

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: October 14, 1999

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Chair Jon Kvistad, Ed Washington, Presiding Officer Rod Monroe, David Bragdon, Metro Council; Jim Kight, Cities in Multnomah County; Fred Hansen, Tri-Met; Bill Kennemer, Clackamas County; Royce Pollard, City of Vancouver; Don Wagner, Washington State Department of Transportation; Kay Van Sickel, Oregon Department of Transportation; Andy Ginsburg, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality; Tom Brian, Washington County; Rob Drake, Cities in Washington County; Charlie Hales, City of Portland; Karl Rohde, Cities in Clackamas County; Mike Thorne, Port of Portland; Sharron Kelley, Multnomah County; Craig Pridemore, Clark County;

Guests: Dave Lohman, Port of Portland; Lise Glancy, Port of Portland; Sebastian Degens, Port of Portland; Ted Spence, Citizen; Rod Sandoz, Clackamas County; John Rist, Clackamas County; Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland; Dick Feeny, Tri-Met; Mark Lear, City of Portland; Ron Papsdorf, City of Gresham; Beth Wemple, Kittelson & Assoc.; Gary Katsion, Kittelson & Assoc.; Martha Bennett, City of Milwaukie; Beckie Lee, Multnomah County; Ross Williams, Cities for Feasible Transportation/Coalition for Livable Futures; Marc Zolton; City of Portland; Scott L. Rice, City of Cornelius; Steve Dotterrer, City of Portland; Karen Schilling, Multnomah County; Kathy Lehtola, Washington County; Elsa Coleman, City of Portland (PDOT); Dave Williams, Oregon Department of Transportation; Dean Lookingbill, Southwest Washington RTC; Mary Legry, Washington State Department of Transportation; Pat Collmeyer, Neil Goldschmidt, Inc.

Staff: Andy Cotugno, Larry Shaw, Mike Hogle, Gina Whitehill-Baziuk, Tom Kloster, and Rooney Barker, recording secretary

Media: Bill Stewart, *The Oregonian*

October 14, 1999

SUMMARY:

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

MEETING REPORT

Commissioner Kelley moved, seconded by Councilor Washington, to approve the September 9, 1999, Meeting Report as submitted. The motion PASSED unanimously.

Andy Cotugno provided an overview of the Cascadia Metropolitan Forum, tentatively scheduled for April 27 – 29 or May 4 – 6, hosted by the Seattle region. Councilor Karl Rohde, who is JPACT's liaison on this, and representatives from MPAC are working on Metro's program with Andy. Andy said there are two topics that will be addressed that are tackled by all three regions – Portland, Seattle and Vancouver – transportation infrastructure, finance, and housing affordability. He felt that Seattle and Vancouver are doing better at addressing these than Portland and that we could learn from them. There was concern about the Forum's dates from some of the membership in that it would coincide with the primary election. Andy said he would inquire about the possibility of having the Forum take place on a different date.

ODOT'S \$600 MILLION BOND PROGRAM

All the public meetings are now scheduled on the RTP and ODOT's bond program so there are not two sets of hearings; the logistical sheet on staffing of these hearings was distributed. Andy Cotugno described the format staff will use regarding displays, booths and break-out tables for taking citizen comments. He asked the JPACT members to participate in the break-out tables, thus having one JPACT member, and one Oregon Department of Transportation Commissioner to hear each member of the public. He said this approach would achieve better input from the community.

The other half of the work sessions are on the RTP update; he referred to the public fact sheets which are a much shorter version of the thicker document and focus on specific geographic areas. Each work session will have detailed information for that area.

Andy then referred to the projects listed on the yellow ODOT survey form which gave two options: the front of the form (also referred to as the A list) showing ODOT's list that they plan to take to the public; the second page, the supplemental list (also referred to as the B list), show the projects that need to be looked at, e.g., the I-5/Greeley project is a questionable project – if it's taken that off the supplemental list, it's a much smaller list. He explained that today's discussion is to attempt to hone down the supplemental list. He gave the results of the choices made by the members and alternates in the handout. Since all members/alternates did not vote, and since the members/alternates who did vote did not all vote on all projects, the total number of votes did not equal the total number of voters.

Working from this supplemental list and from the ODOT list provided by Kate Deane, a discussion ensued regarding each project. Kate updated some of the information on the ODOT's list: Project #3, now called the 87th Avenue Connection, has a revised cost of \$24.5 million; Project #4, the Clackamas Industrial Connection: I-205 to 145th, has a revised cost estimate of \$72.5 million; Project #5, I-5: Greeley – N. Banfield/Lloyd District/Rose Quarter Access Phase 1, has no revised cost estimate. In response to Councilor Washington's question, Kate explained that #8 on the supplemental list (I-5: Greeley – I-84/Lloyd District Access) would let ODOT take a broader look at that area, allowing the improvements to make that area work better but be coordinated with the I-5 Trade Corridor project.

Project #7 has a \$9 million revised estimate; Project #9 has a new cost estimate of \$3.6 million. On this project, Milwaukie has received \$1.9 million leaving a balance of \$1.7 million for completion; there was not good knowledge of what the cost of the right-of-way would be.

There was a discussion as to how the committee would approach the projects. Fred Hansen asked if the MTIP was coordinated with this selection because it could be very significant. Andy responded that these projects are over and above the MTIP. The question is, with these funds, what would you choose? Fred was concerned that once priorities are set in motion, the decisions made on these projects will set priorities for the next eight or ten years. Andy replied that this is not setting priorities for future funds unless JPACT chooses. Chair Kvistad said no one knows what the funding sources are going to be, the growth patterns, what the federal government will do, etc., but that JPACT needs to choose now what they think is best.

Dave Williams clarified that unless JPACT takes an action to the contrary, ODOT's priorities are to finish the three westside projects, and then the Columbia/Killingsworth Connection, which JPACT has prioritized for after the westside projects. These are the only priorities that exist now, unless JPACT speaks differently.

Commissioner Hales asked for clarification whether what is chosen today for public review will move up in the queue. He also suggested that the committee might operate under the principles of buildability and the need to respond to political issues/criticism. He said the projects need to go out for public review and it needs to be demonstrated that ODOT can work with the communities. Barbur Boulevard should be worked on and we should persevere at least in the design state even though people are nervous. He also said the environmental community thinks the freeways just keep getting widened, and that the Sandy project is meritorious for being something different and helping the main street and Hollywood Town Center. This is the time to respond to criticism that ODOT and JPACT are dinosaurs; public review is good politics and there may be support and possible funding because of it.

Councilor Karl Rohde asked how much leeway the committee has on ODOT's list. Chair Kvistad replied that one of JPACT's strengths is taking difficult funding constraints and making them work.

Commissioner Tom Brian said the essence of ODOT's \$600 million program was to infuse cash into getting these projects done. He didn't think substituting one project for another would matter; he heard complaints from everyone about projects not getting done. It was his opinion that whatever JPACT decides on the supplemental list, it will be good sense to share that with the legislature. He said everyone wants the projects done.

Commissioner Bill Kennemer suggested caution because the legislators vary on their thoughts. He agreed with Commissioner Hales and thinks good faith with public needs to be kept, i.e., not be over optimistic and promise more than can be delivered. Referring to the unfinished projects, he said ODOT needs to update their numbers because if one starts adding the numbers to all the projects, the funding hole gets deeper. Chair Kvistad agreed that finishing the committed projects needs to be kept at the front.

Commissioner Sharron Kelley commented that JPACT needs to analyze what their mission is to the public. JPACT will interact with the public and revise projects accordingly. It doesn't make sense to send out something that doesn't meet the ODOT criteria. Unrealistic projects should be taken off. She said she is ready to listen to the people but JPACT can't send out a list that doesn't meet the criteria.

Kate Deane explained that the supplemental list is not the legislature's list, that JPACT can recommend removing a project if they so choose. The committee then voted on the following projects from the supplemental list:

1. **I-5: Greeley – I-84, Phase 1.** It was acknowledged that I-84 couldn't make it to construction in six years, which will reduce the need by \$92 million dollars. A companion project to this is #8 (I-5: Greeley – I-84/Lloyd District Access). Andy Cotugno explained that #8 has funds committed for four years.

Action taken: There was no objection to Chair Kvistad's motion that #1 be removed from the supplemental list and #8 be retained. Project #8 is RETAINED on the supplemental list and Project #1 is removed, unanimously.

2. **Tualatin-Sherwood Expressway EIS/PE.** Kate Dean said that unless you know what specific alternatives you want to look at in an EIS, ODOT recommends doing a major investment study and spending \$2 million instead of \$3 million. Mayor Drake strongly recommended keeping this project as it's critical to Washington County and impacts Clackamas County. He said the traffic nightmare here is killing the area. Kate did not know the answer to Councilor Rohde's question of having to spend more money on the EIS after completing the MIS. She said doing the EIS now would be a waste of money because there's no plan where the road will come in. Alternatives need to be revisited through an MIS. Andy Cotugno added that it's cheaper to go this route, that doing a greater number of alternatives now will allow for spending the money better later. Dave Williams said the area is so developed now that locating an area to bring in the road is quite difficult. He said if an

EIS is done, construction needs to begin within three years. Tom Brian said as long as progress is being made, it makes sense not to do an EIS.

Another discussion ensued as to whether or not projects that are not buildable in six years should remain on the supplemental list. Andy reiterated that there is now one list that totals \$189 million. There is the other list that's well over that amount, and if we or the public want to add anything to it, we have to ask what comes off. Chair Kvistad added that right now the committee needs to decide what to take out for public comment. Fred Hansen said he'd rather have a list that says these are the projects JPACT believes should have public comment, and then another list that the public can comment on but that JPACT felt wasn't feasible. He didn't think JPACT should state support at this time. Mike Thorne wondered why we would recommend that the public comment on a project or projects that are questionable (citing #7 on the supplemental list). Mayor Drake agreed, saying staff will have the recommendations after the public comment. The public may enlighten us about some of them. Councilor Rohde asked if JPACT isn't supposed to determine what to take off the list before it goes before the public. Chair Kvistad responded that if the consensus is that something isn't doable, JPACT will say that. It should become obvious which ones work and which don't.

Karl confirmed what Chair Kvistad said, that if the majority of the body thinks something should be removed, it will be and will not go out for public comment.

Action taken: Sharron Kelley moved, seconded by Councilor Kight, to remove projects #1 (I-5: Greeley – I-84, Phase 1) and #12 (Powell Boulevard: I-205 to Eastman Parkway [Birdsdale]) as unfeasible. Projects #1 and #12 were, by unanimous vote, REMOVED from the supplemental list.

3. 99E (McLoughlin): Hwy 224 to River Rd.

Action taken: Councilor Rohde moved to send this to public comment (i.e., retain it on the list); Commissioner Kennemer seconded the motion. Project #3 was unanimously approved to be RETAINED on the supplemental list.

4. Sandy Modernization (12th to 57th Avenue);

5. SW Clay/Market Reconstruction: Naito Parkway/I-405;

9. Barbur Modernization (Terwilliger to SW City Limit);

10. Lombard Modernization: I-5 to St. Johns Bridge: The discussion on these projects recognized that they are state highways that function more as city streets. The ODOT criteria provides for upgrading of the streets, the pedestrian environment, and transferring them to the cities. Councilor Rohde said he thought the ODOT criteria "of statewide importance" didn't apply. Andy Cotugno replied that the criteria was broadened to mean the state would consider projects "of statewide and regional significance" or projects of local significance if the jurisdiction then takes it over. Kay Van Sichel confirmed this.

Action taken: Commissioner Tom Brian moved, seconded by Mayor Rob Drake, to retain Projects #4, #5, #9 and #10 on the supplemental list for public comment. Councilor Rohde and Bill Kennemer voted no. The motion passed to RETAIN these projects. Andy Cotugno said the transfer of jurisdiction issue will be clarified when it goes out for public comment.

6. Powell Blvd.: Central Eastside Southbound Access, and

- 7. South Portland Circulation Phase I.** It was pointed out that these two projects involve more physical changes. There's still development in this area so there's still work to go on them. Elsa Coleman agreed on project #6 that there may not be consensus with ODOT but there is a study that addressed this. Kate Deane felt that both of these fare better than some of the other projects on the list, that they can be considered buildable within six years from today. Fred Hansen said #7 is very significant for Tri-Met as far as improving the neighborhood and keeping on-time service from Clackamas County and the inner southeast.

Action taken: Fred moved, with a second by Councilor Bragdon, to keep #7 on the supplemental list for public comment. Councilor Rohde voted no. The motion to RETAIN Project 7 was approved. Councilor Kight moved to recommend Project #6 not be included on the supplemental list, with a second by Councilor Rohde. Fred Hansen and Councilor Washington voted no. Project #6 was REMOVED from the supplemental list by a majority vote.

- 11. 242ND Avenue Connector: I-84 to Stark.** Phase 1 of the Mt. Hood Parkway will provide connection from I-84 to NE 242nd. The EIS process is under way; this provides engineering and construction.

Action taken: Council Kennemer moved, with a second by Councilor Washington, to retain project #11 on the supplemental list. With a no vote by Councilor Rohde, the motion was approved to RETAIN Project #11 on the supplemental list.

- 13. I-5: Lombard to Expo Center – PE and ROW.** This is a \$13 million construction project for the north section with two lanes going to three lanes. It was noted that environmental issues will not slow this project down.

Action taken: Commissioner Pridemore moved, with a second by Fred Hansen, to retain this project on the supplemental list. The motion passed, with no dissenting votes. Project #13 is RETAINED on the supplemental list.

- 14. I-5/Hwy. 217/Kruse Way Interchange – Phase 2.** A delay on this project would mean secondary, overlapping construction at the same interchange. Councilor Rohde asked for clarification that the printed list is incorrect in stating that this phase of the project is not needed for 10-15 years, that it's Phase 3 of the project that is not needed for 10-15 years. That clarification was confirmed. The supplemental list is citing Phase 1 of the project, which is going into construction now.

Action taken: Councilor Rohde moved, with a second by Mayor Drake, to retain this project on the supplemental list. The vote was unanimous. Project #14 is **RETAINED** on the supplemental list.

Action taken: Commissioner Brian moved, with a second by Commissioner Pridemore, to approve from JPACT the supplemental list for public comment. The motion was unanimously **APPROVED**. The supplemental list, as approved by JPACT, was recommended to be taken out for public comment.

COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL DEEPENING PROJECT

Mike Thorne gave a brief introduction to the project, stating that the region's decision to prioritize light rail is in the same category as maintaining the Columbia River channel. He said Portland is the tenth largest trade center in the United States despite a population ranking of around 25. This region is the market center for a large geographic area, and it exists because of the good transportation system. This project will enhance the environmental values of the region; less dredging will be done and 1,500 acres of new wetlands will be created. Mr. Thorne asked for JPACT's support by endorsing this project by letter to the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers and requesting issuance of a favorable Chief's report.

Sebastian Degens of the Port of Portland gave a presentation to the committee that explained the two essential elements of the regional maritime strategy: 1.) To maintain the region's position as the center for grain exports; and 2.) To support the container and general cargo facilities serving the regional market. Mr Degens' presentation also explained more on the commerce handled, the commodity flow forecast, the major users of Portland Harbor and their types of usage (forest products, technology, food/beverage, etc.), as well as highlighting the river's impact on the region's employment.

The presentation then covered more specifics of the project, i.e., dredging to accommodate the new, larger ships that are entering the world trade market, the actual construction, maintenance, scope, and cost of the project, and the transportation cost savings. Mr. Thorne interjected that the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMSA) has given a No Jeopardy letter for 40' dredging and that the Port is anticipating the same for their request for the 43' dredging.

Mayor Drake said he was convinced that the environmental issues are addressed in the project.

Action taken: Mayor Drake moved, and Councilor Rohde seconded, that JPACT send the endorsement letter.

Discussion: Commissioner Pridemore asked if there would be a value in expressing bi-state support; Andy Cotugno replied that JPACT support is bi-state. Andy Ginsburg commented that the environmental issues are highlighted in the letter and felt that no degradation finding will be made. He said if there are environmental problems that surface in the process, JPACT can address them as they come up.

Chair Kvistad informed the committee that he had been approached by the business community and the Port of Astoria on this project as well as representatives of the fishing industry, that he will sign the letter to the U. S. Corps of Engineers should the committee vote to do so, but that he will abstain from the vote on this project. Fred Hansen expressed concern about the next to last paragraph in the draft letter to the Corps with reference to what has to happen to ensure all environmental issues are addressed. He said he'd like something that this process has to evaluate. Mayor Drake concurred, saying his motion was to support the process of dredging so ships can be accommodated in both the Columbia and Willamette; if the project doesn't get federal and state environmental support, it won't happen unless the Port does something to mitigate those concerns. He amended his motion to say that JPACT supports dredging, provided the Port meets all federal environmental requirements, etc.

Mayor Pollard emphasized that Portland, Vancouver and Clark County need to take a strong and positive support position for this project. He said there should be no question that JPACT fully supports the dredging. Councilor Bragdon was comfortable with the environmental safeguards included in the process and that the letter to the U. S. Corp of Engineers would address the points made by Mr. Hansen.

Action taken: The motion to approve JPACT sending the letter to the U. S. Corps of Engineers with the amendment was PASSED unanimously.

RESOLUTION 99-2843 – ADOPTING THE PORTLAND AREA AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY DETERMINATION FOR THE FY 2000 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Andy Cotugno explained how this resolution maintains the air quality standards of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Staff is asking for JPACT approval, assuming the budget has been met. Andy Ginsburg said he was a little uncomfortable making an approval because of the time constraints without seeing the quantitative analysis. He understands the assumptions were agreed upon going in, yet he feels that seeing the final numbers is important and could raise some issues. He believes it's good policy that JPACT review numbers before taking action.

Action taken: Andy Ginsburg made a motion, seconded by Councilor Washington, that JPACT conditionally approve this resolution contingent upon seeing the numbers. He asked that staff be encouraged to build in enough time in future schedules. Fred Hansen commented that he will be surprised if the analysis doesn't come in in terms of conformity. He suggested a future JPACT discussion with DEQ about where things might be in 10-12 years. The motion was APPROVED unanimously to conditionally approved Resolution 99-2843 and forward it to the Metro Council for consideration.

ANNOUNCEMENTS Tom Brian informed the committee that Washington County is sponsoring a commuter rail demonstration on November 15 and that invitations to the demonstration will be sent. There may be a future presentation on this to JPACT.

JPACT
October 14, 1999

ADJOURNMENT There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Rooney Barker

c:\jpact\101499\1099mtgreport.doc

cc: Mike Burton, Metro Executive Officer
JPACT members