

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: December 12, 1996

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Chair Rod Monroe, Don Morissette and Jon Kvistad (alt.), Metro Council; Tom Walsh, Tri-Met; Tanya Collier, Multnomah County; Dave Lohman (alt.), Port of Portland; Rob Drake, Cities of Washington County; Charlie Hales, City of Portland; Ed Lindquist, Clackamas County; Craig Lomnicki, Cities of Clackamas County; Claudiette LaVert, Cities of Multnomah County; Roy Rogers, Washington County; Greg Green (alt.), DEQ; Dean Lookingbill (alt.), Southwest Washington RTC; and Grace Crunican, ODOT

Guests: Don Wagner (JPACT alt.) and Dave Williams, ODOT; Lisa Naito, Metro Councilor-Elect; John Rosenberger, Washington County; Kathy Busse and Susan Lee, Multnomah County; Steve Dotterer and Kate Deane, City of Portland; Jim Howell, AORTA; Scott Rice, City of Cornelius; Rod Sandoz, John Rist and Gini Brewster, Clackamas County; Robert Behnke, Citizen Against Transit Scams; Jan Shearer, Bernie Bottomly, Dick Feeney, G.B. Arrington and Mary Fetsch, Tri-Met; Tom Markgraf, Markgraf & Associates; Steve Clark, Transit Choices for Livability; Len Bergstein, Northwest Strategies; Meeky Blizzard and Pat Forgey, Office of Representative Blumenauer; Howard Harris, DEQ; Gary Katsion, Kittelson & Associates; Chris Wrench, RTP CAC; and Benjamin Schonberger, NGI

Staff: Mike Burton, Executive Officer Andrew Cotugno, Richard Brandman, Leon Skiles, Mike Hoglund, Bridget Wieghart, Kim White, Pamela Peck, Gina Whitehill-Baziuk, and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

MEDIA: Larry Hilderbrand and Gordon Oliver, The Oregonian
Bruce Solberg, Daily Journal of Commerce

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background	1
Introduction	1
Project Description	1
Western Bypass Study Context	1
I. Statement of Need	4
Introduction.....	4
IA. Modal Nature of Need.....	5
Public Transit	5
Freight	6
Automobile.....	6
IB. Deficiencies	7
Circumferential Facilities.....	8
East-West or Radial Facilities.....	11
IC. Transportation Demand	12
ID. Future Growth Allocations and Land Uses.....	18
Growth Allocations.....	18
Land Use Changes.....	18
II. Mode	20
IIA. Alternative Modes	21
Alternatives Modes Considered But Not Further Analyzed	21
Alternative Modes Evaluated But Not Further Analyzed	24
Recommended Alternative Modes.....	26
Express Transit Service	26
Fixed-Route Transit Service.....	27
Demand Responsive Transit (DRT).....	29
Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities	29
IIB. Transportation Demand Management Measures	30
IIC. Improvement to Existing Facilities.....	31
Improvements To Existing Facilities Considered But Not Evaluated	31
Improvements To Existing Facilities Evaluated But Not Recommended.....	33
Recommended Improvements to Existing Facilities	34
IID. Alternative Land Use Patterns	37
III. Function of the I-5 to 99W Connector	39
IIIA. Purpose/Type of Trip.....	39
IIIB. Why A 4-Lane Limited Access Roadway?.....	41
IV. General Location	43
Rural Land Within the Corridor	44

JPACT

December 12, 1996

Page 3

within the existing system. The OTI recognizes that both state and local efforts will be needed to meet transportation demands.

Andy reviewed the Staff Report/Resolution that would endorse the principles relating to operations, maintenance and funding of the transportation system.

Mike Burton commented on the importance of the SAC recommendations and his concern about whether the Metro area jurisdictions have identified their local needs. He spoke of very intensive transportation needs that are unique in this part of the state. He suggested that, while we are to work closely with the rest of the state, he hoped that endorsement of this resolution did not preclude finding some local, regional solutions to our transportation problems. He cited the need to work continuously with the state but to also seek authority and the ability to deal with transportation needs apart from the rest of the state.

Grace Crunican noted that it was her understanding, as a member of the State Advisory Committee, that everyone understood that there are regional needs beyond what is covered in the state's base package. She expressed appreciation for the cooperative effort with the Governor, commenting that the SAC expects the Portland metropolitan area to articulate their needs.

Mayor Lomnicki, who participated on the State Advisory Committee, indicated there was no discussion about limitations being placed on the regions' ability to meet their own needs. He felt there was nothing in the proposal that would limit this region from seeking its own funds.

Action Taken: Commissioner Hales moved, seconded by Mayor Drake, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 96-2436, endorsing the Statewide Advisory Committee recommendations on the Oregon Transportation Initiative. The motion PASSED unanimously.

Grace noted that the Governor has acknowledged the specific unfunded transportation need of \$391 million that needs to be addressed in the next biennium. Flexibility is being maintained and is needed through the process. The question was raised as to whether there will be a specific funding proposal from the Governor. The general conclusion was that any proposal may be molded as part of the legislative process.

Chair Monroe felt that the legislative leaders don't want this forwarded as the Governor's Plan but rather the Oregon Plan. Most of the work has been done in the State Capitol.

RESOLUTION NO. 96-2429 - APPOINTING NEW MEMBERS FOR VACANCIES ON THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN CAC

Pamela Peck, Associate Public Involvement Planner at Metro, described the widespread advertising, mailing, nominations and screening process Metro undertook for filling the three vacancies on the Regional Transportation Plan Citizens Advisory Committee.

The three nominees recommended for appointment include: William Stewart, freight-at-large delegate; C.A. (Madya) Panfilio, City of Vancouver/Clark County delegate; and Edward Gronke, Cities of Clackamas County business delegate.

Action Taken: Councilor Kvistad moved, seconded by Commissioner Lindquist, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 96-2429, appointing new members for vacancies on the Regional Transportation Plan Citizens Advisory Committee (as noted above). The motion PASSED unanimously.

TRAFFIC RELIEF OPTIONS UPDATE - WORKING PAPERS NOS. 3 AND 4

Andy Cotugno explained that the genesis of the *Traffic Relief Options Study* (congestion pricing) occurred two years ago when JPACT adopted a resolution to undertake a study to determine whether congestion pricing has an appropriate role in this region. A grant has been awarded for this study, which the Task Force launched in May.

The study's process will include evaluation of a series of specific proposals for peak period pricing as a means of reducing traffic congestion in the region. The focus of the study will center on the field of possible approaches and types of congestion pricing applications from which 10 locations and types will be selected for further study. Based on that selection, staff will determine which are workable, their positive or negative consequences, and benefits.

Staff must first consider the practicality of the approaches and whether other applications have been overlooked. It is hoped that the outcome of the study will determine whether there is an appropriate pilot project for peak period pricing for a long-term solution for traffic congestion in this region.

Open houses will be held on the 10 locations/types to gain public feedback and, as a result, appropriate modeling and qualitative analysis will follow that will allow a narrowing of the projects from 10 alternatives to 3-5. The 3-5 alternatives will then be subjected to further review through open houses before a final selection is made.

Andy explained that the task at hand is to develop a series of approaches that include a three-step evaluation: getting all possible locations and approaches in the field of possibilities to be considered; picking 10 specific proposals around the region to be evaluated in more detail; and narrowing the 10 alternatives down to five. He described congestion pricing as market pricing of the roadway based on time of day and location through management of peak-hour demand.

Examples of currently operating congestion pricing applications included State Road 91 in Orange County, California; Autoroute A-1 in France; Singapore; I-15 in San Diego -- where SOV drivers can pay to drive in HOV lanes; and on the Maine Turnpike where weekend recreational traffic is priced at peak times.

Andy noted that there are other U.S. metropolitan areas undertaking the same kind of FHWA demonstration studies. Our region is looking at congestion pricing because we have congestion problems (ranked in the top 15 most congested areas in the United States) and we have limited resources to keep up with growth and future congestion.

Current work has focused on identifying potential locations and types of pricing applications. The first step is to identify where congested locations are -- either now or projected for 2015. Also to be considered is what you do about the rest of the transportation system when capacity improvements are called for. Diversity in locations and approaches are also important.

Andy described the following types of potential applications:

- 1) Spot pricing (bridge, tunnel or chokepoint), which would be priced according to location and time of day.

In discussion, the issue of traffic diversion was raised. The spot approach does not distinguish how far a person travels. Examples noted include the tunnel on Sunset, the Willamette River bridge, and Highway 43 between the Sellwood Bridge and Taylors Ferry Road.

- 2) Partial facility (e.g., pricing the middle two lanes of a six-lane highway). The feeling is that it should only be considered on a freeway with three lanes available in each direction. Examples given included: the length of Sunset Highway, the length of I-84, Highway 217, I-205, McLoughlin Boulevard, I-5N, and I-5 south of downtown.

- 3) Whole facility (pricing all lanes). This would be regarded as a toll facility and all users would pay.

In discussion on the whole facility pricing, it was explained that people would try to find alternative routes. It needs to be a limited access facility and not have a strong set of parallel routes. Examples given included: Highway 217 with or without additional lanes, I-5S, I-5N, the Tualatin-Sherwood Expressway, the Sunrise Corridor, and Highway 43 south to the Sellwood Bridge.

Mayor Drake noted that such a major change in the region, if implemented, would necessitate giving something back to the users to reinforce the change. They need to see a positive return from the toll. He expressed difficulty in supporting a toll on T.V. Highway or Highway 217 unless there was some incentive given to ensure success of the project.

Commissioner Collier commented on the potential unpopularity of the subject matter, wanting to know what happens after this portion of the study is completed. Andy spoke of the importance of public involvement, noting that half the congestion pricing budget is dedicated to public outreach. He indicated that meetings are being held with targeted groups and, when agreement has been reached on 10 proposals, there will be broad public outreach. Mike Burton cited the importance of public approach in dealing with this topic.

Chair Monroe felt that it is more acceptable if you are adding capacity when tolling the new part of the roadway.

Andy Cotugno reported that the TRO Task Force has been concerned that congestion pricing be looked at as part of the whole transportation system. The pricing component is defined in conjunction with TDM and transit as part of an entire package to evaluate whether there is a net gain or loss from such an application. Grace Crunican commented that you need to see an improved performance of the trip, not necessarily a widening of the lane.

Mayor Drake commented that the Tualatin Valley Economic Development Corporation has expressed concern about the huge amount of business and single-occupant vehicle travel. The region must decide whether it needs to add buses, commuter rail or a combination package to make travel more efficient. The citizens need to experience a positive change in the corridor.

- 4) Corridor (pricing of a major highway and major parallel arterials along a route from an origin to a destination)

This entails management of all the travel demand occurring in that corridor and must rely on pricing the network of parallel routes. Examples noted include: I-84 with a cordon line; I-5 north of downtown; and I-205 south of I-84.

- 5) Area Pricing (pricing of an entire area through an area license, an AVI cordon or attaching a peak-period component of parking pricing)

Andy cited the need to work with specific locations to see how they might develop such an approach.

- 6) Regionwide Approach (developing a regional approach of an entire area by pricing all facilities on a regionwide system or establishing a series of cordon lines)

Andy indicated that the TRO Task Force has identified evaluation criteria for further consideration.

Chair Monroe commented that one of the things needed to make our regional system work more efficiently is ramp metering. We try to discourage people from taking short trips on the freeways during peak hours. Andy cited the possibility of having metered ramps bypass carpoolers.

Following review of the 10 locations and types/approaches being considered by the TRO Task Force, public outreach will be broadened.

Commissioner Rogers asked about the timeline. Andy responded that the study will run until June of 1998 and half of the following year. The projects will be narrowed from 10 to 3-5 in the spring of 1997. It was explained that the Task Force will serve as the oversight committee and that there is a Technical Advisory Committee and a Project Management Group of partner jurisdictions. The study is co-sponsored by ODOT/Metro.

Commissioner Hales questioned the practicality of congestion pricing as a mechanism in relation to the conversion of the present ramp metering system. He noted that it has the potential of involving Clark County. A discussion followed on spill-over effects on adjacent parallel routes. Commissioner Hales felt the side effects would not be as severe.

Mike Burton reported that the state is looking at signalization systems and system improvements that would be used in other

areas. Grace added that the state is also looking at ramp metering as a possibility.

Andy commented that, when this study was first initiated, the three Clark County JPACT representatives declined to directly participate and, therefore, are not part of this effort. Metro staff met with the Southwest Washington RTC board and they were not interested in a cooperative scope of work that would examine congestion pricing across the two bridges. We are committed to return with a proposal on how that could be addressed and are looking at a variety of other issues in that corridor. The South/North corridor is involved as well and those issues need to be integrated in the discussion.

Commissioner Collier felt that the various governing bodies need to address the congestion pricing issue, citing the need for political unanimity. Grace Crunican pointed out that, while the topic is unpopular, part of the packaging is to remind people of the implications of doing nothing. She felt that our approach to explaining congestion pricing is vital, noting that it is considered crucial to changing driver behavior. It is an essential component in describing why this option looks viable to the region.

Commissioner Lindquist felt that it will be difficult when tolls are placed on a facility but that people can gain acceptance of it as long as they know that revenues will be used wisely. Commissioner Collier stressed the importance of working with the Legislature on this to ensure that it is a legally acceptable thing to do. Andy noted that the purpose of this study is to determine feasibility of a pilot project in the region before anything gets implemented. They must first determine whether there is political and public willingness to go along with it.

TRANSIT CHOICES FOR LIVABILITY

Steve Clark, Chair of the Transit Choices for Livability Committee, spoke of Tri-Met's planning and outreach effort as it relates to strategic transit priorities, rules and responsibilities. The objective of the effort is to enlist bold and flexible solutions and public-private partnerships in support of investments that will improve transit service within the suburbs.

Steve cited his background as a suburbanite since 1978 and his concern for the future of this region. He acknowledged that transit doesn't serve the needs of the suburbs. His concern stems from projected growth in the region, complexity of needs, public attitudes, and disappearance of open space. He noted that only 30 percent of Tri-Met's service is in the suburbs. He felt

JPACT

December 12, 1996

Page 9

that safety and the transportation network will be enhanced if Tri-Met is successful in its effort to improve transit service.

The 33-member Transit Choices for Livability Committee is composed of business people, residents, and community leaders dealing in market-driven solutions. They are addressing how suburban transit service matches up with land use plans. Steve reported that a regionwide community workshop resulted in 700 recommendations for service improvements, which included: the need for more choices, greater flexibility, more transit connections between and within suburban communities, expansion of South/North corridor transit service to include light rail, the need to increase our investment in roads, the need to connect Regional Centers, major employers needing to get their employees around their campus, and a loop service being a significant issue. He also spoke of high-growth areas that currently do not have adequate transit service.

Steve reported that Oregon City has no light rail and is poorly connected to the surrounding communities. The Transit Choices for Livability Committee will recommend to improve service enhancement possibilities. They recognize, however, that funds are limited. He reiterated that this is a market-driven and market-responsive project. Steve felt that an action plan is needed for the right set of transit improvement projects.

Phase II of the process will begin in March 1997. Some initial demonstration projects will occur in 1997. Steve emphasized the importance of a partnership between JPACT and the state and asked what the priorities are in regard to that project.

Also emphasized was the need to seek new funding opportunities, create smart partnerships which, in effect, will create benefits. Steve felt that smart transit solutions will last longer if there is better utilization of limited funds.

Steve pointed out that this effort represents a long-term task and encouraged JPACT's commitment and participation.

Mike Burton applauded Steve Clark for his time and effort spent on behalf of the region. He felt the changing nature of the region is an important aspect of that effort, citing land use planning and the population increase as key factors in those considerations. He emphasized the importance of accessibility to the region, transit and roads being supportive of the 2040 Growth Concept and the ability to meet regional needs. Mike felt the effort is critical and should be a No. 1 priority, thanking Steve Clark for his presentation.

Tom Walsh commented that the community workshops have produced thoughtful comments, interest and criticism over transit's shortcomings. He noted the opportunity to follow the results of this committee's leadership by putting some of these projects on the ground. He personally thanked Steve Clark for his efforts and commented on the need for some permanent funding for transit improvements throughout the region.

Commissioner Rogers asked about the committee's thinking on other transit modes and public-private partnerships. Steve responded that it is quite possible that some of the improvements will not be owned or operated by Tri-Met. In discussion, possibilities included establishment of a community transit foundation that matches funds that the business community puts up, engaging Broadway Radio Cab, and employing a jitney service in a consumer-demand service. A number of alternatives are being explored.

Mayor Drake reported that both Hillsboro and Beaverton experienced large citizen turnout. Tri-Met representatives were present to facilitate rather than to drive discussion. Meetings were attended by a good cross-section of interests. Mayor Drake thanked Tri-Met for providing people with the opportunity to be critical of transit in a constructive way.

Councilor Kvistad felt the effort addressed most concerns about service and resulted in opportunities to provide innovative service.

SOUTH/NORTH LIGHT RAIL

Mike Burton noted that a synopsis of the impact of Ballot Measure 32, a precinct analysis of the vote, and a survey of voter opinion had been distributed at the meeting. Also distributed was a memo from Rod Monroe, JPACT Chair, and Mike relating to the South/North LRT proposal. The memo outlined the South/North Steering Group's recommendations, as follows:

- . Develop a range of options and design changes to significantly reduce the cost of the project;
- . Develop a financial plan which can be implemented to provide the basis for federal matching funds;
- . Work with the Oregon Congressional delegation to pursue ISTEA funds for the Phase One project;
- . Continue to assess and discuss with the public a range of transportation options to meet the future needs of this region; and

JPACT

December 12, 1996

Page 11

- . Develop a thorough public process to ensure that citizens have full opportunity to provide input regarding how this project moves forward and what changes are made in the DEIS.

Mike spoke of continued support for light rail in the Metro area, noting that the outcome of Ballot Measure 32 doesn't change the circumstances of the region. In terms of ISTEA funding, the region needs to get its request for match in after the first of the year.

Mike felt the region would be missing an opportunity if it failed to provide the leadership needed to seek available federal funding through ISTEA. If the region misses this window of opportunity, it will be another five years before those funds become available again. Mike noted that we will likely be competing with Seattle for such funds.

The Steering Group unanimously recommended that JPACT and the Metro Council proceed with this course of action to obtain funding for a Phase One South/North light rail project. Mike cited the need to reconfirm the public's commitment to light rail.

Commissioner Collier was supportive of moving ahead with the project and funding through ISTEA. She was also pleased to have the opportunity of reviewing the project once again in terms of scaling it back or making other modifications. She felt the river crossing issue should be further addressed and that there be provision for traffic in addition to light rail. She encouraged a thorough public outreach effort.

Chair Monroe reported on comments with Tim Hibbitts after his assessment of Measure 32 that indicated strong support for going forward with light rail in the South/North corridor in some form. Chair Monroe cited the importance of going on record in support of South/North light rail and hoped that all the partners would be included in that process. Commissioner Rogers stated that Washington County was supportive and wanted to participate in the process because they are included at the ballot box.

Mike Burton indicated that the reasons for people outside the region voting "no" were different from those within the region. There is need for the region to recapture some of the funds that were going to be transferred downstate (\$75 million).

Grace Crunican suggested taking the time to address the issues that were raised and suggested that the third bullet (relating to working with the Oregon Congressional delegation) be omitted as

JPACT

December 12, 1996

Page 12

it wouldn't occur until January. Other committee members felt the intent should be incorporated in the last sentence of the memo.

Mike Burton felt there was more interest in the voting data than the polling data. He noted there will be Congressional staff here this month to look at the existing light rail project.

Meeky Blizzard announced that Congressman Blumenauer is totally supportive of the regional light rail project between Clackamas County and Portland and that it move forward. His office will be holding a series of public forums beginning in January in the Southeast/Clackamas area and in North Portland in February to address concerns raised. It is slated to go to the full Congressional delegation in March.

Councilor Kvistad felt the committee should be sensitive to the concerns of the voters. He expressed his intention to fast-track this through the Metro Council as a placeholder on those funds.

Mayor Drake concurred with Commissioner Rogers' opinion that Washington County should also be at the table with regard to light rail; he noted that the City of Beaverton supported Measure 32 by a vote of 67 percent. He supported a full light rail system through the region in the long term and felt we would be foolish in not moving forward in view of current polling that demonstrates that the citizens of the region are in favor of completing the initial system.

Commissioner Hales favored deleting the third bullet on the second page of the letter (relating to the Congressional delegation) until such time as a position paper is developed in January and a public hearing has been held to gain public input rather than going forward on the basis of momentum and instincts.

Grace Crunican commented that there have been many public forums on this issue since defeat of Ballot Measure 32. The Citizens Advisory Committee held meetings in North and South Portland with citizens expressing support of moving forward with the project.

Mayor Lomnicki spoke of working with the Neighborhood Associations, the City of Milwaukie's Citizens Advisory Committee, and the business community and felt that the bullet relating to the Oregon Congressional delegation was important to the City of Milwaukie. Mike Burton cited the need to take something to the Metro Council that demonstrates regional consensus.

Action Taken: Commissioner Lindquist moved, seconded by Tom Walsh, to approve the December 11 JPACT memo on the South/North

light rail proposal with removal of the third bullet on the second page of the memo and incorporation of that intent in the last paragraph of the memo. The last sentence will read: "The Steering Group is recommending that JPACT and the Metro Council accept this course of action, include funding for a Phase One South/North Light Rail project in the ISTEAs position paper scheduled for adoption in January 1997, and work with the Oregon Congressional delegation regarding ISTEAs funding for Phase One of the project." The motion PASSED unanimously.

TRIBUTES TO OUTGOING JPACT COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Humorous, but heartfelt, "certificates of appreciation" were extended to Chair Monroe and Councilor LaVert, this being their last JPACT meeting. They were acknowledged and thanked for their contributions to the region.

Chair Monroe indicated he would continue to be a participant on transportation issues and needs of the region.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Mike Burton
JPACT Members