

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: August 12, 1993

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Chair George Van Bergen and Rod Monroe, Metro Council; Earl Blumenauer, City of Portland; Tom Walsh, Tri-Met; Bruce Warner, ODOT; Dave Lohman (alt.), Port of Portland; Craig Lomnicki, Cities of Clackamas County; Gerry Smith, WSDOT; Steve Greenwood (alt.), DEQ; Roy Rogers, Washington County; Bruce Hagensen, City of Vancouver; Gary Hansen, Multnomah County; Rob Drake, Cities of Washington County; and Bernie Giusto, Cities of Multnomah County

Guests: Tim Rutten, Office of Senator Hatfield; John Rosenberger and Mark Brown, Washington County; Tuck Wilson and G.B. Arrington, Tri-Met; Ray Polani, Citizens for Better Transit; Steve Law, Business Journal; Howard Harris, DEQ; Aaron Ellis and Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland; Richard Dierking, resident of Cedar Hills; Pamela Reamer-Williams, Oregon Trucking Association; Dan Layden and Ed Pickering, Multnomah County; Bob Bothman, MCCI; Rex Burkholder and Marc San Soucie, Bicycle Transportation Alliance; Rod Sandoz, Clackamas County; Pat Allen, Office of Congressman Kopetski; Jim Howell, OFCET; Dave Williams, ODOT; Steve Dotterrer and Kate Deane, City of Portland; Jeff Boothe, Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt; Sam Sadler, Oregon Department of Energy; Troy Horton, Leahy Community Association; Maggie Collins, Cities of Clackamas County; Douglas Terrill, Hillsdale Vision Group; and Kay Durtschi, Southwest Neighborhood Information (SWNI)

Staff: Andrew Cotugno, Mike Hoglund, Ted Spence, Rich Ledbetter, Allison Dobbins, and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

SUMMARY:

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

JPACT
August 12, 1993
Page 2

MEETING REPORT

Minutes of the July 8, 1993 JPACT Meeting Report were approved as written.

RESOLUTION NO. 93-1829 - ENDORSING THE REGION'S PRIORITY FY 95-97 CONGESTION MITIGATION/AIR QUALITY PROGRAM PROJECTS FOR SUBMISSION TO THE OTC FOR INCLUSION OF THESE PROJECTS

Mike Hogle, Transportation Planning Manager, reviewed the Staff Report/Resolution and accompanying attachments for endorsement of the region's priority FY 95-97 CMAQ projects. Also distributed were copies of funding priority totals by jurisdiction and project type as well as staff's recommendation for three additional resolves to be incorporated in the resolution.

Mike noted that this action would amend the RTP to include the CMAQ projects but would not necessitate a TIP amendment at this time. He reviewed the objectives of the CMAQ funds, citing the development of projects that will help the region meet its air quality attainment, that address regional goals for completing regional system needs, and that will assist in realizing long-term goals pertaining to Rule 12 and implementation of an Air Quality Maintenance Plan. He noted that the Air Quality Maintenance Plan must be developed over the next couple of years and that FHWA specifies short-term guidelines to reach air quality attainment. He felt that there was real effort to provide a good set of projects that would help achieve air quality benefits in the short and long term.

Mike reported on the July 19 public workshop on the CMAQ Program, noting that new publicly-generated project recommendations emerged which were reviewed and ranked by staff. There was concern expressed about the Cedar Hills bike project, as well as support indicated for the East Bank trail loop project. Following the first round, three studies were recommended with a \$3 million reserve (Pedestrian to Transit: Phase III Study, Project No. 009; Pedestrian to MAX Capital Program, Project No. 010; and the Willamette River Bridges Improvement Package, Project No. 021) which, under ISTEA guidelines, must lead to construction.

Mike noted that TPAC's recommendation for the top contingent priority is to fund more Tri-Met buses.

Andy Cotugno pointed out that Exhibit A represents TPAC's recommendations. He commented on the Westside LRT overcrossing, the fact that the Westside project is underfunded at this time, and noted that the proposed Sunset Transit Center overcrossing has been deferred as a Westside LRT project element. At issue is

JPACT

August 12, 1993

Page 3

whether the overcrossing should be funded out of CMAQ funds or out of any future surplus funds from the Westside project.

Exhibit B, comprising a list of contingent priority projects from Round 2, was then reviewed. Andy Cotugno commented that the appropriations level represents only 80 percent of ISTEA funding and felt that the resolution should be revised to cover the remaining \$1.9 million for a more accurate assessment of funds. That would move Project 004a (additional buses for service expansion -- maximum of 10 vehicles) and 006a (additional mini-buses -- maximum of 7 vehicles) to the Funding Priority List of Attachment A.

Andy then reviewed staff's recommendation for three resolves to be incorporated into the resolution, reading as follows:

1. That a total of \$3 million be set aside for implementation of projects identified during the study phase for: Project No.009 - Pedestrian to Transit: Phase III; Project No. 010 - Pedestrian to MAX Capital Program; and Project No. 021 - Willamette River Bridges Improvement Package (bike lanes, sidewalks and wheelchair ramps). A portion of the \$3 million will be allocated to each project. The specific allocation to construction projects resulting from the three studies will be subject to approval by JPACT/Metro Council resolution.
2. That all projects for construction of pedestrian or bicycle facilities shall conform to the standards established in the federal ADA Access Guidelines and with the performance standards found in the State of Oregon's "Best Management Practices" for the Goal 12 Transportation Planning Rule.
3. That companies participating in the Portland Area Telecommuting project (Project No. 016) provide adequate information and project data to the Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE) that enables ODOE to complete a written evaluation of the extent of involvement in the Portland area; the degree of success or failure in meeting project goals; and the degree of success relative to reducing vehicle emissions in the Portland area.

Bruce Warner questioned what would happen if any of the projects on the first priority list cost more than the amount specified. Andy Cotugno explained that the amounts are considered allocations and the project should be built to that funding level. If an additional amount of funds is being sought for the project, it would need to be referred to TPAC for consideration. Tuck Wilson indicated that the Sunset Transit Center overcrossing could

JPACT

August 12, 1993

Page 4

exceed the specified cost if completed at the Transit Center but that the Westside project was not seeking any additional funding from CMAQ.

Rex Burkholder, representing the Bicycle Transportation Alliance, noted that he had served on the advisory committee that helped formulate these projects. He felt it represented a stakeholders' group, raising concern about the process. He noted that some critical assumptions were not questioned with regard to the models used and the fact that different people were using different numbers. Rex indicated he is also a member of the Oregon Bicycle Advisory Committee that utilizes street criteria with no vested interest. He felt that some of the projects brought forward were not representative of the best possible bike projects for the money. Rex cited the need for more public outreach for use of CMAQ and Transportation Enhancement funds.

Richard Dierking, a Cedar Hills resident, was supportive of the Sunset pedestrian overcrossing (from Cedar Hills to the Transit Center) as a means of eliminating a drive to the downtown area, better access from the Cedar Hills Shopping Center to the Transit Center and as an enhancement to the shopping area. His only concern was the possible loss of ridership without it. He noted that he has been a bus rider for the past 13 years.

Troy Horton, a member of the Leahy Community Association, did not feel the Cedar Hills bikeway/walkway project represented a critical neighborhood link and commented further that the \$1 million would not seem well spent. He felt that Washington County had an ulterior motive for those funds. He noted there are no bikepaths and no walkways on that route, encouraging removal of the project from the list of priorities.

Marc San Soucie, a member of the Bicycle Transportation Alliance, indicated that his comments reflect the biking community in Washington County. He noted that they are interested in seeing the money spent in areas other than the Cedar Hills project. A discussion followed on completion of the bike network to Durham parallel to Highway 217. Marc commented that an informal bike study has been completed with results indicating that some portions of the bike network are not up to standard, citing significant gaps. He felt that any available funds along the regional network should be used to fill those gaps, suggesting that the Cedar Hills project be completed at a later time.

Andy Cotugno clarified that, since approval of the Regional Bike Plan in 1983, incremental bike improvements have been funded which parallel the Highway 217 corridor as part of a regional bike network. The Cedar Hills project would close one of the gaps that need to be filled along this corridor.

Kay Durtschi, a member of Southwest Neighborhood Information, cited the lack of sufficient public outreach for this program and suggested that county citizen involvement groups and Metro citizen advisory committees be utilized. She felt that public outreach was a major component of the federal guidelines. She questioned the ranking process and her concern for east-west links that would tie Washington County and Multnomah County at the border. Ms. Durtschi felt there have been plenty of telecommuting projects elsewhere, questioning the need for the Portland area telecommuting project, and encouraging use of the funds for pedestrian and bikeway projects. She also questioned use of CMAQ funds for the Columbia Slough project, feeling there would be no air quality benefits realized. Ms. Durtschi stressed the need to change people's habits from riding in their cars to use of transit and pedestrianways/bikeways. She also encouraged further use of bike racks on buses. She commented further on neighborhood impacts from traffic diverted from Highway 26.

Douglas Terrill of the Hillsdale Vision Group emphasized the need to enable patrons access to buses. He spoke in support of Project No. 39, the SW Bertha Boulevard bikeway, and provided ridership data of the Hillsdale area used by Tri-Met.

Action Taken: Commissioner Rogers moved, seconded by Bruce Warner, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 93-1829, endorsing the region's priority FY 95-97 CMAQ program projects with inclusion of the three proposed resolves and the two back-up projects (Projects No. 004 and 006).

In discussion on the motion, Commissioner Hansen asked about the methodology used on the bike forecast. Initial reliance was made on the local jurisdictions for estimates provided, comparisons were made between facilities, and rankings were tied to mode split and auto trip length. The TDM Subcommittee reviewed all estimates and made changes as necessary.

Commissioner Hansen also questioned the citizen involvement process. Andy Cotugno explained that this is only the beginning step in a larger process. There is opportunity to give testimony at the Planning Committee and Metro Council public hearings. Once the recommendation receives Metro Council approval, submittal will be made to the Oregon Transportation Commission followed by a series of public hearings on funding for all categories of projects in the Six-Year Program. Andy noted that a public workshop for CMAQ projects was held on July 19 to gain public input and, following that process, some changes were incorporated in staff's recommendation. All of the bike projects of regional significance were ranked by staff; Andy acknowledged that the Sunset overcrossing project was ranked higher than the Cedar Hills project.

JPACT

August 12, 1993

Page 6

Commissioner Blumenauer spoke of the dilemma of making intermodal decisions for funds where experience is lacking. He felt that technical advisory committees may have a different dimension or perspective. He cited the need to redefine how we rank these projects and offered to have someone from Portland meet with Metro to avoid these future discussions, but he was supportive of moving forward with the recommendation at this time. He suggested that, while there is concern, more emphasis should be placed on how refinements can be made. He stressed the need for plans, priorities and a good public outreach program.

Dave Lohman supported Commissioner Blumenauer's comments, adding that the Columbia Slough projects represents a different approach. He assured Ms. Durtschi that the railroads have not been lobbying people but that the Port has tried to bring the railroad into it for air quality benefits. He informed the Committee that the Union Pacific/Burlington Northern Railroads bring in about 10 unit cars per day. Because of train break-ups and the present switching process in the Rivergate area, it is felt air quality benefits would be realized by more efficiently providing long-haul freight. Mr. Lohman explained that they are virtually at capacity in the Rivergate area. For every unit train, there would be 4,000 trucks and it is estimated that, by 1997, traffic would double. He also cited the advantages of being more economically efficient. Mr. Lohman indicated that the railroad has made no commitment. He explained that \$2.1 million would come from STA demonstration funds; \$1.5 million from the Port of Portland; \$1.5 million from the two railroads; and \$1 million hopefully from CMAQ funds.

With regard to Commissioner Blumenauer's comments, Chair Van Bergen indicated a willingness on the part of the MPO to discuss this process further with the jurisdictions.

Steve Greenwood asked how time-sensitive this issue is. Bruce Warner responded that ODOT is in the process of its Six-Year Program update with discussions being held on process and timelines. ODOT would like regional submittals as soon as possible for processing its priorities so that the draft Six-Year Plan can be developed in October. He indicated there would be public participation throughout the community.

Andy Cotugno spoke of the inexperience in weighing tradeoffs between modes and the need to improve planning for multi-modal projects. In making those tradeoffs, he cited the need for judgment to be exercised. He noted that expectations in all categories of funds are enormous at a time when funds are dwindling, commenting on a huge need for bike and pedestrian projects.

JPACT

August 12, 1993

Page 7

Further discussion reinforced the need for interaction between Metro and the jurisdictions for later readjustments.

In discussing opportunities for public testimony, Chair Van Bergen emphasized that further testimony could be given at the August 24 Planning Committee and September 9 Metro Council hearings. Commissioner Hansen pointed out that, at each step of the process, it seems less likely there would be changes and therefore did not feel it was fair to ask citizens to participate at that level because it would have little impact. He also did not feel it would be viable if we relied solely on citizen input.

Councilor Monroe felt that new ground is being broken with Metro Council and that every citizen is assured of being heard with regard to modifications.

The motion PASSED unanimously.

Following discussion, it was the consensus that:

- . A comprehensive multi-modal planning process be developed between Metro and local jurisdictions.
- . This process include expanded public participation during the initial stages to identify and choose potential projects for analysis and funding.
- . A more comprehensive examination of local priorities be taken by the jurisdiction.
- . The planning process should be used to facilitate future programming of funds for multi-modal projects.

Mayor Hagensen commented on the fact that there is high priority for public transportation with no public initiative for transporting freight. He felt more public discussions need to take place on the issue and its impact on the region. He cited the importance of trade and commerce to the region and its need to be funded.

JOINT MEETINGS WITH METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (MPAC)

Andy Cotugno spoke of the land use milestones reached and the need for interaction on land use and transportation issues between MPAC and JPACT. Andy reminded the Committee that MPAC was formed by charter. The focus of the meetings would be on 2040 and transportation as they interrelate to Clark County growth management. He felt it was a matter of information sharing. He noted that MPAC is more up-to-date in discussing 2040 tradeoffs.

JPACT

August 12, 1993

Page 8

Andy commented on poor participation by JPACT at the July 28 MPAC meeting and asked whether they wished to continue the joint meeting effort. It was suggested that the Metro Council Chambers be scheduled for the next meeting. Dave Lohman was supportive of JPACT participation.

Mayor Lomnicki felt that, while land use and transportation are interrelated, land use is the overriding concern. He felt you can't deal with land use without considering transportation. The driving goal should be land use.

It was the consensus that JPACT participate in one more meeting with MPAC. To be discussed further is the role of MPAC and its recommendations.

OTP LEGISLATIVE PACKAGE

A revised packet of the OTP legislative package was distributed defining the history, approach and outcome at the Legislature. Positive comments centered around the strong coalition that was formed of counties, cities, highway officials, businesses and transit providers with stronger recommendations between modes. Also discussed were the contributing factors that led to the bill's demise. Andy stated that efforts must now deal with known available funds. He pointed out that the current Six-Year Program is overdrawn by \$400 million and that two years is being added to that program in order to balance the budget. He felt that ODOT needs to address how the process should proceed and whether consideration should be given to projects being added to implement the OTP at the same time we are having to delay or drop projects. Andy felt that it's not ODOT's problem alone and that the region needs to address those issues as well.

Andy emphasized the importance of maintaining the coalition formed for the legislative package. He cited the need to participate in a process where the region has a lot at stake, that the coalition should be involved, and the fact that we are starting to implement the rest of the Oregon Transportation Plan.

Councilor Guisto spoke of the Mt. Hood Parkway right-of-way and the need to know more of the Six-Year Program process. Bruce Warner commented that the OTC will address the \$400 million shortfall. He indicated that some projects will either be dropped or delayed.

Bruce indicated that the OTC will address its commitment to the existing projects in the Six-Year Program on Wednesday, August 18. An update will be provided on OTC direction at the September 9 JPACT meeting.

Commissioner Blumenauer cautioned the Committee that the region's thinking not become less ambitious. He felt there could be a special legislative session and did not wish to lose momentum. He also was supportive of outreach efforts, citing the need to get the public involved.

Bruce Warner felt it was a good summary of the OTP legislative process, that a lot of effort went into it, and that the legislators should be appropriately thanked, naming Tom Brian and Delna Jones.

Ray Polani, representing Citizens for Better Transit, distributed a copy of the July 31, 1993 Oregonian Forum "Opinion and Commentary" column regarding expansion of highway capacity. He felt the outcome of the OTP legislative package reflected the will of the voters. Ray cited the need to change direction and provided a list of projects which he felt should be reviewed for deletion or delayed construction from the Six-Year TIP. He felt the primary criteria is to look at projects that will impact travel and air quality.

Ray asked that serious consideration be given to his list. He felt that the negative vote reached by the Legislature represents a tremendous opportunity to begin in a new direction.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Rena Cusma
Dick Engstrom
JPACT Members