

SEP 5 1991

**JOINT IRC TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE
AND METRO JOINT POLICY ADVISORY
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION MEETING**

**Meeting Summary
February 14, 1991**

The Joint IRC Transportation Policy Committee and METRO Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation Meeting was called to order on February 14, 1991, at 7:50 a.m. at Club Green Meadows, Vancouver, Washington. Those committee members in attendance follow. An attendance sheet with all guests present was not available.

Joint IRC/JPACT Committee Members Present

Don Adams	Oregon Department of Transportation
Gary Demich	Washington State Department of Transportation
Richard Devlin	Metro Council
John Fischbach	City of Vancouver
Dean Lindgren	City of Washougal
Bob Moser	Port of Vancouver
Dave Sturdevant	Clark County
Les White	C-TRAN

Don Adams	Oregon Department of Transportation
Pauline Anderson	Multnomah County
Earl Blumenauer	City of Portland
Clifford Clark	Cities of Washington County
James Cowen	Tri-Met
Gary Demich	Washington State Department of Transportation
Richard Devlin	Metro Council
Steve Greenwood	Department of Environmental Quality
Ron Hart	City of Vancouver
David Knowles	Metro Council
Robert Liddell	Cities of Clackamas County
Ed Lindquist	Clackamas County
Marge Schmunk	Cities of Multnomah County
Dave Sturdevant	Clark County
Les White	C-TRAN

Staff and Guests Present

Keith Ahola	WSDOT
Richard Brandman	Metro
Kim Chin	C-TRAN
Elsa Coleman	City of Portland
Andy Cotugno	Metro
Derek Crider	BRW Inc.
Grace Cruncan	City of Portland
Mike Cuneen	Kittleson and Associates
Lynda David	IRC
Steve Dotterer	City of Portland
Bernie Giusto	City of Gresham
Howard Harris	DEQ
Bob Hart	IRC
Mike Hogland	Metro
Merlyn Hough	DEQ
Darrell Joque	Berger/ABAM Engineers, Inc.
Shinwon Kim	IRC
Wayne Kittleson	Kittleson and Associates
Lois Kaplan	Metro
John Kowalczyk	DEQ
Dean Lookingbill	IRC
Gil Mallery	IRC
Molly O'Reilly	STOP
Dale Robins	IRC
Bebe Rucker	Port of Portland
Rod Sandoz	Clackamas County
Gail Spolar	C-TRAN
Karen Thackston	Metro
Tom VanderZanden	Clackamas County
Bruce Warner	Washington County
Richard Warren	IRC
David Williams	ODOT
Martin Winch	Metro
Diane Workman	IRC

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

Dave Sturdevant called the meeting to order at 7:50 a.m. He welcomed everyone, and he thanked them for the opportunity to share the High Capacity Transit Issues. He turned the first presentation over to Dean Lookingbill.

II. Bi-State Transportation Study

Dean Lookingbill distributed a memorandum stating the Bi-State Transportation Study's policy objectives and issues. He introduced the consultant in charge of the project, Wayne Kittleson, of Kittleson and Associates. Mr. Kittleson had a slide presentation to help illustrate their findings.

Mr. Kittleson stated that throughout the study the primary objectives they will look at are existing travel patterns and traffic conditions. Also, the future travel conditions to the year 2010 will be addressed. These include truck travel as well. The first slide showed the level of service that the I-5 and I-205 corridors are currently running. He stated that over the last 30 years, traffic volumes across the Columbia River have increased 6 percent per year. He summarized by saying that the traffic congestion on I-5 is more intense than the congestion on I-205, and congestion is worse on both of these facilities in the evening peak hours. The major problems of capacity and safety on I-5 are generally south of SR-14. I-205 rates are highest from SR-14 to Mill Plain Road, but even those rates are only about half of those on I-5.

He presented slides relating to truck travel characteristics. Because truck travel is important in forming the freeway system not only how the system operates during the day, but also how it might operate in the future. He said that of the percentage of trucks crossing the Columbia, 37 percent were single unit trucks, 48 percent were semi trucks, and 15 percent were tandem trucks. The growth of truck travel is toward longer, larger trucks. These are the ones that have the greatest impact on the use of the capacity of the freeway system. They also have the greatest potential multiple accident impact.

It was found that travel time was the key to mode choice to both people and freight. Travel time was found to influence future decisions of location.

In terms of the project identification, they expect to have a memo on impact conditions in March; in April and May, they will look into future conditions, the Year 2010 RTP, complete the Regional Economic Analysis, with a Draft Final Report to be out in June and the Final in July.

III. Clark County HCT Activities

A. I-205 Bridge LRT Retrofit Study

Dean Lookingbill introduced Darrell Joque, the lead consultant in the I-205 Retrofit Study. This study is mainly looking at the feasibility of retrofitting the I-205 Bridge to LRT between Portland and Clark County, the structural issues on the bridge, and the operational connection at Gateway.

Mr. Joque stated that their main study was to evaluate the transit modes LRT and Exclusive Busway/HOV. The preliminary structural assessment of the Glen Jackson Bridge and the South Channel Bridge has been reported. In order to further understand the findings, he presented slides to explain some of the engineering terms. He explained the terms sheer and moment. He stated that the bridge was originally designed for five lanes of traffic for future expansion. This would allow for four lanes of traffic and room for an LRT lane at the center near the bike path. He showed a slide giving a cross-section of the Glenn Jackson Bridge with one side showing the LRT option and the other showing the Exclusive HOV/Busway option. Either would run on the inside of the two bridges in a both a north- and south-bound direction.

Beginning with the LRT he stated that in following the minimum Interstate standards for highway bridges, it is possible to accommodate four 12-foot lanes of traffic with the required minimum of 3-feet 6-inch shoulders and still accommodate the LRT system. The LRT would be right next to the present bike path where there is a concrete barrier. The bike path would not be disturbed with the addition of LRT. A new traffic barrier would be provided between the LRT and the traffic. The Exclusive Busway/HOV System would have a painted barrier and not a physical barrier due to lack of feasible lane space.

The Gateway area is considered a main transfer station. They have envisioned having the cars go from Clark County into this area and then switching ends of the car to proceed into downtown Portland. This area has a high potential of heavy competition of scheduled other lines. The other

option is to return these cars to Clark County and have a transfer at this point to go downtown.

IV. Portland HCT Activities

A. Westside/Hillsboro LRT Update

Andy Cotugno presented a handout of a bar chart displaying the different corridors, their current status, and projected time line activities. He stated the Hillsboro LRT Alternatives Analysis is underway and a Draft Environmental Impact Statement is anticipated by the middle of 1991 to the spring of 1992.

B. Milwaukie/I-205 Preliminary AA

They have proposed doing a Pre Alternatives Analysis Study. With a Preliminary Scope of Work having been refused by UMTA, they are working on a detailed Scope of Work to provide a basis for getting UMTA approval to start that process some time this spring.

V. Next Meeting

The next meeting date was suggested for July 11, 1991, in Portland on the regular JPACT meeting date.

VI. Adjourn

Dave Sturdevant stated his appreciation for the opportunity to share the HCT activities that are going on in the Clark County area. David Knowles thanked everyone for their hospitality. The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 a.m.