

## MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: November 13, 1997

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Chair Jon Kvistad, Ed Washington and Susan McLain, Metro Council; Tom Walsh, Tri-Met; Jim Kight, Cities of Multnomah County; Ed Lindquist, Clackamas County; Craig Lomnicki, Cities of Clackamas County; Dave Williams (alt.), ODOT; Dean Lookingbill (alt.), Southwest Washington RTC; Don Wagner, WSDOT; Charlie Hales, City of Portland; Lou Ogden (alt.), Cities of Washington County; and Roy Rogers, Washington County

Guests: Karl Rohde (JPACT alt.), Cities of Clackamas County; Tom VanderZanden, Rod Sandoz and John Rist, Clackamas County; Kathy Lehtola and Dennis Mulvihill, Washington County; Steve Dotterrer, City of Portland; Brian Campbell, Port of Portland; Kathy Busse and Susan Lee, Multnomah County; Dick Feeney, Bernie Bottomly and G.B. Arrington, Tri-Met; Howard Harris, DEQ; Scott Rice, City of Cornelius; Betty Atteberry, Sunset Corridor Association; Ron Papsdorf, Cities of Multnomah County; Gary Katsion, Kittelson and Associates; Paul Silver, City of Wilsonville; and Deb Wallace, C-TRAN

Staff: Mike Burton, Metro's Executive Officer; Andrew Cotugno, Mike Hogle, Larry Shaw, Tim Raphael, Kim White, and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

Media: Gordon Oliver, The Oregonian

### SUMMARY:

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

### MEETING REPORT

Commissioner Lindquist moved, seconded by Chair Kvistad, to approve the October 9, 1997 JPACT minutes as submitted. The motion PASSED unanimously.

JPACT

November 13, 1997

Page 2

#### ELECTION DAY COMMENTS

Chair Kvistad acknowledged the need for a statewide solution to our transportation funding problems, noting familiar concerns raised at a recent neighborhood association meeting alluding to the fact that the road system is unable to accommodate the growth. He thanked the local jurisdictions for all their hard work in putting the county measures on the ballot even though they were unsuccessful. He cited the need to make transportation finance a regional priority.

Commissioner Hales spoke of future elections and commented on councilors facing a recall vote because of their support for light rail. He urged financial support on their behalf.

#### GOVERNOR KITZHABER'S LETTER ON STIP

Andy Cotugno reviewed Governor Kitzhaber's October 15, 1997 letter, recommending that the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) prioritize and allocate its transportation dollars only for maintenance and preservation work in years 2002 and 2003, foregoing the Modernization projects. Andy asked Committee members whether they wish to communicate any concerns to the Oregon Transportation Commission.

Also distributed at the meeting was a letter to the OTC from Washington County, under the signature of Commissioner Linda Peters, expressing concerns relating to the state's inability to respond to the impacts growth has placed on the transportation system and the economy. Also addressed was Washington County's concern about the potential impact on established state, regional and local priorities. The letter specifically cited highway projects relating to the Westside Corridor and the I-5/Highway 217 interchange that could be compromised.

In addition, a letter to the OTC was distributed from Duane Cole, City Manager of Newberg, encouraging continued support of the Newberg/Dundee Transportation Improvement Project's environmental study. A resolution, No. 97-2079, in support of that recommendation was passed by the Newberg City Council on November 3, 1997 and accompanied the letter.

Discussed at the meeting was whether or not funding should be provided for development of Modernization projects that have construction funds available down the line.

Dave Williams reported that the OTC has met on the Governor's recommendation and has not as yet reached a conclusion. In readiness for a response, an agenda has been developed of

JPACT

November 13, 1997

Page 3

potential problems that could arise if his action plan were followed. He noted that there are some Environmental Impact Statement questions as well. Andy asked whether JPACT would like an opportunity to respond once some of the ramifications of the projects are known.

Commissioner Lindquist supported the Governor's recommendation, acknowledging to the public the seriousness of the situation. He noted that it wouldn't occur until January 1999. Commissioner Lindquist, however, expressed concern that federal funds might be lost on a number of projects if state funds are not available. Projects would need to be ready if a program could be delivered in the year 2002.

Mayor Lomnicki reported that the League of Oregon Cities (LOC) had adopted a resolution in support of the Governor's letter with a caveat about the development of some projects. He noted that the league's top priority is for maintenance and preservation. He regarded it as a clear message to the Legislature. Mayor Lomnicki indicated that the LOC will continue to strive for more funds for Modernization projects.

Commissioner Lindquist spoke of master planning for the 2040 Growth Concept and related projects in Tier I, citing the widening of Sunnyside Road as an example.

Councilor McLain felt there was need for categories of Modernization projects. She felt that projects should be scrutinized for phasing, proximity to completion, and those in the pipeline or transition period, citing Highway 26 as one example. In that regard, Dave Williams indicated that issues have been raised about projects operating under a single Environmental Impact Statement and must be dealt with over the next one and one-half years.

#### REGIONAL FRAMEWORK PLAN - CHAPTER 2

Andy Cotugno reported that the Metro Council has been working toward completion of the *Regional Framework Plan* (RFP). If there are further comments or changes, he asked that they be considered at this time.

A memo and summary of issues and responses to public comments on Chapter 2 (Transportation) was included in the agenda packet. One hundred and two comments have been received to date. They are very detailed and intended to clarify policy direction. This consideration represents a follow-up to the September 17 joint MPAC/JPACT/Transportation Planning Committee meeting action which forms the base for the proposed changes.

JPACT

November 13, 1997

Page 4

Also distributed were comments from Oregon City that were not reflected in the packet mailed out.

Andy explained that Chapter 2 provides the guiding policy direction for the transportation element of the *Regional Framework Plan*. It does not define all the projects, their costs or conditions. It also represents the policy direction that will be reflected in the *Regional Transportation Plan* and improvements to address those needs. He clarified that it is a multi-modal transportation plan linked to the 2040 Growth Concept that includes policies related to freight access to centers and terminals, street design, functional classification maps, and targets for non-SOV mode share.

Discussion items included whether or not street design guidelines should be mandatory or applied through the use of financial incentives; issues about street connectivity standards; the status of the Water Avenue ramp; whether mode split is a key regional measure; and whether street connectivity should apply to commercial or industrial areas. Andy noted that the Staff Recommendation is to make design guidelines through financial incentives. He proposed consideration at the time the general TIP criteria is allocated. Andy then reviewed all the discussion items.

Councilor McLain shared Councilor Naito's concern that the language provided in Chapter 2 be user or reader-friendly. She indicated that Councilor Naito was not interested in trying to change policy or the direction of the committee but was hopeful that an Executive Summary would be prepared for the general public that would provide a more reader-friendly document. Councilor Washington supported the recommendation and felt the issue should be addressed.

Councilor McLain also asked about the specifics and what is contained in the Appendix to the *Regional Framework Plan*. It was noted that the *Urban Growth Management Functional Plan* (UGMFP) is in the Appendix. A discussion followed on how this element relates to the UGMFP and the need to make a reference for implementation of Chapter 2 of the *Regional Framework Plan* through the *Urban Growth Management Functional Plan* and the *Regional Transportation Plan*.

With regard to Discussion Item 8, relating to the Water Avenue ramp being deleted from the Freight System Map, Commissioner Hales noted that the Water Avenue project was originally intended to serve truck access to the Central Eastside Industrial District. His comments centered on the fact that the character of the area has changed and that the development occurring is quite

JPACT

November 13, 1997

Page 5

different from industrial use. He felt the market is changing the area to a mixed employment district and the City of Portland would like to focus their attention on other projects that would be more beneficial to the vehicle circulation system or provide a variety of Ross Island Bridge improvements. The City of Portland would prefer to drop the Water Avenue ramp from the Freight System Map.

The Staff Recommendation is to retain the Water Avenue ramp project on the Freight System Map and in the RTP, as supported by Metro Council Resolution No. 94-1890A, until an alternative has been identified and approved. The ramp would support the freight network with access to I-5 southbound. Councilor McLain felt it was appropriate to retain the ramp on the map until an alternative option has been planned for. Chair Kvistad indicated he was still supportive of the Water Avenue ramp and wanted to have it retained for further consideration. Commissioner Hales reported a declining number of truck usage in the area and noted that he will be pushing alternative access strategies in order that the ramp can be removed from the RTP maps.

Dean Lookingbill raised the issue of acceptable levels of congestion and how prioritization is done among corridors, referencing Consent Items 99 and 100 of Attachment A. Andy Cotugno pointed out that the language is not intended to deal with priorities and only relates to level of congestion. He didn't wish to set any congestion standard that might prove impossible to achieve. He felt that you need to determine what's possible, arrive at a conclusion of what can be accomplished in that corridor, and then focus on the problems and objectives to achieve that standard. Dean expressed concern about a case-by-case consideration. Committee members agreed on the need to provide language in the Motor Vehicle Level-of-Service Policy section that references what we want the system to do consistent with Policies 2.11 (street design), 2.12 (motor vehicle transportation), and 2.16 (freight movement) in Chapter 2.

Action Taken: Councilor Washington moved, seconded by Commissioner Lindquist, to recommend approval of Chapter 2 (Transportation) of the *Regional Framework Plan*. The motion PASSED unanimously.

#### TITLE 6 AMENDMENTS

A substitute packet, dated November 12, 1997, was distributed summarizing comments received on proposed amendments to Title 6 of the *Urban Growth Management Functional Plan* (UGMFP). The replacement packet reflected action taken at the November 7 TPAC meeting. Work on the UGMFP was undertaken last year as an early

action program to achieve early implementation of the RFP. The Functional Plan was adopted in November 1996 to provide an immediate set of requirements which include: population/employment targets; parking ratios; and four specific transportation requirements that include "boulevard" design treatment in centers, local street connectivity, level-of-service standards in centers and establishment of mode split targets.

Andy reviewed the proposed amendments and corresponding Staff Recommendations to issues and comments on the Functional Plan (Attachment A). He noted that refinements, intended to deal with some specific elements in local comprehensive plans, have been made to the UGMFP since its approval in November 1996. Forty-five comments were received.

Dave Williams provided an explanation of what "key regional measures" meant in terms of how investment decisions are made. He cited considerations such as 2040 objectives, mode split, green corridors, the protection of roadways outside the UGB, environmental issues and diversion of traffic away from certain traffic areas. Mayor Ogden expressed concern over Discussion Item 4 relating to mode split as "a" or "the" key regional measure for transportation effectiveness in all 2040 Growth Concept land use design types. He indicated he was not against mode splits but was concerned that it would be difficult to obtain gas tax funds for access improvements or widenings if the decision was based on a single measurement of mode split or being transit-oriented. He spoke of a major connection between two highways for the purpose of diverting truck traffic and regional commuter traffic and was concerned about having alternative mode split targets regarded as the key consideration. Notwithstanding a major freeway, he spoke of committing dollars for transit and taking advantage of mode split. He didn't want to get caught in a "Catch 22" position of being dependent on transit without Tri-Met's ability to deliver. Mayor Ogden was concerned about the use of limited dollars.

Commissioner Hales felt it struck an appropriate balance since major new highways aren't going to be built in the region. He didn't feel we were being idealistic about how we move people, regardless of criteria. He cited the need for change from a level of service for auto capacity to criteria dealing with mode split.

Councilor McLain supported Commissioner Hales' comments, noting that we are trying to undo past mistakes and felt that the language proposed by TPAC represented a good compromise.

Commissioner Rogers felt the point was made with regard to person travel. He asked whether language provided under Discussion Item 3 would be provided to accomplish that.

Mayor Lomnicki felt that mode split means a number of alternative modes, including buses, rail, and others and that, in total, are the No. 1 solution to congestion.

Dave Williams had concerns using mode split as "the" measure. He commented that the I-5/99W connector would help get traffic off the local streets and provide a better connection to the Coast. He asked whether language having mode split as "the" measure would preclude putting that project into a 20-year plan, noting that the project may meet other objectives. It was noted that the Tualatin Commons and Beaverton Round are making huge improvements in terms of mode split that have nothing to do with transit. They relate to connectivity and pedestrian access. In line with that type of development, discussion centered on building more projects with transit, pedestrian and bike improvements.

Commissioner Lindquist commented that he didn't disapprove of radial highways, but suggested that language be added to denote "where transit is available" in recognition that the purpose is to move people. A discussion followed on improving mode split between the Metro area and Salem and the need to stop adding freeway capacity.

The discussion focused on the differences between the word "a" and "the" relative to Discussion Items 3 and 4. The importance of person travel was stressed. Commissioner Hales noted that this was a policy recommendation discussed thoroughly by MPAC and that it was a significant enough change to warrant referring it to a subcommittee for public hearing.

Action Taken: Mayor Ogden moved, seconded by Commissioner Rogers, to recommend approval of Discussion Item 3 with substitution of a for "the," which read:

"1. Person travel represents the largest share of trips for all modes of transportation. Mode split will be used as a key regional measure for person travel in all 2040 Growth Concept design types and will be used to guide transportation system improvements."

In discussion on the motion, Commissioner Hales suggested that there be a joint JPACT/MPAC meeting scheduled as soon as possible to discuss the issue. He noted that use of "the" rather than "a" key regional measure had previously been endorsed by MPAC.

The motion PASSED by a vote of 7 for, 5 opposed.

Further discussion centered on the mode split between barge, air, rail and freight. Commissioner Hales reported a special MPAC meeting being held on December 3 and asked that there be no action taken on Discussion Item 4 until replacement language could be considered.

Action Taken: Councilor McLain moved, seconded by Mayor Ogden, to substitute Discussion Item 4 for Discussion Item 3, which read:

4) Amend the first sentence, Line 249, as follows:

"Mode split will be used as a key regional measure for transportation effectiveness in all 2040 Growth Concept land use design types."

The motion PASSED by a vote of 8 to 4. Those voting for included Councilor McLain, Don Wagner, Mayor Ogden, Dean Lookingbill, Commissioner Lindquist, Dave Williams, Commissioner Rogers, and Councilor Kvistad. Those opposed included Councilor Washington, Commissioner Hales, Mayor Lomnicki and Councilor Kight.

Action Taken: Commissioner Hales moved, seconded by Mayor Lomnicki, to amend Discussion Item 6 to read:

"For new residential, commercial, and mixed-use development, all contiguous areas of vacant and primarily undeveloped land of five acres or more shall be identified..."

In discussion on the motion, Commissioner Rogers commented that the market in Washington County has changed to campus-style development that has some of the worst connectivity in the region. He reported that colleges in Washington County are starting to sell space to other high-tech facilities for alternate users. The hospitals are attempting to add other kinds of uses to their development as well. In addition, there are campus developments such as Peterkort, Nike and Tektronix that may need to put in roads to aid pedestrian traffic. Five-acre parcels of mixed-use development require a roadway at 530-foot intervals, which would include campus-style development. Andy Cotugno clarified that the intent was to apply the requirement to campus-style development if it is a multi-tenant, multi-purpose facility. If it is a single owner with single purpose, that application would not apply. If it is developing in a multi-tenant environment and with more than one owner, it would apply. Commissioner Rogers noted that he believes in connectivity but felt it ran counter to the direction being taken in the market.

Councilor McLain felt that if it is not an auxiliary service or support service, there may need to be some connectivity and should perhaps be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

Further discussion focused on colleges, business campus development, hospitals and the question of whether it would apply to expansion or "new" development. The Title 6 document states that the comprehensive plan will define how it deals with the 10-16 and 530-foot streets/mile minimum spacing requirements. Comments



centered on street connectivity, how it would help the transportation system, and opportunities for jurisdictions to be creative with such development. The requirement is on five-acre vacant land that is developable. The section allows for exemptions if the connections can't be made due to topographical or environmental factors. Andy explained that street connections are intended to provide public access, not necessarily publicly-owned streets.

Chair Kvistad noted that this will be taken under advisement.

Action Taken: Commissioner Hales moved to table Discussion Items 3, 4 and 6 of Title 6 for referral to a joint JPACT/MPAC meeting to be discussed in the context of land use and transportation. (He noted there is a December 3 MPAC meeting scheduled.)

Councilor McLain felt that everyone wants the land use/transportation connection to work. Councilor Washington felt that these regional concerns need to be worked out so they are applicable to everyone. Dave Williams didn't feel there were fundamental differences.

Mayor Ogden noted that Grace Crunican's motion on "a" versus "the" usage failed at the last JPACT/MPAC meeting. He questioned the sanctity of the vote and was interested in discussing the issue further.

Commissioner Hales felt the issue is about whether or not the transportation system is going to support the land use plan. He asked whether the region is going to build a transportation system to alleviate congestion or build a system to support a very different kind of land use plan. He cited the importance of having emphasis on improving the mode split.

Chair Kvistad felt we should adhere to the vote on mode split and tabled the issue on connectivity.

Action Taken: After further discussion, there was general consent (6 for, 3 opposed) to reaffirm action taken on Discussion Items 3 and 4 of Title 6 but to table Discussion Item 6 to the December 11 JPACT meeting, allowing time for further refinement of the language relating to mixed-use development.

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Mike Burton  
JPACT Members