



METRO

\* \* \* \* \*

BEFORE THE JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION  
FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING THE REPLACEMENT OF COMMISSIONER ED WASHINGTON  
AS CHAIRMAN OF THIS ADVISORY BODY

Introduced by Councilor Jon Kvistad, JPACT Chair

WHEREAS, Pursuant to Title 57, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 372, Metropolitan Planning Organizations are required to rotate the bodies that occupy the biggest chair on a regular basis; and

WHEREAS, The federal ISTEA promotes the use of bicycles by competent cyclists as an alternative to driving; and

WHEREAS, It is unclear whether Ed Washington qualifies under the federal definition of "competent" pending final examination of the remains of his bicycle helmet; and

WHEREAS, Initial forensic evidence from the accident scene shows tire marks linked to a vehicle registered under the name of "Jon Kvistad"; and

WHEREAS, The assignment of JPACT chair is generally considered to be a form of cruel or unusual punishment; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

That JPACT hereby declares:

1. That Councilor Ed Washington is formally removed from the "big" JPACT chair, and relegated to the "little" or "crappy" JPACT chair, to be designated by Lois Kaplan.
2. That Councilor Washington be equipped with a new helmet to protect him against injury should the little and/or crappy chair collapse unexpectedly.
3. That Councilor Washington be required to complete the "lil' tykes" bike safety certification program at Peninsula Elementary School before riding his bicycle again.
4. That Councilor Jon Kvistad be sentenced to chairmanship of JPACT for his alleged involvement in causing Councilor Washington to disembark from his bicycle in a sudden and unexpected fashion resulting in bodily injury and damage to said helmet.

ADOPTED by the members of JPACT on this 14th day of January, 1999.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jon Kvistad, Chairman



METRO

\* \* \* \* \*

BEFORE THE JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION  
FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING THE RETIREMENT OF COMMISSIONER ED LINDQUIST  
FROM THIS ADVISORY BODY

Introduced by Councilor Jon Kvistad, JPACT Chair

WHEREAS, Pursuant to Title 23, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 450 and Title 49 CFR part 613, Metropolitan Planning Organizations are required to oust County officials from committee assignments as frequently as possible; and

WHEREAS, The federal ISTEA requires county jurisdictions where the number of four-wheel drive pickup trucks exceeds the population to secede from their respective MPOs; and

WHEREAS, The interim federal Regional Transportation Plan maps establish that areas located south of the Multnomah County line consists of large expanses of ocean populated with dragons and other sea monsters; and

WHEREAS, More Clackamas County voters wrote in "Jesse Ventura" than voted for John Kitzhaber in the most recent general election; and

WHEREAS, Commissioner Ed Lindquist was unable to make it to this final JPACT meeting due to the broken axle on the County car sustained while driving over crater-like potholes on some unnamed County road in Gladstone; and

WHEREAS, Commissioner Ed Lindquist has more than "done his time" as the longest serving member of JPACT; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED,

That JPACT hereby declares:

1. Ed Lindquist to be an ex-member of JPACT.
2. That staff is instructed to incorporate frighteningly large potholes in addition to dragons and other hazards in the unknown area located south of Multnomah County on Metro maps.
3. That a special tax be levied on pickup trucks and sport utility vehicles registered in Clackamas County to permit construction of a 14-lane freeway in the South/North corridor.
4. That Clackamas County Commission fleet vehicles be equipped with bags of asphalt patching compound and shovels to allow for emergency road repairs and for officials to avoid delays when attending meetings.

ADOPTED by the members of JPACT on this 14th day of January, 1999.


---

Jon Kvistad, Chairman

**METRO**

**Date:** December 23, 1998

**To** TPAC and Interested Persons and Organizations

**From:**  Andrew C. Cotugno, Transportation Director

**Re:** Priorities 2000 Project Selection Process

Metro solicited transportation project nominations from local jurisdictions in early September. The cutoff for nomination of new projects was October 16, though Metro continues to accept clarifying materials. Enclosed is a preliminary schedule for the remainder of the project selection process. It identifies the expected date for release of draft technical rankings by project mode, dates of TIP Subcommittee meetings, dates of TPAC, JPACT and public workshop meetings to consider project technical and administrative ranking factors, and the anticipated date of full program approval by JPACT and the Metro Council.

Staff proposes that the TIP Subcommittee meetings scheduled for review of both the technical and administrative factors also be used to clarify several issues related to transit and TDM applications and bike/pedestrian/boulevard, bridge maintenance and ITS (Intelligent Transportation System) project funding requests.

These dates may change if consensus approval cannot be achieved during any portion of the selection process. Agendas for specific meetings will be sent beforehand.

If you have questions or wish to schedule an additional information briefing, please call Terry Whisler at 797-1747.

ACC:TW:lmk

Enclosure



METRO

**DRAFT**

January 14, 1999

Ms. Carolyn Gassaway, Highway Plan Manager  
Planning Section  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
555 13th St. NE, Suite 2  
Salem, OR 97301-4178

**Subject:** *Portland Metro Area Comments on the Oregon Highway Plan:  
Public Hearing Draft*

Dear Ms. Gassaway:

These comments on the 1998 *Oregon Highway Plan (OHP), Public Hearing Draft, January, 1999*, are submitted on behalf of local governments represented through the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) for the Portland metropolitan area. We thank you for the opportunity to comment.

#### *General Comments*

JPACT is supportive of the changes that have been made over the last year to prior draft versions of the plan and we thank ODOT staff and the OHP advisory committees for incorporating the vast majority of our earlier comments. We feel the most recent draft provides a more focused strategy for ODOT to pursue in the areas of multi-modal systems, the relationship of state highways to adjacent land use, access management, and funding strategies. The draft reflects the complex nature of those inter-relationships and will be a far more useful document than the adopted 1990 Highway Plan.

We also appreciate that the new draft OHP continues to recognize the growth management and transportation planning efforts we are pursuing in the Portland metropolitan area. These are most notable in the land use/transportation and highway level-of-service/mobility standards. This draft also better emphasizes inter-governmental coordination and provides more flexibility in dealing with complex issues.

As with any evolving or draft document, a number of issues of concern to Portland metropolitan area governments are still outstanding. Those are listed below.

### *Specific Issues*

Following are our specific comments on outstanding issues. They are listed in the order they appear in the draft OHP.

- State Highway Functional Classification System (Policy 1A). We support the proposed ODOT study to further evaluate and refine the functional classifications of State highways shown in the draft OHP. For example, we anticipate amendments are needed for a number of Portland area classifications such as Highway 43 through West Linn; the Highway 47 network in Forest Grove; and lack of planned routes in the Tualatin-Sherwood and Mt. Hood Parkway corridors.
- Land Use and Transportation (Policy 1B). The introduction to this chapter, and the action areas of this policy, as appropriate, should be expanded to better state the use of the OHP land use policies for ODOT planning purposes as opposed to the role of local governments in making final land use decisions. We suggest highlighting and expanding the bullets at the bottom of page 29 and top of page 30. The ODOT role, as stated on page 30, is the responsibility to develop and manage the highway system. We would add the following clarification that "the land use policies guide ODOT decisions for access management, highway design and investment decisions, and local plan review, but do not direct particular land use decisions by local governments. Land use actions, including the designation of functional classifications within Transportation System Plans are the responsibility of local governments." To this end, Metro should be included in the definition of "local governments," to be consistent with the local government definition contained within ORS 197.015 (13) relating to land use decision-making.

The plan should also eliminate or clarify the use of the terms "designate" and "designating" (pages 38, 44, 45) from ODOT's responsibilities. These terms indicate a "land use designation" which would be a land use action that can be appealed under Oregon law. In actuality, ODOT is "classifying" road segments for ODOT's access management, highway design, investment, and local plan review decisions separate from local plan roadway designations. Again, this would clarify that the appealable land use decisions associated with designating ODOT highways and adjacent land uses would occur at the local level.

We strongly recommend that the adopted 2040 Growth Concept areas of Central City, Regional Centers, Town Centers, Station Communities, and Main Streets automatically qualify for Special Transportation Area (STA) status. The STA characteristics described on page 39 are consistent with the region's adopted and acknowledged objectives for the above 2040 concept areas. We understand that eligibility is the first requirement for STA consideration and look forward to working with ODOT to develop coordinated management plans for the State highways within our STAs. We recommend the status of our 2040 concept areas can be further clarified on page 30 of the draft Highway Plan.

Regarding the Commercial Center concept, we suggest clarification that the centers are intended for commercial or mixed commercial, retail, and residential activities. As currently defined, industrial/warehouse areas and office parks would qualify as commercial.

- State Highway Freight System (Policy 1.C). In general, we feel the modifications to the freight system map make for a more useful document. However, we support the proposal for ODOT to develop a Freight Plan to provide a more detailed freight classification map that is comprehensive in reviewing key freight routes important to the state both on and off the state system.

We also encourage ODOT to work with local governments and MPOs to adequately address issues related to smaller trucks and commercial vans and traffic. For example, the Metro area will be addressing this issue later this year and hope to have ODOT as a study partner.

- Highway Mobility Standards (Policy 1.F). We appreciate the effort of ODOT staff to work with the Metro region as we revise our highway level-of-service policies. As such, we appreciate and support the inclusion of the mobility standard table specific to the Portland area within the Highway Plan (page 66). However, we wish to continue to work with ODOT staff on methods to apply our new two-hour standard approved by the OTC for the optional LOS standard in Title 6 of Metro's Functional Plan.

From a technical standpoint, the two-hour mobility standards represent two hours of demand divided by two hours of capacity. Table II.4 indicates analyzing two separate one-hour conditions. Initial meetings with ODOT staff indicates we can work through this subtlety. In addition, as the region, including ODOT, completes corridor studies and system planning we may return with revised standards in certain corridors consistent with Policy 1F. Any revisions would be based on a thorough examination of the cost and environmental and physical constraints to meeting a higher mobility level.

- Access Management. The region is supportive of the access management policies contained in the draft Highway Plan. However, regarding the proposed spacing standards, both public streets and private streets which allow public access should be included in the standards.
- Alternative Modes. Within the funding scenarios, the draft Highway Plan should recognize the importance to the state of maintaining adequate funding of alternative modes, particularly under low investment scenarios. It is under low investment conditions that it is critical to maintain alternative mode funding in order to limit demand on an already crowded State highway system. That direct benefit should be acknowledged in the plan as necessary under limited investment scenarios. It should be recognized that it is in the state's interest to at least maintain status quo conditions for alternative modes if all you can do is maintain status quo conditions

Ms. Carolyn Gassaway

January 14, 1999

Page 4

for roads. In addition, as noted on Page 139, if the "highest priority" for investing in the transportation system includes adding new capacity to address critical congestion conditions, improvement to alternatives to the state highway should be acknowledged as one way to accomplish that.

- Funding Scenarios. We appreciate the funding scenarios and believe they add significant value to the plan. In fact, they should be a major component of the plan upon its adoption. It would be helpful, however, to differentiate between public cost and private cost within each scenario. For example, it was not intuitive as to how user costs would go up if public taxes and fees would remain the same. The draft plan did not explain that private costs for maintenance, etc. would likely rise as the condition of the system deteriorates.

Again, we look forward to working with ODOT to address our outstanding issues and thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Jon Kvistad,  
JPACT Chair