problem, but his concern wasn't enough to make an issue of it. Councilor Monroe said the IGA that created the Bi-State Transportation Committee said that all transportation issues before JPACT or that affect the region in the corridor said they must go before the Bi-State Transportation Committee. It was moot on the question of whether or not members of the Bi-State Transportation Committee could bring forth other issues. This resolution and amendment to the IGA didn't change that, it just clarified. He also stated that almost all of the members of the Bi-State Transportation Committee were either members of JPACT or the RTC or both. Councilor Rohde asked if they were being allowed to take on so much work that it would allow them to compete with JPACT. Councilor Monroe ~~He said he~~ thought it very unlikely that issues would be brought to the Bi-State Transportation Committee that would be in conflict with the position of JPACT and/or the RTC since the membership was so overlapping. This amendment did not change the intent nor the purpose of the committee.

Vote: Those voting in favor of the motion to approve Resolution No. 00-2991 – Jon Kvistad, Rod Monroe, Bill Kennemer, Rob Drake, Craig Pridemore, Mary Legry, Royce Pollard, Kay Van Sickel, Jim Kight, Ed Washington, Dave Lohman, Roy Rogers, Charlie Hales, Annette Liebe (15).

Those voting against the motion – Fred Hansen, Karl Rohde (2).

The motion passed.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE BI-STATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

The Bi-State Transportation Committee First Annual Assessment memorandum, dated September 29, 2000, was included in the committee's agenda packet. Councilor Monroe said the most significant positive accomplishment of the committee was the HOV recommendation that has since been adopted by JPACT and the Southwest Washington RTC. The WSDOT moved forward quickly with a plan to add a southbound lane on I-5 through Vancouver. Since the policy is that a general purpose lane cannot be converted to an HOV lane, that an HOV lane must be an added lane, there was concern that the new lane being added be constructed as an HOV lane. The Bi-State Transportation Committee came forward with a policy, that JPACT adopted, that said the HOV lane northbound in Oregon should be made permanent (that action was taken by ODOT), that a new southbound lane being constructed in Vancouver be constructed as an HOV lane (this was happening), that ODOT and others be urged to study the possibility of building an HOV through Delta Park southbound in Oregon (and there's money to study that although no money yet for construction). The Bi-State Transportation Committee also recognized that the existing Interstate Bridge cannot accommodate HOVs, and they also recognized that HOVs northbound in Washington would not be effective nor needed at this time.

These accomplishments were significant. The committee was now moving forward with looking at a better way to get across the Columbia River and there was a freight corridor study going on as a major part of that. There has also been discussion on land use differences on the two sides of the river, and much discussion on the interplay of land use and transportation; that's been critical. They've also talked about jobs/housing balance and ways of encouraging more jobs development on the north side of the Columbia. All of the transportation issues that affect both sides of the river are being discussed. Councilor Monroe said he felt the committee had had a good year and would continue to report to JPACT not only on an annual basis but when any issue of significance comes forward.

Commissioner Pridemore seconded Councilor Monroe's comments, and agreed with him that this was a great opportunity for the region to talk about issues of bi-state concern and this was a good forum to do that. He made the observation that if Charlie Hales, Serena Cruz, Kay Van Sickle, Royce Pollard, Craig Pridemore, Don Wagner, Dave Lohman, Fred Hansen, and Rod Monroe wanted to pump themselves up at JPACT, they probably could do that without the Bi-State Transportation Committee.

FY 2002-2005 JOINT STATE/METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PROCESS AND SCHEDULE

Mr. Cotugno said it was time to start the next cycle of funding allocation systems, and this was the middle category he spoke of earlier where JPACT has discretion, where there was a fair amount of flexibility of how these funds can be spent. However, he said, the last time JPACT went through this process they had the luxury of about \$75 million to allocate; this time they're limited to more like \$20 million to allocate. Last time there was a windfall out of the updated TEA-21, and the amounts received were higher than forecasted. A portion of that previous funding was already committed to the Interstate MAX project, \$12 million, so the remaining dollars clearly are limited. The process followed last time was one where this committee first set a criteria tailored to the different modes – boulevard projects, bike projects, road expansion projects, bridge projects, etc. The criteria essentially were defined to include 2040 components emphasizing regional centers, town centers, and industrial areas, in particular, as well as transportation components emphasizing measures of cost effectiveness, measures of safety and measures of overall demand being served. In the past, the criteria was decided, the projects were solicited for proposals, and then an application process was opened. Once those applications were received, there was a ranking. He said he didn't think it a good idea to open up a large application process for this small amount of money. He asked for input on how to structure a process more focused and tailored to this small amount of money, recognizing that the last allocation process started with a list that was about three times the resources available. That list was cut down to about one-and-one-half times the resources available, and then cut down to 100%. Left on the table, at two different cut points, were a lot of projects that were proposals within the last eighteen months that could be the basis for revisiting. The tan colored informational pages stated the options for the committee's consideration. Mr. Cotugno asked for some feedback, ideas, suggestions, etc., so a recommendation could be crafted, and then that recommendation brought back for adoption next month. A public hearing would be held on that

adoption. Input from this committee could mean emphasizing certain kinds of projects, or it could mean changing criteria, emphasizing certain kinds of factors, whatever. Pages 2 and 3 of the informational packet outlined some of the issues and options to serve as a basis for the committee's feedback. Number 1 on page 2 suggested that there were certain things that have received annual allocations in the past; the suggestion here was that those programs be reevaluated to determine if and how much continued annual allocation should be provided. Not that this would be a commitment of these amounts, he said, but that it would be a start to evaluate these programs to determine if a continued allocation should be given there, and then move on to determine whether individual projects should be funded.

He pointed out, on p. 3, the proposed alternatives for how to tackle the issue of what individual projects would be considered, first going back to the cut list that wasn't funded last time, and then another suggestion that the dollars not be spread around on a lot of little projects but to a few big projects. The next suggestion, on p. 4, was to make sure that projects that were funded actually be completely funded because there are a variety of projects with only partial funding. The last suggested alternative was to recognize that the number being worked with is so small, there are already three years' worth of projects in the pipeline, so he cautioned not to allocate money for projects that will come in the third and fourth year. Wait to allocate funds for those projects until after the three years' worth of projects have been developed, he said, or until it's known that they can actually be done.

Those are different approaches, he said, and asked for feedback today in order to prepare a proposal for adoption for next month's meeting.

Mayor Drake agreed that the ongoing programs should continue to be funded. He said he looked at all the work, at the commitments that had been made – Transit Choices for Livability, TDM grant programs, TOD revolving loan fund, the annual transit service increase, etc. – the ongoing programs that have been invested in and should be continued. Beyond that, he cautioned prudence with the remainder of the money, perhaps going with existing programs so as to not try to carve the funding up for such a small amount, or just holding onto the money and/or going with a few of the 150% cut list projects.

Mr. Hansen agreed with Mayor Drake, adding that he wanted to mention the TMAs as another funding commitment. He said he thought the outline shown was appropriate, perhaps with some slight modifications. If a new project were to come in to be considered, maybe we ought not to close the door and say we can't consider anything that's not on the 150% list but it would need to go through some process. While he's not opposed to the delay, as in (d), at this stage, he would propose JPACT look at (1), building from the 150% list.

When this committee dealt with this the last time, Councilor Rohde said, he'd argued stridently for the need to fund those non-modernization, non-road projects because of being hamstrung by state law on spending all other transportation dollars on road projects and modernization projects. Ultimately, though, he said he supported the MTIP because before that he had supported the criteria that was used to develop the project list for it and he had agreed that the criteria seemed

appropriate. When he saw the result of what had come out of the criteria he had approved, it was not what he had expected or wanted. Although he agreed totally with not reopening the process now to all comers on transportation projects, he would like to see a review of the criteria so that the \$19 million available now would be used towards those projects that state law doesn't allow.

Commissioner Hales agreed with Mr. Hansen and Councilor Rohde regarding the existing programs. His thought was that any rethinking of the process should be as little as possible. He said to keep the existing programs, go back to the perfectly valid process used the first time, do not reinvent the wheel for \$19 million.

At the request of Mr. Lohman, Mr. Cotugno clarified that in the last MTIP process, this committee said they wanted to consciously fund projects across a wide range of different categories, they consciously wanted to do bike projects, pedestrian projects, TDM projects, boulevard projects, etc., and made sure they had those projects and had them throughout the region. The effect of that was there are a lot of smaller projects, now. If you are the recipient of one big project, you may think that's a good idea. If you're the loser of one big project, you'd have rather gotten one small project than nothing at all. The effect was that it did get spread around a lot, but this committee consciously wanted to do that in all those different categories, and not emphasize a single mode category.

Commissioner Kennemer concurred that the money was very limited as to where it can be spent. Since it's not very discretionary, he agreed with Commissioner Hales that if it's not broken, don't fix it. Another point he wanted to make, relating to Councilor Rohde's comment about arterials, was that in Clackamas County's perspective things are getting a little more complicated in that there's increasingly a linkage between land use and transportation. He gave improvements on Sunnyside Road as an example – if urban reserves are put there, they'll be needing money for preliminary engineering from 122nd out to 172nd. It suddenly becomes a little more complicated than it has been, and that's a concern to Clackamas County. It does make sense, he added, that with the small pot of funds, a delay only makes matters worse.

Councilor Monroe said the Metro Transportation Planning Committee again reviewed this and had a recommendation that they came forward with, to continue the Ongoing Programs listed on p. 2 at an appropriate funding level, not necessarily the numbers listed there, but what it will take to meet the needs of this program. That'll take about half of the \$19 million; the other half the Transportation Planning Committee recommends would give priority to the Increased Program Funding (c. on p. 4), those programs that are already funded but where the funding may be inadequate – there's additional need there – and to the Priorities 2000 "150 Percent Cut List" (a. on p. 3) for those programs that did not get funded. The Transportation Planning Committee rejected the idea of just funding one or two big projects. He added that, if this was what happened, in selecting projects left over from the 150 Percent Cut List he agreed philosophically with Councilor Rohde, and cited a State of Washington proposed ballot measure that would restrict their highway funds to 90% being used for pavement and only 10% being used for other needs. Oregon's highway fund is restricted to 100% pavement, 0% for other needs, so when

there's discretionary federal money like this, he feels JPACT needs to give priority to the other kinds of alternative transportation needs, since 100% of the highway fund must be used for pavement.

Responding to a question from Mr. Hansen regarding the table on Attachment 3, Mr. Cotugno said in the past process, using the criteria Councilor Rohde referred to, the number on the left of the listed project was the order ranking. JPACT didn't rank between those categories. Mr. Hansen said it seemed that was the issue before this committee today was that, as well as looking at this \$19 million, this group would have to decide between those categories. Mr. Cotugno said that was correct.

Chair Kvistad thanked the committee for the good feedback. He then asked Mr. Hansen if Tri-Met would please come back in November to brief the committee on the scheduled TDM Semi-Annual Report, as time was short. Mr. Hansen agreed.

Chair Kvistad then asked Mr. Hansen if he could give the committee a brief update on the light rail funding appropriation. Mr. Hansen said they received 50% more than from the House appropriation level, which he considered to be a wonderful success, \$7.5 million; they're now fully launched. The important part now, he said, was signing the full funding grant agreement which was is a federal IOU. Mr. Hansen said they were very pleased with what Senator Smith and the rest of the delegation were able to achieve. He added that the additional dollars transferred to the City of Milwaukie, an additional commitment by Tri-Met to meet their obligations for the South Corridor and Clackamas County, was another success.

Chair Kvistad mentioned the tentative JPACT schedule for 2001, distributed last month and this, and asked the members to add the dates to their calendars.

Mr. Lohman distributed an October 18, 2000, letter from Mike Thorne of the Port of Portland, regarding the status of and an update on the Columbia River channel deepening project, which is included a part of this record.

There being no further business, the committee adjourned at 9:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rooney Barker,
Recording Secretary