

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: December 9, 1999

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Chair Jon Kvistad, David Bragdon, Ed Washington, Metro Council; Bill Kennemer, Clackamas County; Rob Drake, Cities in Washington County; Kay Van Sickel, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT); Karl Rohde, Cities in Clackamas County; Roy Rogers, Washington County; Fred Hansen, Tri-Met; Charlie Hales, City of Portland; Sharron Kelley, Multnomah County; Craig Pridemore, Clark County; Andy Ginsburg, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) (alternate); Mary Legry, Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) (alternate); Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland (alternate); Jim Kight, Cities in Multnomah County; Royce Pollard, City of Vancouver.

Guests: Presiding Officer Rod Monroe, Bill Atherton, Metro Council; Rod Sandoz, John Rist, Clackamas County; Bob Stacey, Bernie Bottomly, Tri-Met; Mark Lear, City of Portland; Courtni Dresser, Washington Congressman Brian Bairds's Office; Glenn Schneider, WSDOT; Ron Bergman, Clark County; Dean Lookingbill, Southwest Washington RTC; Scott L. Rice, City of Cornelius; Karen Schilling, Multnomah County; Henry Hewitt, OTC Chair; Dave Williams and Kate Deane, ODOT; Kathy Lehtola, Washington County; Ted Spence, citizen and TPAC member; Lou Ogden, City of Tualatin; Paul Silver, City of Wilsonville; Martha Bennett, City of Milwaukie; Don Waggoner, Leopold and Stevens, Inc.; Betty Atteberry and Judy Edwards, Westside Economic Alliance; Beckie Lee, Multnomah County; Ross Williams, Citizens for Sensible Transportation; Chris Hagerbaumer, Oregon Environmental Council; Marc Zolton, City of Portland; Michael W. Schaufler, City of Happy Valley; Dick Feeney, Tri-Met.

STAFF: Andy Cotugno, Ted Leybold, Kim White; Mike Hoglund; Gina Whitehill-Baziuk; Richard Brandman, Rooney Barker.

MEDIA: Bill Stewart, The Oregonian; Tom Ryll, The Columbian.

SUMMARY:

The meeting was called to order and Chair Jon Kvistad declared a quorum.

MEETING REPORT:

The meeting report of November 18, 1999, was unanimously approved with one correction on page 4: Councilor Bragdon was in favor of Commissioner Jordan's proposed amendment to the congressional delegation letter, and did not support Mr. Feeney's statement to not change the draft letter.

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Andy Cotugno reminded the committee that the public comment period on the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is still open until December 16th. The comments listed in Exhibit B as *Part 1, JPACT Discussion Items* and *Part 2, JPACT Consent Items* reflect all the comments received through Thursday, December 2, 1999.

Tom Kloster then gave his presentation on the RTP, focusing on what's in the plan, the policy focus on 2040 and on trade, system performance relative to 2040-based congestion standards, alternative standards for some centers and corridors and non-single occupant vehicles (SOVs). The presentation also spoke to performance in special areas and non-SOV targets. Mr. Cotugno continued the presentation from the funding aspect, citing the funding shortfall and revenue producing strategies that need to be addressed on the state, county and city levels. He explained the strategic system and the financially constrained system, concluding with the issues JPACT needed to address on resolution 99-2878.

Fred Hansen asked Mr. Cotugno for a comment on the strategic option regarding the 2040 Plan, whether this RTP is leaning more one way than the other. Mr. Cotugno replied that that is reflected in the RTP, that there is a substantial transit commitment.

Councilor Monroe said a tax on off-street parking wasn't mentioned in the presentation and asked if it had been considered in the draft RTP. Mr. Cotugno said there are about 700,000 off-street parking spaces in the region; Councilor Monroe then calculated those spaces times \$100 a year, saying this could raise significant revenue.

Councilor Rohde said a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) tax is not mentioned in the presentation, and it's a good revenue source. Mr. Cotugno explained that the scenarios presented in were not intended to be the revenue answer, that there are many sources that aren't reflected. Instead, the scenarios were limited to currently used funding sources and the VHT tax is not currently used. This presentation was not intended to be a funding commentary.

Chair Kvistad concurred that there are bigger issues in the RTP than finance; the bigger debate is about funding the transportation system in total. He reminded the committee that this is not the

instrument to do that, but that issue may have to be confronted soon. Mr. Cotugno added that the MPAC funding subcommittee chaired by Commissioner Jordan has been discussing funding 2040 in general and they have concluded that transportation funding is the biggest hurdle. They've developed an approach to define and list funding sources, and have about 40 now. He said a suggestion has been made to have MPAC and JPACT join forces on this. Chair Kvistad said this would be looked at after the first of the year.

Kay Van Sickel commented that our road system is deteriorating and she wanted to emphasize that sleeves will need to be rolled up to deal with this. She said she doesn't think the legislature will come through with a lot of gas tax money. ODOT is dealing with the issue of keeping the highways maintained and they are already losing ground on this, due to the effects of inflation and improved fuel efficiency in reducing gas tax revenue per capita.

Consent Items:

Chair Kvistad asked if anyone wanted any Consent Items listed in Exhibit B, Part 2, of the Resolution moved to the Discussion Items list.

Commissioner Rogers requested **Comment 92** (p. 21) regarding the Highway 26 Overcrossing and **Comment 88** (p. 20) regarding the TV Highway Corridor Study be moved to the Discussion list.

Andy Ginsburg requested **Comment 68** (p. 16) regarding local plan amendments, and **Comment 69** (p. 16) regarding the MTIP section in Chapter 6 on air quality be moved to the Discussion list. He said they are similar to **Comment 1** and **Comment 2** (p. 1) on the Discussion list. He also requested **Comment 64** (p. 15) regarding the 2040 forecast requirement for local TSPs in Chapter 6, and **Comment 65** (p. 15) regarding clarifying local forecast option in Chapter 6.4.1 be moved to the Discussion list.

Clarification was requested on **Comment 25** (p. 6) regarding minimum parking ratios, i.e., is it necessary for the RTP to state that the minimum needs be established or can the locals do it. Mr. Cotugno explained the Title 2 Policy is that local governments should not require any more than the minimum. He said this Comment is saying that they should not permit more than the maximum, but does not require more than this minimum. **Comment 25** was not moved from the consent list.

The discussion on **Comments 64** and **65** resulted in the question of whether or not there is a way to make them consistent. Mr. Cotugno said this decision is made every five years, that the RTP is based on a growth forecast and assumes added land, yet every five years more land is added. Staff made the assumption that there will be growth in these areas but there are questions as to when this expansion will take place. These assumptions are not intended to determine when the UGB is expanded; staff does not determine that. Staff projects transportation demands based on expected urban growth. These projections may be different from what actually happens or from

what the local governments may determine, and these differences will be reconciled in the next RTP. Neither **Comment 64** nor **Comment 65** was moved to the Discussion list.

Commissioner Kennemer requested **Comment 51** (p. 11) regarding level of service, and **Comment 52** (p. 12) regarding one-hour LOS modeling be moved to the Discussion Items list.

Action taken: There being no further Consent Items requested to move to the Discussion list, Commissioner Rogers moved, with a second by Fred Hansen, to approve the Consent Items list in Exhibit B. The Consent Items list was unanimously approved.

Consent Items Moved to the Discussion List:

On Discussion Item **Comment 92** (p. 21) regarding the Highway 26 Overcrossing, Commissioner Rogers said this project is expensive, it's not needed and the landowners don't want it. He moved, with a second by Mayor Drake, to remove this project from the Discussion Item list.

In discussion, Andy Cotugno explained that this project would add secondary crossings over the highway to alleviate traffic at full interchanges. Mayor Drake concurred with Commissioner Rogers, saying the certainty of the project is questionable, that the area's not set up to handle the potential traffic. He said the overpass would have minimum impact on the Sunset Highway at crossings at Murray and Cornell. He also agreed with Commissioner Rogers that it's not worth the money.

Commissioner Rogers asked if it's taken out, will the option to study it still be there. Mr. Cotugno replied that he believes taking it off will eventually foreclose future study.

Chair Kvistad commented that both the county and the city want it removed. Councilor Rohde said although he understood the argument for removing it and asked, of the potential projects throughout the RTP, why this one was different. Mayor Drake replied that if it's kept in the plan, a lot of options for the business park at that location would be lost and more traffic that's not needed would be coming onto Walker Road. He said Beaverton likes good, clean business and this would eliminate that for this business park. Councilor Rohde asked if there were alternatives. Commissioner Rogers replied that both the City of Beaverton and Washington County are studying the area, and Beaverton is adversely against this project. He said if something needs to be done in the future, they will study something else.

Action taken: The committee unanimously approved removing **Comment 92** from the Discussion List.

Commissioner Rogers asked that the conclusions be removed on **Comment 88** (p. 20) (reference the RTP document, p. 6-31, *Tualatin Valley Highway*) regarding the TV Highway Corridor Study and said he has proposed language in lieu of the bulleted text. Chair Kvistad said removal of the bulleted text would leave all of the Tualatin Valley Highway from Hillsboro to Beaverton

as status quo, that the change wouldn't necessarily affect the RTP, but that didn't mean the designation would not or could not be changed later. Mr. Cotugno said that a corridor study of the TV Highway could conclude that instead of just widening the corridor, figure out how to use it better.

Commissioner Rogers said the highway is fully developed between Hillsboro and Beaverton, and the language in the RTP says looking at alternatives is precluded. That forces certain configurations that may or may not be in their best interest. He's not opposed to reworking it, but wants to know the time period and what some of the alternatives would be. Chair Kvistad asked if Commissioner Rogers wanted to remove all of **Comment 88** or to leave or change part of it. Commissioner Rogers replied that if the language in the document allowed for flexibility, people would be less concerned regarding preconclusions. As it is now, he said, the citizens would like to remove it entirely.

Chair Kvistad said if it's left in, it can be worked on at the Transportation Committee or it can be sent to the County for review. He recommended that it be left in. Mayor Drake agreed to that as long as it was understood that it may be doctored in order for citizen groups to know they are being listened to. He added that it also needs to be recognized that this area is going to become more urbanized in the next 20 years.

Councilor Rohde wanted to know if passing the motion would bring it out of compliance, and Chair Kvistad answered that it would leave the current designation in place. He clarified the motion as leaving the TV Highway designated as it is for the time being, and refer the center section back to the locals for review; the middle of it will be an amendment that will come later. Mayor Drake said this would allow them more time to study it in the County.

Action taken: Commissioner Rogers moved with a second from Mayor Drake to retain the current functional classification of TV Highway as it is in **Comment 88**. The motion passed unanimously.

Action taken: Andy Ginsburg moved, with a second by Councilor Washington, to move **Comment 68** back to its listing as a Consent item. The motion passed unanimously.

In discussion relevant to **Comment 51** (p. 11) regarding level of service (LOS), and **Comment 52** (p. 12) regarding one-hour LOS modeling, Commissioner Kennemer commented that Clackamas County is moving into its urban reserves with no infrastructure, and they're trying to avoid a problem but are not sure of the mechanisms to do so. Mr. Cotugno said this RTP update includes quite a few improvements regarding LOS and locals' needs have been acknowledged. This RTP proposes the LOS standard. He also said that language has been included that allows the locals to adopt a lower LOS, should they desire. Currently, many locals have higher LOS' than are in the RTP. Mr. Hansen suggested staff work on this for JPACT to revisit at a later date.

Action taken: Commissioner Kennemer moved, with a second by Commissioner Hales, to move forward as placeholders **Comment 51** and **Comment 52**. The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion List:

Comment 1 regarding the “financially constrained” scenario being more central to the RTP update, and **Comment 2** regarding the adoption of the RTP in a single action following the completion of the financially constrained system analyses (p. 1) of the Discussion list were discussed with **Comment 69** regarding the MTIP section in Chapter 6 on air quality (moved to the Discussion List from p. 16 of the Consent List). Mr. Cotugno commented that **Comment 69** is to add language recognizing that there are a variety of air quality neutral projects that should be able to be added to a fiscally constrained system more easily. He said this language has been in the RTP in the past. Mr. Ginsburg said he thought all that was needed was to amend **Comment 69** to cite the applicable rules to make it less vague.

Action taken: Mr. Ginsburg moved, with a second by Councilor Washington, that **Comment 69** be refined to cite the appropriate rules. The motion passed unanimously.

Regarding **Comment 1** and **Comment 2**, Mr. Ginsburg expressed concern that it be feasible to develop the constrained system and get the RTP adopted by the May 2000 target date and still do justice to the air quality piece. He said that JPACT had approved the air quality resolution in October, contingent upon the numbers, and thought the process was a little backwards. Chair Kvistad added that the RTP adoption ordinance can't go forward until the air quality piece is complete. He said the resolution puts the RTP on the table, and the ordinance can't be adopted until the conformity issues are done. The process is geared toward May or June right now, possibly later.

Action taken: Mr. Ginsburg moved, regarding **Comment 2**, and with a second by Councilor Washington, that the final adoption ordinance include both the strategic system and the financially constrained system and that the air quality analysis be completed and put out for public comment prior to the Plan coming before JPACT and the Metro Council for adoption. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Ginsburg stated that there is probably nothing JPACT can do about **Comment 1** regarding the RTP. He said the strategic system is what JPACT should be designing and moving toward, but he conceded that the financially constrained plan is what will probably be the final product. He said there are hard choices to be made. A lot of good projects will not be built within this RTP and making those choices and selecting the projects, choosing the ones that meet the air quality goals will be very hard choices. Once this is done, he said, it's very important that the public gets to look at it.

Mr. Ginsburg said the language in the staff comments on **Comment 1** and **Comment 2** could be more positive. He would also like language in the RTP specifically stating where we are today regarding funding levels.

Action taken: Mr. Ginsburg moved, with a second by Councilor Bragdon, that in developing the second portion of the RTP adoption, the financially constrained system be fully developed to include the air quality analysis, that it receive appropriate public notice, and be adopted as part of the ordinance; and in that adoption make it clear that a financially constrained system is going to have to meet the air quality test, and because it's the most likely system to be funded that we will put adequate effort into defining a system that we can all live with that will both meet the mobility needs and the air quality test, and we will give priority to implementing that system.

After a short break, Mr. Ginsburg revised his motion, with agreement by Councilor Bragdon, to state that the financially constrained system will be completed quickly, providing full opportunity for public comment, and will reflect a realistic basis for funding of all identified projects. To this end, the system must be a key and central part of the RTP. The motion passed, with Mayor Drake and Kay Van Sichel voting no.

Action taken: Mr. Ginsburg then moved to accept **Comment 1** and **Comment 2**, as amended, with a second by Councilor Bragdon. The motion passed unanimously.

Mayor Drake stated his concern that he hoped this body wasn't settling in on mediocrity. He said he thinks it wise to continue to look over the horizon at what the region will look like in 20, 30, even 40 years. He said he knows what he doesn't want, which is L.A.

Action taken: Commissioner Hales moved on **Comment 3** and **Comment 4**, with a second by Mayor Drake, to accept the TPAC recommendation on **Comment 3** (on p. 2) regarding the strategic system being scaled back to more closely reflect financial constraints, and continuing to address transportation finance needs upon completion of the RTP update. The motion passed unanimously.

Regarding **Comment 5** (on p. 2) on growth-based fees, Chair Kvistad said Councilor Atherton's suggestion (included in the *December 2, 1999, Public Comment Report*) includes a specific funding strategy, and this Comment is one of them. When asked to comment, Councilor Atherton asked if JPACT was planning to reduce uncertainty or to stay flexible. He said this puts the question a bit more directly. How one pays for things shapes the transportation system, and we need to take care of that ourselves.

Action taken: Councilor Rohde moved, with a second by Commissioner Hales, to accept TPAC's recommendation on **Comment 5**. The motion passed unanimously.

On **Comment 6** (p. 3) regarding operations and maintenance being funded before system expansion, Mr. Cotugno mentioned that an additional aspect of this is that the RTP doesn't have the authority to tell the locals how to spend their gas or state-shared gas taxes. He said this could be adopted as a direction to pursue, and then do just that through the right channel.

Action taken: Commissioner Rogers moved, with a second by Mayor Drake, approve the TPAC recommendation on **Comment 6**. The motion passed unanimously.

On **Comment 7** (p. 3) regarding the meaning and status of no-SOV targets, Mr. Cotugno said a key issue is that the targets were set in the functional plan to get to the 2040 level, and that this is a 2020 plan, not a standard by which to be measured. A second issue is that the TPAC recommendation clarifies that this is a local and a regional action.

Action taken: Mr. Hansen moved, with a second by Mayor Drake, to approve the TPAC recommendation on **Comment 7**.

In discussion, Mr. Hansen commented that the City of Hillsboro comment seemed to state that this is principally a Tri-Met issue when, in fact, the TPAC recommendation is more correct in saying it's a full partnership. Mr. Ginsburg agreed with the targets but not the standard, saying it's somewhat undefined. He asked if there could be added some clarity to how much progress we should make in 20 years. Mr. Cotugno replied that an evaluation that demonstrates what we want has been included.

Mr. Ginsburg then referred to the revision in the Table 1.2 introductory text which crossed off the 10 percent rule and said he would like to move a friendly amendment to add new language, "and achieve to the extent possible the 10 percent VMT/capita reduction requirement." Mr. Hansen said that language would be redundant – Chair Kvistad said that accepting TPAC's recommendation leaves the needed flexibility. Mr. Cotugno said the Transportation Planning Rule requires either 10 percent or a good faith step. There was no second to Mr. Ginsburg's amendment to the motion.

Mr. Hansen's original motion on **Comment 7** passed unanimously.

Comment 8 (p. 3 and 4), regarding replacing the entire Chapter 1, section 1.3.7, "Implementing the transportation system." Chair Kvistad said this comment will be dealt with at a later date by JPACT and that accepting the TPAC recommendation now meant these changes will not be made now.

Action taken: Councilor Rohde moved, with a second by Commissioner Kennemer, to accept the TPAC recommendation on **Comment 8**. The motion passed unanimously.

Action taken on **Comment 9**. The TPAC recommendation on **Comment 9** (p. 4) regarding a revision to Policy 3.0, Urban Form, was moved for acceptance by Councilor Rohde, with a second by Mayor Drake. The motion passed unanimously.

On **Comment 10** regarding improvements to the urban reserve areas being timed with urbanization, Mr. Cotugno said these comments addressed projects already in place vs new projects serving the urban reserve areas. He referred to Commissioner Jordan's memo, distributed to the body, referring to the paragraph beginning "On page 3-50 . . ." which was accepted by MPAC the previous evening, but not the remainder of this memo. Commissioner

Kennemer agreed that that is what MPAC did and said he didn't expect JPACT to address any part of this memo except the paragraph referred to above.

Action taken: Commissioner Kennemer moved, with a second by Mr. Hansen, as a friendly amendment to **Comment 10**, to accept the middle paragraph of this memo as it reads, in reference to p. 3-50 of the November 5, 1999, Adoption Draft in the paragraph on Findings: On page 3-50, under Damascus and Pleasant Valley Centers. Delete the sentence "Urban reserves in the Damascus and Pleasant Valley are expected to be added to the urban growth boundary incrementally, and will not be necessarily timed according to needed transportation improvements." The motion to amend passed unanimously.

Action taken: The **Comment 10** TPAC recommendation, as amended, was moved by Mayor Drake and seconded by Councilor Rohde, for approval. The motion passed unanimously.

Regarding **Comment 11** (p. 5) on the connectivity revisions being enacted, Mr. Cotugno explained that this revision is based on what's been heard from the locals. This amendment, he said, revises the Title 6 portion of the RTP. The 10-16 street requirement per mile is still included, but this amendment eases the future street map requirement for cities and counties. This would take affect immediately so the locals can follow the revision now. This amendment precludes the start of another ordinance process to change this procedure. Mr. Cotugno said it was important that the local jurisdictions are comfortable with this.

Action taken: Councilor Rohde moved, with a second by Commissioner Kennemer, to approve the TPAC recommendation on **Comment 11**. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Cotugno indicated that **Comments 12 through 15** (p. 5 and 6), as a package, all raise land use concerns from a transportation perspective which need reexamination from a land use perspective.

Action taken: Mr. Hansen moved, with a second by Major Drake, to approve the TPAC recommendations on **Comments 12, Comment 13 and Comment 15**.

Discussion then focused on Commissioner Kennemer's handout, a photocopy of page 6-35 of the Adoption Draft of the RTP marked with two suggestions. Mr. Cotugno pointed out that the second suggestion regarding an urban reserve boundary does not apply to the RTP. Commission Kennemer agreed and withdrew his suggestion regarding that. Commissioner Kennemer then made a motion to incorporate into **Comment 13** as a friendly amendment his first written suggestion, which would make the 6.8.2 Damascus-Pleasant Valley TCSP Planning, second paragraph, last sentence read: "Transportation and land use scenarios will be developed to reflect a variety of land-use alternatives for the area, and will be analyzed with the regional transportation model." Mr. Hansen seconded the motion. The motion to amend **Comment 13** was passed unanimously.

Action taken: Mr. Hansen's motion to approve the TPAC recommendations on **Comment 12, Comment 13 (as amended) and Comment 15** passed unanimously.

Action taken: Commissioner Kennemer moved, with a second from Councilor Rohde, to approve TPAC's recommendation on **Comment 14** (p. 6) regarding adding bulleted text to Section 6.8.7 dealing with needed land use and transportation evaluation of the 2040 Growth Concept. Commissioner Kennemer, in discussion, said the last sentence in the recommendation doesn't work for Clackamas County and wanted to delete it. This is the sentence that begins, "These reserves should be reviewed . . ." He asked for a friendly amendment to his motion, with agreement from Councilor Rohde, to delete that sentence. Councilor Washington asked that, included in the friendly amendment, the word "be" be added to the middle of the first sentence between the words "may" and "appropriate" so that phrase reads "may be appropriate." Commissioner Kennemer and Councilor Rohde agreed. The motion, as amended, passed unanimously.

Mr. Cotugno then proposed that the committee take action on the RTP as a whole, including the additional comments, which they will review and ratify next month. Mayor Drake asked that the letter regarding TMAs be included; he was assured by Mr. Kloster that this letter is in the record.

Action taken: Mayor Drake moved, with a second from Commissioner Kennemer to approve the RTP, including the additional comments, with placeholders reserved per the earlier discussion and with the understanding that there are still items to come before the committee, and that they will be addressed/changed/ratified in January.

In discussion, Mr. Hansen expressed concern that after Metro Council adoption in January some of the important discussions won't happen. Chair Kvistad told him to keep in mind that this is only the first of the two-part process, that the next six months will have debates and discussions. The vote today, he said, will move this forward.

Commissioner Rogers expressed concern about the funding aspects and said he was still not convinced that the committee has reached a resolution. He said that in the quest to finish their approval today, they had not dealt with that issue. He added that Mr. Ginsburg's comments as well as Councilor Atherton's had not all been addressed. Chair Kvistad said that will be discussed probably in January, as soon as the body meets next, and he will be coordinating that soon.

Mr. Hansen added, in response to Commissioner Rogers, that the RTP is a vision, it's where we want to go. He agreed that the financing issue needs to be revisited but the vision needs to be there before the funding can be discussed.

Mayor Ogden interjected a comment that he was concerned about accepting everything in the RTP because it's difficult to undo. He asked why it can't wait a month. Chair Kvistad replied that the basic body of the document is ready to go forward, that the Metro Council is working on the land-use issues while TPAC and then JPACT are working on the transportation issues. As

it's been amended today, he said, it can move forward. Now the financing and compliance issues can be worked on. This is a changing document, he reminded Mayor Ogden, that can always be amended.

The motion to approve the RTP, include the additional comments, and with placeholder reserved, passed unanimously.

ODOT \$600 MILLION BOND PROGRAM

Kay Van Sickel introduced Henry Hewitt, Chair of the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC).

Mr. Hewitt thanked the region representatives for their time and effort put into this project. He gave a brief background of the genesis of the Region One Bonding List, and urged cooperation and collaboration. Ms. Van Sickel then asked Kate Deane to update for the committee the project costs as shown on the distributed list.

Ms. Deane indicated some changes that had been made since the list was printed. **Project #1, US 26: 217-Murray** – ODOT recommends that project be moved to the 2002-05 STIP. The project was not included in the \$189.00 million total shown on the list. Another change was **Project #7, US 30: Swedetown – Lost Creek (Columbia County)** – It's not in this region, she said, but in Columbia County and has gone up in cost.

Project #10, Sandy Blvd. (12th – 57th) – Was on the 150 percent list at \$17 million; ODOT suggested adding \$10 million. They have requested the City of Portland contribute local capital funds or additional road transfers; Ms. Deane said this will be worked out. **Project #13, I-5: Greeley Ave. to I-84/Lloyd District Access EIS** – Was reduced from \$5 million to \$3 million.

Project #14, Barbur Blvd. (Alice St. to Capital Hill Rd.) – Was originally a much higher figure; ODOT suggested this project also have an additional contribution from the City of Portland. **Project #16, 242nd Avenue Connector** – ODOT recommends funding the PE so when funds are here, the project is ready to go; likewise Project #17 I-5: Delta Park to Lombard. **Project #18, I-5/Kruse Way/217 - Phase II** – Phase I is being done now; the work should be completed in April 2000. The main movement in Phase 2 is southbound 217 and southbound I-205. **Project #21, Pacific Avenue and 12th (Hood River)** – ODOT is recommending this project be funded on the STIP at \$500,000.

Councilor Rohde asked about the legislature's intent regarding this list, and then said that some of these projects relate to agreements that have been in effect since before he was born and asked if someone could explain them.

Regarding his legislature's intent, Mr. Hewitt responded that initially the legislature was not going to give ODOT one nickel. ODOT put the list together and presented it as a beginning point for public discussion. Their initial thought was that there would be no wholesale changes

because it evolved from many meetings and comments from throughout the state. The legislature wouldn't fund needs without knowing where they were going to go. Mr. Hewitt said the Governor is 100 percent behind this list, and Mr. Hewitt thinks he's satisfied this will address preservation and maintenance needs at the state level.

Regarding the history of the projects, he said the process has been that, knowing they can't all be dealt with at once, they're worked through in an orderly way. That doesn't mean those were necessarily done with the right thinking or in the right order, but this group had addressed them as significant transportation needs throughout the region. The reality is that there are commitments in the Hwy. 26 corridor that need to be dealt with.

Chair Kvistad interjected that this goes back to the Hwy. 26 light-rail alignment, which was delayed in order to facilitate westside light rail. Once this body makes a deal, he said, it follows through with it if possible. That's how projects are prioritized. After Hwy. 217 was done, the next Number One priority of the region is set. Our institutional memory as a body is to stick the course once a commitment has been made, no matter how painful, even with changes in membership. When a jurisdiction says they're willing to be a partner, that's another strength of this body.

Commissioner Rogers asked, regarding ODOT requesting this body to come up with a 100 percent list, if that didn't happen, and if a 150 percent list were submitted, would they come down to the proposed 100 percent list anyway. Mr. Hewitt said his understanding is that ODOT has to agree with what we want, and we have to agree with what they want. He wasn't certain what would occur if there was no agreement since he'd never experienced that. Commissioner Rogers wanted definition of what would happen if JPACT couldn't agree on a 100 percent list. Mr. Hewitt said the OTC would like to see a 100 percent list, that this isn't a hypothetical exercise.

A discussion followed as to what stages of development and/or completion some of the projects were and where some of the funding was coming from. It was mentioned that this is "the" list for the region, and to keep in mind that these dollars are not available yet. It's up to the voters. What's put forward on this list are the projects that have made it through the process.

Action taken: Councilor Washington moved, with a second by Commissioner Rogers, to approve the Region 1 Bonding List.

In discussion, Commissioner Rogers mentioned **Project #18, I-5/Kruse Way/217 – Phase II**, saying it's critical to his area. He said he thought this would force gridlock if it were all done (Phases 1 and 2) at same time. Ms. Deane said ODOT is already on the street with Phase 1. Ms. Van Sickle said Phase 2 would cause major changes to Phase 1, but that Phase 1 should have a life of 8 years before the area will need Phase 2. She told Commissioner Rogers that if it's not going to be funded, the reason will need to be succinctly stated.

Ms. Deane said a concern is that Phase 1 is a short-term improvement to traffic movement. Phase 2 is another level of improvement to that same movement by separating that traffic. Phase 2 buys another eight years. Phase 1 is starting right now and will be good for eight years before Phase 2 is needed. Mr. Hewitt interjected that this project deals with two major bottlenecks.

Mr. Hansen asked for clarification. If Phase 2 doesn't take place, do you spend money you'd waste which would have been spent differently if you hadn't done Phase 1. He said it wasn't practical.

Ms. Van Sickle said that Phase 1 was designed in a way so there's no need for great changes when it goes into Phase 2. Commissioner Rogers asked if both phases could be completed within six years. Ms. Van Sickle replied that no, Phase 2 is not ready.

Chair Kvistad asked the body if they wanted to propose an amendment to this list, one which doesn't reallocate the money but says that, as a region, Project #18, Phase 1, be the priority following the 100 percent list. Commissioner Kennemer said if it's done for that project, it will need to be done for all. He said this is a handpicked list, legislatively, and if we don't want to keep with that, we'll face the consequences. ODOT has made their best recommendation to the legislature with this list and JPACT was told by that legislature to play with this menu. It's time to get down and make the hard decisions. Clackamas County is here to say we're here to help, but you have eight years to do this project. Clackamas County has phases that are important, too. It's time to say let's say where we are, and then realize it's not where we want to be. We'd all have a hard time prioritizing this list.

Mr. Hewitt said he wanted to clarify the role of the legislature in this in that they made no changes on this list. This is the list this group has historically talked about. At the end of the day, all the legislature wanted to know is, what is the list? Mr. Hewitt said he doesn't think JPACT should turn this question over to them, but it should recommend to them what to do with the money. He suggested that JPACT could give their priorities to the legislature.

Mayor Pollard said he supported the 100 percent list. He wasn't necessarily happy with it, but he understands the realities of life and thanks all for recognizing the problem of I-5 being the most congested freeway in the metropolitan area, saying the I-5 Trade Corridor Study has recognized this. The issue, he said, is not necessarily to move SOVs, but to get them out of the way so the concentration can be on trade and commerce. This is an historic decision on our part for his constituents, involving not only bi-state relations but decisions at the state and federal level as well. Opening this up for trade and commerce, and getting back to the light rail discussion again, is what he's looking for.

Councilor Kight said **Project #16, 242nd Ave. Connector** represents about 14 percent of the listed projects, and the ODOT list represents about 7 percent of the entire budget for the transportation projects. He said voter support for this bond measure needs to be maximized in order for it to pass.

Action taken: Council Kight then moved in a friendly amendment to the original motion to request adding \$10 million to **Project 16, 242nd Ave. Connector**. There was no second to the motion.

Commissioner Kelley told Councilor Kight that she wanted Multnomah County to have funding at a higher level, also.

Commissioner Rogers then moved, with a second by Mayor Pollard, a friendly amendment to the original motion, regarding **Project #16, 242nd Avenue Connector, Project #17, I-5: Delta Park to Lombard, and Project #18, I-5/Kruse Way/I-217 – Phase II**, that the following language be incorporated into the transmittal when forwarding the approved list to ODOT: To accept the 100 percent list as presented with the addition of a direction to voters of the state and the state delegations that these three projects are of regional significance and are the priority of JPACT, and therefore of any additional dollars that come forward that these three projects be prioritized as the region's priority to be funded. Commissioner Rogers said his intent in this motion was that the body have something to take back to their communities.

Councilor Washington moved, with a second by Commissioner Rogers, to amend the language of the friendly amendment as follows: To accept the 100 percent list as presented with the addition of a direction to the state and the state delegations that these three projects are critical regional priorities and that federal, state and local funding strategies should be pursued.

The amendment to the original motion passed unanimously.

Councilor Monroe said, regarding **Project #17, I-5: Delta Park to Lombard**, that even though it's only a \$2 million project, it's a major step to recognize that this is a serious transportation problem. He said he'd like to see more funding for it, but what's there is a step in the right direction and is an important gesture to our friends north of the Columbia River.

Calling for the question on the original motion, as amended, to accept the Region 1 Bond List, the motion was approved unanimously.

The South Corridor Transit Improvement Program status report was postponed to a later date. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Rooney Barker
Recording Secretary