

## MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: August 13, 1992

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Chair Richard Devlin, Susan McLain and Jim Gardner, Metro Council; Pauline Anderson, Multnomah County; Earl Blumenauer, City of Portland; Larry Cole, Cities of Washington County; Don Adams (alt.), ODOT; Fred Hansen, DEQ; Craig Lomnicki (alt.), Cities in Clackamas County; Ed Lindquist, Clackamas County; Roy Rogers, Washington County; Gerry Smith, WSDOT; Mike Thorne, Port of Portland; and Tom Walsh, Tri-Met

Guests: John Kowalczyk, Steve Greenwood, Merlyn Hough and Howard Harris, DEQ; Tuck Wilson, G.B. Arrington and Laurie Garrett, Tri-Met; Ted Spence, ODOT; Bruce Warner, Washington County; Rick Root, Cities of Washington County; Keith Ahola, WSDOT; Ken McFarling, Oregon Association of Railway Passengers; Janet Adkins, Oregon Legislative Committee staff; Steve Dotterer, City of Portland; David Lohman and Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland; Meeky Blizzard, STOP; Tom VanderZanden and Rod Sandoz, Clackamas County; Roger Buchanan, Metro Council; and Bob Hart, Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council

Staff: Andrew Cotugno, Richard Brandman, Karen Thackston, Rich Ledbetter, and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

Media: Jim Mayer, The Oregonian

### SUMMARY:

The meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Chair Richard Devlin.

### MEETING REPORT

The July 9 JPACT Meeting Report was approved as written.

### REPORT OF JPACT FINANCE COMMITTEE

Chair Devlin reported that the JPACT Finance Subcommittee has met three times since the committee was formed to look into the

matter of a vehicle registration fee and whether it should be considered for the November ballot. He indicated that a public opinion poll was commissioned to obtain more information, noting that the results were quite promising. There was a probability of a 53 percent "yes" vote but, lacking adequate time to mount a successful campaign in coordination with other state/regional/local efforts, it was decided to target efforts instead toward a November 1993 legislative strategy and program.

The JPACT Finance Subcommittee recommended that the local option vehicle registration fee be used for an Arterial Program. Discussion was held on uses of such a fund.

The Finance Subcommittee will continue meeting to review the OTP and Roads Finance efforts and to prepare a legislative agenda for 1993.

Chair Devlin asked whether there were any exceptions to the Finance Committee's recommendation to forego the November 1992 election, and there were none noted.

#### WESTSIDE LRT FULL-FUNDING AGREEMENT

Chair Devlin reported that the Westside LRT Full-Funding Agreement is anticipated to be signed by the end of this month. He noted concern over the unpredictability of the federal cash flow. \$100 million a year is needed in order to complete the \$500 million commitment. FTA has expressed concern about the required \$100 million, and a series of items for deferral has been considered in a scoping process. The Government continues to push for a shorter project or one that is stretched out over time. They don't wish to sidetrack Hillsboro but they need to smooth out the cash flow process.

Andy pointed out that the Transportation Improvement Program is scheduled for adoption in September and that the conclusion of the Full-Funding Agreement is something that needs to be reflected in that document.

Tuck Wilson reported that Tri-Met has a total of \$330 million non-federal funds; \$180 million is committed to the project. At issue is whether they wish to preserve the option of using some of the \$150 million set aside for Hillsboro. They are receiving \$75 million in appropriations each year from the Federal Government. If such action is needed for use of the \$150 million (set aside for Hillsboro), Tri-Met will be back before JPACT.

ENDORSEMENT OF THE OREGON TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Andy Cotugno reported that the Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) policy and system elements are moving toward conclusion. To highlight the document, he introduced Dave Bishop, ODOT's Transportation Plan Manager.

Dave Bishop reported that ODOT's formal public hearing on the OTP will be held on August 25 at 1:30 p.m. in Bend. He noted that a total of 49 public meetings will be held on the document prior to its adoption. September 15 is the OTC's target date for adoption of the document, which is scheduled in Roseburg.

After the Steering Committee's final worksession on the draft, they recommended that the OTC work closely with the MPOs. A Transportation Symposium, planned by ODOT for September 18 and scheduled at the Masonic Temple in Portland, is designed to highlight the OTP, bringing together local and national speakers.

Dave Bishop distributed copies of the Findings of Compliance with the Statewide Planning Goals. He noted that they will be subject to comments at the public hearing and will become part of the OTP document.

Also distributed was a letter from Mike Hollern, OTC Chairman, noting that the OTP's adoption would serve as the state's policy to guide transportation decisions. Comments and participation were encouraged for the August 25 public hearing.

Andy Cotugno then reviewed the draft letter to the Oregon Transportation Commission in support of the document. Comments included the need for a re-evaluation of highway level-of-service standards; clarification of the term "requirements" in contrast to "guidelines;" that efforts to attain LCDC's VMT/capita target for each MPO area be determined on an individual basis rather than a prescribed action; that the State Modal, Intermodal and System Management Plans section be clarified with regard to the "intermodal" and "multi-modal" terminology; that updates of the OTP consider more comprehensive policies for bicycle and pedestrian level-of-service standards; that the Technical Document and the Findings be reviewed by JPACT prior to OTC adoption; and that refinement of the Oregon Rail Passenger Policy and Plan consider the following: coordination with the state of Washington for a single Pacific Northwest strategy for incremental rail improvements, recognition of Union Station as the principal multi-modal center in the Portland region for intercity rail service, further evaluation of a Willamette Valley/Columbia Gorge commuter rail system, and that intercity rail is not funded at the expense of urban transit and LRT expansion.

Comments followed on the need for further clarification to Clause 5 by adding "to or from destinations outside the region" (pertaining to section on "State Modal, Intermodal and System Management Plans"); the need for coordination with the state of Washington and Vancouver, B.C. regarding a single strategy for a Pacific Northwest rail passenger plan; the desire of the Port of Portland to be participatory in developing the logic and basis of air freight and air passenger technologies; and the suggestion that we work with ODOT on development of a financial plan to implement the OTP.

Mike Thorne spoke of future airplanes being designed to handle increased passenger and freight loads. The Port views the OTP as having reduced operations with increased passenger loads. He emphasized the need to maximize efficiency of the system; expressed concern for development relating to the intermodal hub in Klamath Falls; and cited the need to proceed carefully on how we plan expectations for a competing airport in the Willamette Valley. The Port feels that, based on its Master Plan, it has the capacity and capability to handle the demand for year 2010.

Action Taken: Fred Hansen moved, seconded by Commissioner Anderson, to endorse and forward the OTC letter to Mike Hollern with the following comments:

- . That a new Resolve be incorporated as follows:

"We look forward to continuing to work with ODOT to establish the financing mechanisms to implement the OTP. It is important that this be done in a comprehensive manner to ensure the different modes called for in the OTP can advance. It is also important that the financing strategies be structured in a manner to reinforce the changing policy direction to encourage alternative modes."

- . That Resolve 4a (pertaining to the Oregon Rail Passenger Policy and Plan) be expanded to read as follows:

"a. Planning should be closely coordinated with the State of Washington and Vancouver, B.C. in order to produce a single Pacific Northwest strategy for which decides the extent to which incremental rail improvements leading to a common decision on high-speed rail should be implemented and whether to pursue high-speed rail, when it should be implemented and with what technology."

- . That a new Resolve be added to read as follows:

"We encourage you to work with the Port of Portland on the issues of a new Willamette Valley International Airport and a

new Klamath Falls intermodal freight airport hub. You should take advantage of their expertise as the air freight and air passenger technologies evolve. Current and expected changes in technology will affect how existing facilities will be managed, thereby increasing their capacity. These changes should be taken into account as planning for new facilities is undertaken."

The motion PASSED unanimously.

#### GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE ON VEHICLE EMISSIONS IN THE PORTLAND REGION

John Kowalczyk of DEQ reported that the 1991 Legislature mandated that a task force be formed to look at strategies to reduce vehicle emissions in the Portland area. Population and motor vehicle use data are being analyzed. Two decisions to be made include which strategies should be analyzed in detail and settling on growth assumptions over the next 20 years. Metro is developing the technical information (through modeling) for the Governor's Task Force on Motor Vehicle Emission Reductions in the Portland Area.

Merlyn Hough, DEQ, reviewed Figure 4.1 of the handout dealing with the ozone precursor emissions for the Portland-Vancouver area based on population and traffic growth assumptions. He noted that emissions have adequately dropped from the 1990 level.

Rich Ledbetter, Metro, reviewed Tables 5-1 and 5-2 defining emission reductions and impacts of the proposed strategies to be considered for analysis. He noted that travel and energy data are included in the tables and that the base case includes Metro's 2010 model with light rail transit. Rich indicated that the RTP was also run as a strategy and, using the RTP scenario, hydrocarbons would result in a 0.8 percent reduction. He noted that the RTP is a comprehensive transportation plan and calls for some TDM measures. A cost-benefit analysis is being performed for each strategy which will be considered at the August 26 Task Force meeting. He clarified that pricing strategies are based on true costs.

Rich noted that the analysis for use of a land use and HOV fee has not been completed. He further explained that a detailed analysis was available for each strategy and that this information would be compiled into a Technical Appendix at the conclusion of the study.

Merlyn Hough explained that these strategies all address highway vehicles. Other categories will be discussed at the next meeting although some are assumed in the projections. Fred Hansen indicated that, with the RTP and transit options for the region,

we will be about even on air quality but we will not be in attainment. There will be major sanctions if we don't reach attainment. Fred felt that how we maintain that balance and achieve a healthy economy are the real issues, and that the Governor's Task Force study is an effort toward those goals.

Andy Cotugno noted that the emissions analysis was required last year as a demonstration that the TIP was in conformance with the 1982 State Implementation Plan for Air Quality.

RESOLUTION NO. 92-1619 - ELIMINATING BYPASS OPTION B FROM FURTHER WESTERN BYPASS STUDY

Mike Wert, ODOT's Project Development Manager for the Western Bypass Study, provided an overview of the study. She noted that, under provisions of the Intergovernmental Agreement, formal action must be taken to eliminate any of the strategies.

Mike Wert explained that this analysis grew out of the recommendations of the Southwest Corridor Study, calling for a corridor study on circumferential travel movements. The four stages of the study included defining the problems; defining the existing deficiencies; developing the evaluation criteria; and evaluating the alternatives.

ODOT has worked with three project committees who have agreed on the following four recommended alternatives: No-Build; Transportation System Management (TSM)/Planned Projects; Arterial Expansion/High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Express; and the Bypass. Mike elaborated on the alternatives and noted that one of the goals of the study was to reduce reliance on the single-occupant vehicle. She reviewed the strategies considered and pointed out that 1000 Friends had suggested that a land use alternative be considered. 1000 Friends undertook its own study, has utilized data shared by ODOT, and is developing such an alternative to be completed by October 1. At that point, ODOT will introduce another resolution for an Intergovernmental Agreement to enter into the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

Bob Brannan, consultant from Parsons Brinkerhoff Quade & Douglas, discussed the components of the four recommended alternatives. He noted that all the projects in the TSM alternative are also included in the other two Build alternatives. In addition, he noted other common improvements such as transit components, including express bus service in the 217 corridor, a dial-a-ride service, and a TDM Program.

Bob Brannan cited reasons for dropping the two strategies from consideration and emphasized that the focus of the study was on the north-south, circumferential traffic movement.

Mike Wert explained that neither action (elimination of the proposed two strategies) requires an amendment to the RTP since the RTP recognizes that we are looking at a range of alternatives. She noted that ODOT is not trying to solve all of Washington County's traffic problems but to address the circumferential traffic between I-5 and Highway 26. She felt that the question of whether this project should proceed is still an issue and asked whether there is still a commitment to continue this study.

Ken McFarling, representing the Oregon Association of Rail Passengers, felt that the only reason ODOT presented Option B in the first place was to impart equity in its consideration of strategies. He stated that it was the only alternative contemplating use of railway technology, that ODOT seemed antagonistic toward railway use, and that the retained alternatives would do nothing to curtail dependence on the single-occupant vehicle.

Meeky Blizzard of STOP noted that ODOT's reason for dropping the strategies in question is because those alternatives don't address the issues in the Purpose and Need Statement. According to STOP's analysis, the following will result:

- . In 2010, 68 percent of all study area trips will be less than six miles long;
- . 92 percent of all study area trips will be within the urbanized area; more than one-half will be within the same district;
- . Long-distance circumferential trips will be less than 4 percent of the total study area;
- . 85 percent of all study area trips will begin and end in the study area; and
- . Less than 5 percent of all trips that begin and end in the study area would be likely to use a Western Bypass.

Meeky cited new policy direction that requires conformance with the Clean Air Act, ISTEA, Transportation Planning Rule, Oregon Benchmarks, livable communities, RUGGO, the Strategic Plan and the LUTRAQ study. She did not feel the recommended strategies address these issues and that these policy directions should have been dealt with at the onset of the study. She questioned whether the region can afford to present any alternative that does not meet either the Clean Air Act or Planning Rule requirements. Meeky emphasized the need to address transitional

planning now, pointing out that this is Metro's study, not ODOT's.

Councilor McLain felt that the evaluation of the process and the transitional plan are important issues and that we sometimes forget such elements. She felt that we need to come to grips on those issues now and be responsible to the public. Andy Cotugno responded that there are a number of efforts underway to address these issues. He spoke of Region 2040, dealing with alternative land use forms; the SIP must meet air quality standards; the light rail transit study, dealing with the next LRT corridors; and the RTP update, which will address Rule 12 and ISTEA requirements. He noted that the piece of information that the Bypass Study contributes is the Environmental Impact Statement information. He explained that Metro is not budgeted to evaluate the environmental impact information and thus there are trade-offs. Andy indicated that nothing in the RTP is grandfathered should the final RTP update reflect otherwise. He felt that efforts to produce needed environmental impact information are worthwhile.

Commissioner Blumenauer felt the matter on how the information is put together was at issue to ensure that the study doesn't result in a series of discrete studies about circumferential movement in Washington County. He felt that TPAC could develop suggestions for a transitional planning framework on how to integrate those policy directions in a plan, which would later be discussed at the JPACT level. He didn't feel it was apparent on how those pieces are put together and whether we are getting the maximum benefit because the stakes are high in terms of economic growth for the region. He stressed the need for a framework to make wise investments.

Commissioner Rogers expressed surprise about the question raised as to whether this study should go forward. He noted that this issue goes back to 1977 when the need for a bypass was first discussed. He indicated that the process went forward and has become a great irritant and an issue for debate. He noted that we keep looking for additional information. Washington County is supportive of the LUTRAQ study, was aware of additional state rules and regulations changing policy direction, and the issue of whether to place related language in the Purpose and Need Statement was discussed and is not an oversight. Commissioner Rogers noted that STOP's analysis has been looked at several times and that their information, while useful, is debatable. He felt the Western Bypass Study has gone through an exhaustive process and should be allowed to move forward. He cited 99W and T.V. Highway as the problem area and didn't feel anything would be accomplished by debating this issue forever.



Councilor Gardner spoke of the dilemma of this long process, noting that circumstances do change. He spoke of the Transportation Rule, the Clean Air Act and the flexibility of ISTEA requirements. He felt it is a dramatic shift and spoke of the need to look at some of the underlying assumptions. Councilor Gardner had a problem with eliminating the LRT alternative. He noted that the EIS looks at specific on-the-ground impacts of an alternative. There is a fundamental difference between the attractiveness of light rail versus bus service. He couldn't understand why it should be dropped from the ODOT study within the two-month completion date of the LUTRAQ study.

Fred Hansen expressed some of the same concerns and supported the issues being fully integrated into a framework. He suggested that a subcommittee be formed to give JPACT that policy framework direction. He was not supportive of dropping the LRT alternative until after the LUTRAQ alternative is presented.

Mayor Cole was not supportive of keeping the LRT option in, asking when we are going to put this rail option in the LRT study for the region. From Beaverton's point of view, Murray Road would become the defacto bypass if the Western Bypass is not built. He emphasized the need for a highway bypass. He felt discussion needs to take place on this in the rail studies.

Chair Devlin indicated that he was in his eighth year of meetings on bypass options and alternatives. He spoke of the proponents and opponents drawn because of the bypass. He noted that some are looking at issues in the area and want some resolution. He felt that the east-west movement in the study area is a broader issue than that of circumferential travel (the through trips from I-5 to Highway 26) and spoke of the lack of a transit or arterial system to accommodate that. It is understood that the EIS work will be done if it is included as an alternative. Chair Devlin felt that the decision on whether the study should proceed should only be determined after the alternatives have been identified.

Andy Cotugno summed up the issue on transitional planning by acknowledging that JPACT wants to understand and agree upon the way we are proceeding from here, how all the pieces will fit together, whether we are addressing everything to meet those requirements, whether the efforts of each jurisdiction complement one another, and whether all the pieces are integrated with one another as a result of all these efforts.

Action Taken: Commissioner Rogers moved, seconded by Commissioner Blumenauer, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 92-1619, eliminating Bypass Option B from further Western Bypass study. The motion PASSED unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 92-1620 - ELIMINATING A "TRANSIT-INTENSIVE STRATEGY" FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION IN THE WESTERN BYPASS STUDY WITHOUT PRECLUDING FUTURE LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT IN THE HIGHWAY 217 CORRIDOR

Andy Cotugno explained that the Transit-Intensive Strategy is an alternative with a strictly transit-oriented approach that does not solve the problem in Washington County. He noted the need for a combination approach of transit and highway improvements. Given the land use pattern, he felt that a light rail alternative is not a good solution. He was supportive of heavy-oriented highway options. He asked whether we want to produce an LRT option that has land use considerations. Andy explained that we don't want to preclude LRT or a combination of options. The question of LRT will be considered again following the results of the LUTRAQ study and whether that alternative should be pursued.

Councilor McLain felt we would be irresponsible if we did not look at the complete picture in terms of scale of the project. She felt that the Bypass Study is an incomplete study and that what comes out of the EIS will be too limited.

Commissioner Rogers expressed difficulty about accepting this alternative as it doesn't solve the problem in Washington County. He noted that it may help other problems in the county but not within the framework and objectives of this study.

Fred Hansen suggested deferring action on this resolution until consideration of the LUTRAQ alternative.

Mike Wert questioned whether LRT is the only option considered as transit in the region.

Tom Walsh noted that he had no difficulty in dropping the Transit-Intensive Strategy from consideration. He spoke of the need to do a transportation systems study in Washington County, but he didn't feel it was worth the investment.

Councilor Gardner spoke of the purpose of the study and the need for it to receive credibility from the public. He acknowledged that a lot of options have been examined but he had a problem of dropping the LRT piece. He felt the LUTRAQ study will always be tainted because it is produced by a private group. If any LRT option prevails through the LUTRAQ study, he felt it would be a vulnerable option.

Mayor Cole indicated that, if LRT is part of the land use alternative and if this alternative stays in, it will be the wrong EIS for something they need. He felt it will hurt the future of LRT in that corridor and does not belong there.

Action Taken: Mayor Cole moved, seconded by Commissioner Rogers, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 92-1620 with the change to Resolve 2 to read as follows:

"2. That alternatives which include combinations of highway expansion and transit expansion, ~~not excluding the possibility of rail transit,~~ will be considered for Draft Environmental Impact Statement evaluation in the Western Bypass Study. In addition, when the alternatives are approved for inclusion in the EIS, specific consideration will be given to whether LRT should be the transit element of one of these alternatives.

In discussion on the motion, it was noted that the LUTRAQ study will be one of the alternatives. The Committee agreed that the amendment would open the door for future consideration of LRT. The LUTRAQ study would become one of the region's alternatives if JPACT, and subsequently Metro Council, adopts it. Commissioner Blumenauer spoke of the need for the LUTRAQ model to be a legitimate one or the region will be suspect to anyone who doesn't feel we would be giving it full consideration. In terms of funding and the outcome of this effort, we need assistance from ODOT and it needs to be discussed at the OTC level. He noted that there has been a lot of debate on this project and the process. There are a lot of people facing that debate and most of the questions are framed in a negative sense. If additional funds are required to support this project, he wanted to take that input back to the OTC.

Fred Hansen questioned what the impact would be if action was deferred on this resolution until completion of the LUTRAQ study. He offered to chair a JPACT subcommittee that would develop a transitional planning framework to respond to requirements of ISTEA, the Clean Air Act, and Rule 12. Mike Wert responded that more work has been done to define the alternatives for the EIS.

Councilor Gardner felt that this alternative would allow for consideration of light rail transit versus HOV lanes.

Mike Wert noted that the three study committees have recommended that the alternative not go forward. If a decision is made not to drop this alternative, more time and funding will be spent.

The motion PASSED. Those voting against included Fred Hansen, Councilor McLain and Councilor Gardner.

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Rena Cusma  
Dick Engstrom  
JPACT Members