

## MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: October 14, 1993

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Chair George Van Bergen, Roger Buchanan and Jon Kvistad, Metro Council; Les White, C-TRAN; Bruce Hagensen, City of Vancouver; Gerry Smith, WSDOT; Craig Lomnicki, Cities of Clackamas County; Bernie Giusto, Cities of Multnomah County; Steve Greenwood (alt.), DEQ; Gary Hansen, Multnomah County; Ed Lindquist, Clackamas County; David Lohman (alt.), Port of Portland; Bruce Warner, ODOT; Rob Drake, Cities of Washington County; Roy Rogers, Washington County; and Tom Walsh, Tri-Met

Guests: Rod Monroe (JPACT alt.) and Susan McLain, Metro Council; Jim Ebert (JPACT alt.), Cities of Clackamas County; Michael Borresen, Washington County; G.B. Arrington, Tri-Met; John Kelly, DLCD; David Knowles and Richard Ross, City of Gresham; Troy Horton, Friends of Cedar Springs; Geoff Hyde, Cedar Mills citizen; Bob Bothman, MCCI; Eric Herst, Citizen; Pamela Reamer-Williams, Oregon Trucking Association; Elsa Coleman and Steve Dotterer, City of Portland; Mary Legry, WSDOT; Dean Lookingbill, Southwest Washington RTC; Molly O'Reilly, citizen; Kathy Busse, Multnomah County; Rod Sandoz, Clackamas County; Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland; Anne O'Ryan, AAA; and Jim Beard, Oregon Environmental Council

Staff: Andrew Cotugno, Richard Brandman, Mike Hogle, Susan Lee, and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

### SUMMARY:

The meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Chair George Van Bergen.

### MEETING REPORT

Minutes of the September 9, 1993 JPACT Meeting Report were approved as written.

RESOLUTION NO. 93-1865 - ESTABLISHING A FUNDING POOL IN THE AMOUNT OF \$896,000 TO WASHINGTON COUNTY FOR COMPLETION OF THE CEDAR HILLS/HALL BOULEVARD "ALTERNATE TO HIGHWAY 217 BIKE LANE SYSTEM"

Mike Hoglund explained that this resolution represents the final increment of CMAQ funding for submission to the OTC for incorporation in ODOT's 1995-1998 Transportation Improvement Program. Mike reviewed the four funding options recommended by the Planning Committee, which eventually resulted in the recommendation that a funding pool be established in the amount of \$896,000 for priority bike projects in the Highway 217 corridor for allocation following an extensive public involvement process.

Mike noted that Washington County is supportive of the approach and there was considerable testimony regarding it at the Planning Committee hearing. Councilor Giusto had raised questions about the public process and seemed satisfied that the process had been expanded.

Andy Cotugno clarified that Exhibit A (map of the Highway 217 corridor bike lanes) identifies the full length of the corridor and this request recognizes a corridor from Tualatin to Cedar Hills Boulevard/Sunset Highway. The funds would be dedicated to projects in the corridor which result from a public process.

Action Taken: Councilor Giusto moved, seconded by Commissioner Rogers, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 93-1865, establishing a funding pool in the amount of \$896,000 to Washington County for completion of the Cedar Hills/Hall Boulevard "alternate to Highway 217 bike lane system."

In discussion on the motion, Les White commented that the "TPAC Action" on the Staff Report should more clearly reflect that the funding pool for the Highway 217 bike study is to construct priority bike projects in the Highway 217 corridor following an extensive public process.

The motion PASSED unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 93-1858 - ENDORSING ODOT REGION 1 PRIORITY FY 95, FY 96 AND FY 97 TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT PROJECTS FOR INCLUSION IN THE 1995-1998 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Mike Hoglund explained that the Transportation Enhancement projects are oriented toward alternative mode projects. \$4-5 million has been allocated per year to the State of Oregon with authority granted the state for its allocation. Approximately \$4.4 million

JPACT

October 14, 1993

Page 3

has already been allocated to Region 1 (Multnomah, Clackamas, Washington, Columbia and Hood River Counties) for 1995-1997.

Mike reported that ODOT held a June workshop at Region 1 as an opportunity for reviewing the process and soliciting projects. Forty-four projects were submitted for consideration.

Mike then reviewed the Staff Report/Resolution and accompanying exhibits.

Steve Greenwood asked for clarification relating to the attachments and exhibits. Mike Hoglund explained that Attachment B represented a list of projects recommended by ODOT's Selection Committee. The matter of project ranking was allocated technically, and all 44 projects, urban and rural, were considered by the Selection Committee. There was some geographic distribution considered consistent with OTC directives.

Testimony was then received from the following:

- . Troy Horton, Chair of the Friends of Cedar Springs, noted that he had previously testified before Metro's Planning Committee and that, although the Committee recommended approval of this resolution, there was going to be a minority report in opposition to Project No. 37 (112th Linear Park). He noted that the minority report failed by a 3-3 vote. He reported that Councilor Moore indicated there are already funds committed for this project through the TIP and, therefore, it should be removed from consideration. Mr. Horton stated that his group is trying to preserve the forested area of the Peterkort property, is opposed to funds being used for that project, and noted that there are more appropriate projects to be funded. With regard to the bike path, he stated that Cornell Road does not have a bike path that is safe. He noted that bikers don't use that path; they bike instead on Cornell which is very bad and does not link up with anything.

Mr. Horton commented that there is tremendous public opposition to the 112th arterial project. During the public process, he noted there had been overwhelming opposition. He also felt it was premature to fund the linear park, noting that there is no alignment set for the roadway and a LUBA appeal is pending against an ordinance that would approve the newly proposed 112th alignment through the land use process. Mr. Horton felt there should have been more public process when these projects were first prioritized, commenting that the process was flawed. He encouraged removal of Project 37 from the recommended Enhancement Project list and felt that the people who selected the project didn't know the neighborhood.

- . A letter was received from Charlotte Corkran, 130 NW 114th Street in Portland, in opposition to Project No. 37 (112th Avenue Linear Park) for the following reasons: 1) no formal alignment having been established for the NW 112th Avenue roadway; 2) Washington County ordinances creating a process for public involvement and decision-making for new roads being under appeal to LUBA, making this premature; 3) provision of a bike path that would not be adjacent to a roadway, requiring an RTP amendment; and 4) the question of funding priority. (A copy of the letter will become part of this record.)
- . Geoff Hyde, a Cedar Mill resident, 10217 NW Alpenglow Way, favored removing Project 37 (112th Avenue Linear Park) from the priority Transportation Enhancement list. He questioned Washington County's objective in providing a greenspace when the right-of-way they are purchasing are people's backyards. He felt it was a creative process for buying a 10' wide by 50' strip as right-of-way for a road. He observed that it would become greenspace if left as is in backyards. Mr. Hyde spoke of access to this project as limited and not easy. He commented that there is no bike/pedestrian access to the north terminus and he questioned why it received high points when it is one mile away from the southern part. Mr. Hyde was supportive of alternative modes of transportation and this program but questioned the net gain for greenspace or for bicyclists. He also questioned whether Washington County's goal was to attain a switch in funds.
- . Rob Drake, Mayor of Beaverton, indicated he was familiar with the area and stated that there are no guarantees that Washington County is going to develop 112th Avenue. They are trying to encourage access to the transit center. He noted that pedestrian/bike access needs to be provided at some time in the future, but the funds may not always be available. They hope to develop more pedestrian/bike access to transit. He indicated support for the bike/pedestrian route even if 112th is not built.
- . Commissioner Hansen felt that Cornell Road is too dangerous for a bike path, noting that one had been proposed near St. Vincent.
- . Bob Bothman, member of Metro's Committee for Citizen Involvement (MCCI) and a Washington County neighborhood association, spoke on the total lack of citizen involvement in the state process. He felt that the public involvement process was flawed and stressed the need for early-on citizen involvement. Mr. Bothman felt that the 112th Avenue project is a good example that homework hasn't been done. He noted that it has \$328,000 of TIF-committed 1994 construction funds. 112th

JPACT

October 14, 1993

Page 5

Avenue is a \$3 million project which is underfunded. He didn't feel that "enhancement" was being achieved with these dollars.

Councilor Monroe expressed concern relating to Mayor Drake's comment that the project was contingent upon the road being built on that alignment. This project could be built even if the roadway is stopped. It might not include the bridge or some of the other features so he questioned whether this action is premature.

Mike Borresen of Washington County responded to the "switching of funds" comment by noting that the County has to connect a bike path from the Peterkort property to the existing 112th for access onto Barnes Road. One-half million dollars has already been spent. Washington County is seeking additional funds to provide for bike and pedestrian facilities. He noted that the project started in 1965, pointing out that the County has the right-of-way and that it could be built today on 112th but would wipe out almost every house there. He reported a two-year citizen involvement process that addressed placing the road alongside the back property line. In looking at the Peterkort property, they thought of putting a greenspace along the road.

Commissioner Rogers spoke of working with the Peterkorts to try to preserve the pond, routing the road around it. Washington County is trying to reduce impacts as much as possible to the property owners. He noted that some of the property has already been acquired because the project has gone on so long.

Steve Greenwood felt that the property owners' complaint is not the criteria established but whether this project meets the criteria. He questioned the points granted for intermodal connections as it really doesn't connect with the transit station (the 112th bike route connection to Barnes Road).

Commissioner Rogers noted that, if any additional right-of-way is dedicated, the Peterkorts would have to hold a public hearing. The Peterkorts are planning to develop the property. When the light rail station is completed, there is certainty that there will be bike access to the transit station. Washington County wants to have it completed by the time the transit center is opened. Commissioner Rogers commented that he has been at the County for nine years and noted that the planning process for this roadway has been going on since 1965 with at least six public hearings having been held about the road. He noted that opposition has been persistent and vocal, and hearings have been attended by as little as 9-10 people and by as many as 50. He indicated that there is ample support for this project from the people around Cornell Road, and there has been debate.

JPACT

October 14, 1993

Page 6

Bob Bothman did not feel there was good public process about the bike path.

Bruce Warner felt there will always be opposition to projects and that JPACT's focus should be on the development criteria and ranking of projects for consideration in ODOT's Six-Year Plan. He added that there will be other opportunities for public input. He cited the EIS process as an example. He pointed out further that this type of project cannot be funded from state gas tax dollars.

Action Taken: Bruce Warner moved, seconded by Commissioner Rogers, to endorse the recommendations of the advisory committee that ranked these projects and to recommend approval of Resolution No. 93-1858 for forwarding to the Oregon Transportation Commission for inclusion in ODOT's 1995-1998 TIP.

In discussion on the motion, Commissioner Hansen expressed concern that citizens are still not comfortable with the total public process. He questioned not opening discussion on a project-by-project basis and felt there would be future situations as this passed on to Planning Committee and Metro Council. Discussion followed on whether or not that kind of process should take place at this level.

Councilor Giusto agreed with Commissioner Hansen's comments and felt that projects should be discussed on a project-by-project basis, but was supportive of the resolution.

Chair Van Bergen stated that, under Metro's new Charter, the new seven-member Metro Council may consider such actions on a project-by-project basis but he didn't feel that was the role of JPACT. He cited the importance of projects being developed by criteria and felt that JPACT would be bankrupting itself in terms of time and effectiveness if it changed its role.

Councilors Buchanan and Monroe agreed with Chair Van Bergen's comments. Councilor Monroe also cited the need for Metro to address citizen concerns as they arise, noting that there is considerable concern about Project No. 37. He felt there might be some alteration of the resolution in the future.

Councilor Kvistad felt we have gone beyond project discussions and the question of JPACT's future role. He cited the need for citizen involvement and participation at the local level and acknowledged that we do need to address the flaws in the system. He emphasized the need for all jurisdictions to have a responsibility to ensure that the public process works. In terms of these particular projects, he noted that they came from ODOT and suggested that we move forward with this matter.

JPACT

October 14, 1993

Page 7

Commissioner Rogers felt there are two issues involved: the linear park proposed and the roadway on 112th. He felt that the roadway has had extensive public process but acknowledged that the linear park has not come before the Washington County Commission as yet. If each Washington County project had to have a public process, he felt that every jurisdiction should also meet that requirement. He felt that the public process was handled in a fair and open manner. Commissioner Rogers added that no public hearings have been held on any of the proposed projects.

Les White explained the process undertaken in Clark County.

Commissioner Rogers added that the Washington County Commission is supportive of this project. Staff looked at prospective projects eligible for these funds and recommended this project. He noted that there isn't a citizen process for every project.

Tom Walsh was supportive of the resolution and felt that the process was fair but not excellent. He cited the need to improve the process and asked Andy Cotugno to work with the Metro CCI in that regard.

Andy Cotugno responded that there are two aspects to this issue: the process for the rest of the Six-Year Program update and the directive from JPACT to develop an overall general public process. At issue is the question of what Metro's role should be versus local governments' role.

Mayor Hagensen cited the importance of the process being accessible to the public.

Motion to amend: Commissioner Hansen moved to exclude Project No. 37 from the Resolution. For lack of a second, the motion FAILED.

Commissioner Rogers wanted clarification from JPACT on the issue of whether they felt a public process was needed for every grant and for every project but expected each jurisdiction to have a similar process.

In calling for the question, the motion PASSED. Commissioner Hansen and Councilor Giusto dissented.

STATUS OF ODOT SIX-YEAR PROGRAM UPDATE PROCESS, SCHEDULE AND CRITERIA

Andy Cotugno explained that ODOT must downsize its 1993-98 TIP by \$400 million statewide in view of anticipated revenue and failure at the '93 Legislature. Cuts must be made from Construction projects as well as the Developmental Program. The Development

JPACT

October 14, 1993

Page 8

funds involve advancing projects through design or right-of-way acquisition.

Andy reviewed the ODOT/Metro process defined in JPACT's memo. He noted that the Oregon Transportation Commission has provided some directives on how the cuts should be made. Alternative mode projects will be fully funded and not subject to these cuts.

Andy reviewed the criteria ranked by the regions, acknowledging the local match. He noted that the OTC will consider the draft TIP on November 16. Following distribution of the draft, public hearings will follow. Andy explained that three-fourths of the region's TIP is in ODOT's Six-Year Program, including the air quality process, and the state's annual TIP needs to be adopted by July for submittal to the Federal Government.

The purpose of the October 21 public meeting is informational with the objective of describing the process, reviewing the criteria used for ranking, and identifying the possible projects to be added or deleted. Andy noted that there is need for JPACT to provide direction on how to handle regional STP funds. Staff is recommending that the last two years of STP funds in the Six-Year Program not be allocated because of unknowns. Criteria is laid out by mode but most of the emphasis has been on highways. Construction projects are those committed by ODOT to build. The Development Program includes projects ODOT has committed to fund such as Environmental Impact Statements, Final Engineering or right-of-way acquisition. There is no time certain for project commitments in the Development Program. ODOT's queue right now is 16 years long and nothing else will be considered until that commitment is made.

Bruce Warner added that any new project would be considered "new" in consideration of the next TIP if it is something other than a construction or development project. The question was raised about how you would re-enter such projects in the program after it gets downsized, circumstances change and new revenue becomes available. Bruce Warner responded that if the projects don't make it through the construction/development process, they would be considered as "new projects" in future years. He cited the importance of ODOT and Metro working together so that they won't be at odds with one another and citizen involvement being very critical. He noted that ODOT is trying to get citizen/business involvement, and a strategy is being developed in that regard.

Commissioner Lindquist expressed concern about the Access Oregon Highway (AOH) projects and questioned whether there is still such a program. Bruce Warner responded that ODOT needs to address that issue as the decision on whether or not to go further on right-of-way acquisition will be based on funding availability.



JPACT

October 14, 1993

Page 9

Bruce commented that it is in ODOT's strategic interest to have cooperation between the region and ODOT in building consensus.

Dave Lohman stated that he was not completely satisfied with the criteria because it doesn't address freight movement and related businesses. He felt there should be some distinction in the criteria that considers the matter of freight distribution. When staff conducts the Intermodal Management Study, he felt there would be further insights to better define criteria for intermodal issues.

URBAN MOBILITY/URBAN GROWTH MANAGEMENT - REVIEW OF PROPOSED PROGRAM DESIGN

Andy Cotugno explained that the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) has a program dealing with integration of land use and transportation issues that was funded by the Legislature. An outline of the process in which they will award grants was provided in the agenda packet. If any Committee members wish to make comments on the program, feel free to contact staff. Andy noted that concerns raised by TPAC will be addressed.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Andy noted that copies of the Congestion Pricing application were distributed for informational purposes only.

He announced that a joint JPACT/MPAC meeting has been scheduled at 5:00 p.m. on October 27 to review and better understand Clark County's growth requirements; to discuss 2040 options; and to discuss how the RTP and Regional Framework Plan works.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Rena Cusma  
Dick Engstrom  
JPACT Members

Attachment

JPAC

October 14, 1993

Dear members of JPAC,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the request by Washington County for funds to construct a bike path and linear park along N. W. 112th Street in Cedar Mill.

I most strongly urge you to deny Washington County's funding request for the following reasons:

1. No decision has been made by the Washington County Commission on the alignment of a road in the vicinity of NW 112th. Washington County has not formally proposed any particular alignment of NW 112th. There is no specific project in the planning process at this time. There have not been any public hearings on a specific project for a particular alignment of NW 112th. Several of the alignments of NW 112th that have been discussed recently would require road construction that would take out the bike path and linear path that Metro is being asked to help fund. Either the Washington County Planning Department staff and/or the Commission has made a decision outside of the legal decision-making process, or this discussion is irrelevant at this time. This request by Washington County for Metro funding purports to be for a bike path and park. My personal opinion is that the request is a disguise. I believe that this is a request to Metro to help Washington County buy the private properties along NW 112th. I further believe that if Washington County eventually did present a proposal to the public for an alignment and plan for NW 112th, they would use the argument that it was already partially paid for and could not be changed or stopped. I sincerely hope that Metro will not allow itself to be used in this way by Washington County.

2. The Washington County ordinances that would create a process for public involvement and decision-making on new roads are currently under appeal to the Land Use Board of Appeals, so this discussion of funding for portions of new roads is premature.

3. The proposal from Washington County is for a new alignment of a bike path that would not be adjacent to a road, and therefore may require an amendment to the Transportation Plan.

4. This proposal should not be one of the highest priorities for funding. The proposal would make a very narrow strip park out of a series of backyards. How could this be a higher priority than the wooded portion of the Peterkort property that is near the Light Rail Transit Center and could provide bicycle links from the north, east, and west? How could it be higher priority than a link in the Fanno Creek greenway? Perhaps the criteria and ranking system are in need of change. I hope there is time to revisit these. It would be very unfortunate to hurry through this decision if it means funding minor projects instead of important ones.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Please make this letter a part of the record of this matter.

Sincerely,



*Charlotte C. Corkran*

CHARLOTTE C. CORKRAN  
Wildlife Consultant

