

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: October 9, 1997

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Acting Chair Ed Washington, Susan McLain and Lisa Naito (alt.), Metro Council; Roy Rogers, Washington County; Charlie Hales, City of Portland; Craig Lomnicki, Cities of Clackamas County; Jim Kight, Cities of Multnomah County; Bob Stacey (alt.), Tri-Met; Don Wagner, WSDOT; Rob Drake, Cities of Washington County; Dave Lohman (alt.), Port of Portland; Ed Lindquist, Clackamas County; Ted Spence, ODOT; Tanya Collier, Multnomah County; and Dean Lookingbill (alt.), Southwest Washington RTC

Guests: Karl Rohde (JPACT alt.), Cities of Clackamas County; Mary Legry (JPACT alt.), WSDOT; Phil Selinger, Bernie Bottomly and G.B. Arrington, Tri-Met; Rod Sandoz and John Rist, Clackamas County; John Rosenberger, Washington County; Claude Sakr, Bill Ciz, and Dan Layden, ODOT; Steve Dotterrer and Mark Lear, City of Portland; Kathy Busse and Susan Lee, Multnomah County; Peter Fry, Central Eastside Industrial Council; Meeky Blizzard, Sensitive Transportation Options for People; Scott Rice, Cornelius City Council; and Paul Silver, City of Wilsonville

Staff: Andrew Cotugno, Richard Brandman, and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

SUMMARY:

The meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Acting Chair Ed Washington.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW JPACT MEMBERS

Chair Washington introduced and welcomed as new members to JPACT Ted Spence, ODOT's interim Region 1 Manager, serving as alternate; Don Wagner, WSDOT's new District Administrator, serving as member; and Bob Stacey, Tri-Met's Policy and Planning Executive Director, serving as alternate.

MEETING REPORT

Commissioner Lindquist moved, seconded by Councilor Kight, to approve the August 14, 1997 JPACT minutes as submitted. The motion PASSED unanimously.

RESULTS OF I-5 BRIDGE CLOSURE

Claude Sakr of ODOT reported that the success achieved during the I-5 trunnion repair could be attributed to the use of financial incentives, the qualification of selection criteria, the outreach program being well focused, and the partnership that was developed among the jurisdictions across the state. He spoke of the effort's partnership with a media connection between the bridge and control center and partnerships formed with businesses.

Phil Selinger of Tri-Met noted that they had hoped to learn a lot from the analysis but found the data inconclusive because of the short timeframe. A handout was distributed on the "Lessons Learned from Trunnion Trauma."

Phil reported that the Traffic Management Plan was developed in a short period of time. He lauded the number of jurisdictions that came together for a common purpose and felt that the wide range of alternatives offered to cope with the reduction of capacity on I-5, the extra C-TRAN service provided, the aggressive vanpool program, and the carpool program were all well-received strategies. Peak-hour traffic was reduced substantially on I-5. I-205 experienced some fluctuations in traffic. The peak period shifted a few hours earlier during the first few days of the closure. Amtrak's operation, backed up by C-TRAN's pick-up service, was popular and successful as was evidenced by significant ridership on C-TRAN that exceeded all expectations.

Phil reported that less than half the usual travelers were on the highway. He spoke of the possibility of a lot of discretionary trips, telecommuting, relocating or vacations being taken. Of the visible trips, one-third could be explained by carpoolers.

Reportedly, the media did a good job. Staff learned that the commuting public is both resilient and willing to try alternatives. Phil noted that a consultant is helping with an evaluation of the TDM strategies applied and that the report will be forthcoming in about a month. Commissioner Hales felt that the full evaluation would be helpful in making policy decisions on alternate modes and using the capacity of the system. He spoke of high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes proving to be a creditable action. He felt that the work done on this project would be helpful in directing the local voters about transportation funding on infrastructure needs.

Chair Washington thanked Phil and Claude for their presentations.

RESOLUTION NO. 97-2546B - ENDORSING THE TRAFFIC RELIEF OPTIONS TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATION TO FURTHER EVALUATE PEAK PERIOD PRICING OPTIONS

Andy Cotugno explained that JPACT had previously approved endorsing the traffic relief options defined in Resolution No. 97-2546. At the time of approval by JPACT, there was discussion as to whether Option 20, Beaverton Area Pricing, should be studied further. That issue was also raised at the Metro Council meeting. Since that time, the Traffic Relief Options Task Force revisited the issue and moved that the resolution go forward without Option 20 being considered for further study. Approval of Resolution No. 97-2546B would endorse that recommendation.

Action Taken: Mayor Drake moved, seconded by Commissioner Lindquist, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 97-2546B, endorsing the Traffic Relief Options Task Force recommendation for further evaluation of peak period pricing options. This, in effect, would remove Option 20 (Beaverton Area Pricing) from being considered for further study. The motion PASSED unanimously.

REGIONAL FRAMEWORK PLAN/REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Andy Cotugno reported that a joint JPACT/MPAC meeting was held on September 17 which resulted in a recommendation for approval of Chapter 2 of the *Regional Framework Plan*. The material enclosed in the agenda packet was updated and reflects that recommendation. All comments received are reflected as well, whether or not adopted by the committee. He noted there will be another round of comments following the public hearings. Formal comments on the Framework Plan are to be submitted by October 16. A compilation of comments will be reviewed at the November 13 JPACT meeting.

Ted Spence raised the issue once again about mode split as brought up by Grace Crunican at the September 17 joint meeting.

Andy clarified for the committee that the *Regional Framework Plan* content applies only to Metro, not the local governments. Title 6 of the *Urban Growth Management Functional Plan* deals with the transportation plan. Changes have been incorporated to reflect discussion and actions taken at the last meeting. Title 6 covers boulevard design treatments that should be considered as guidelines for boulevards, streets and highways; setting non-single-occupancy vehicle targets for all 2040 land use types in the region; for changing requirements for local street connectivity from 8-20 to 10-16 streets per mile; and availability of level-of-service options for streets outside the major corridors and centers. Workshops have been scheduled for the first part of November to accomplish these objectives. Andy noted that the RTP part of the process is moving forward.

While not a formal submittal, Dave Lohman asked for clarification of line 71 under "Section 2, Regional Street Design Guidelines" of Title 6. He questioned what the intent of the term "consideration" meant with respect to the regional street design elements, whether there would be need to seek a variance, and what documentation would be necessary. The sentence in question read as follows: "Cities and counties shall amend their comprehensive plan and implementing ordinances, if necessary, to require consideration of the following Regional and Community Boulevard design elements when proceeding with right-of-way improvements on regional routes designated on the regional street design map." Andy explained that the language was recommended by staff to allow for flexibility. The intent was not to be prescriptive but to leave those requirements to be set by the policy-makers. Commissioner Hales felt the issue should be discussed by MPAC as well.

As discussed, the choices to be made are: 1) whether to keep the language vague and general with no sanctions noted; 2) be prescriptive; or 3) financially reward jurisdictions that follow the guidelines. Commissioner Hales felt that would allow the jurisdictions to act independently but to be aware that funding of transportation projects won't be as certain if not in keeping with the plan. He cited the need for a requirement that follows regional street design guidelines when planning for improvements to regional facilities or to link consideration of those guidelines to regional funding approval.

Mayor Lomnicki preferred financial incentives but to also allow the local governments to do as they wish. Andy felt that the issue does not relate to how many lanes are built but rather how best to comply with design-type requirements as needed for pedestrian implementation and speed. Commissioner Hales emphasized that he wants the region to spend its dollars on mixed-use development with a focus on multi-modal transportation.

Councilor McLain stressed the need to provide language in the Framework Plan for the kind of guidelines that would translate into real commitments. She cited the need for the committee to have a clear understanding of what the *Regional Framework Plan* and *Regional Transportation Plan* are trying to achieve and that connection to funding. Commissioner Hales felt it would be difficult for the local governments.

Bob Stacey commented that Tri-Met will benefit about the certainty of what those streets will look like. He felt it would lend itself to a more efficient transit operation and that service would be more effective depending on how the street design works.

Commissioner Lindquist indicated that Clackamas County is supportive of this plan but felt the emphasis should be on financial incentives rather than penalties.

Commissioner Rogers cautioned the committee about how transportation dollars are viewed, noting that the region shares a common vision. Local governments look at the funds in terms of their dollars. He indicated that they like the idea of a shared vision but he had reservations about having a reward system.

Ted Spence spoke of great progress having been made on these documents. He asked where the priorities are in terms of key measures as they relate to freight movement. He spoke of linkage of all the documents in terms of transportation investments.

Dave Lohman raised another issue relating to Section 3 and street connectivity issues where the standards are geared to higher density developments. He felt it would be difficult for the Port to comply. Andy responded that it was not a requirement for industrial use. Lines 193-246 apply only to new residential and mixed-use development. Dave Lohman then retracted his concern over that section. In that same connection, Commissioner Hales asked why commercial use outside of Regional Centers and corridors wasn't included. A discussion followed relating to redevelopment of streets such as SE 122nd and Division and whether connectivity would be required in a street redevelopment if it wasn't required in the initial development. Andy noted that the 2040 design types cover that type of situation, citing Main Streets and Town Centers. He emphasized the need to look at employment areas as a campus-office park which heretofore has not been addressed.

Dave Lohman also raised an issue relating to Section 4A of Title 6, "Alternative Mode Analysis." He noted that the revised language puts intermodal and industrial areas together while there is recognition that mode split targets for those areas may be different.

On Page 8 of the Title 6 document relating to Congestion Management, Dave Lohman wanted to provide language that states that the Port believes that freight mobility is the backbone of the region's economy and that we need to ensure that freight to and from those intermodal facilities should be at a higher level of service. Andy noted that, in the level-of-service table under "Regional Highway Corridors," that case-by-case requirement applies to the roads accessing Rivergate, Swan Island and Portland International Airport. You might end up higher or lower than the level-of-service standards in those locations.

FY 98-99 METRO TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT BUDGET

The list of FY 98-99 Transportation Department budget options was distributed. Andy Cotugno reported that budgets are due to the Executive Officer on November 17, submitted to Metro Council by February 12, and finalized by May. Most of the Transportation Department's budget is reflected in the Unified Work Program.

JPACT

October 9, 1997

Page 6

Andy asked JPACT members to provide input on projects they view as priorities. He noted that the list of options includes various ongoing projects or have a related work program. A budget committee, comprised of citizens from the South/North Citizens Advisory Committee, the Regional Transportation Plan Citizens Advisory Committee and TPAC, serves in an advisory capacity.

Commissioner Hales suggested that "Urban Reserve Planning for Transportation," listed under Section III, should be considered a priority. He felt it represents a base work program requirement. JPACT members were encouraged to comment on priorities.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Mike Burton
JPACT Members