

## MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: March 8, 1990

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Chairman Mike Ragsdale, Jim Gardner  
(alt.) and George Van Bergen, Metro Council;  
Pauline Anderson, Multnomah County; Earl  
Blumenauer, City of Portland; Don Adams  
(alt.), ODOT; Craig Lomnicki (alt.), Cities  
of Clackamas County; Clifford Clark, Cities  
of Washington County; Ed Lindquist, Clackamas  
County; Scott Collier, City of Vancouver;  
Carter MacNichol, Port of Portland; Les  
White, C-TRAN (alt.), Clark County; Marge  
Schmunk, Cities of Multnomah County; James  
Cowen, Tri-Met; Gary Demich, WSDOT; and  
Bonnie Hays, Washington County

Guests: Gussie McRobert (JPACT alt.) and  
Rodger Clauson, City of Gresham; Bebe Rucker,  
Port of Portland; Dean Lookingbill and Gil  
Mallery, Intergovernmental Resource Center;  
Howard Harris, DEQ; Barrow Emerson, Steve  
Dotterrer, Chris Beck and Grace Crunican,  
City of Portland; Bruce Warner and Dennis  
Mulvihill, Washington County; Denny Moore  
(Transit Division) and Ted Spence, ODOT; Bob  
Post (JPACT alt.) and G.B. Arrington, Tri-  
Met; Jim Howell, Citizens for Better Transit;  
Susie Lahsene, Multnomah County; and Tom  
VanderZanden and Rod Sandoz, Clackamas  
County, and Keith Ahola (JPACT alt.), WSDOT

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

MEDIA: None

### SUMMARY:

The meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Chairman Mike Ragsdale.

### MEETING REPORT

Mr. Cowen indicated he did not attend the February 8 JPACT meeting but wished to add the following for clarification to the third paragraph on page 7, line 5, under "Update on Surface Transportation Act": He (referring to comments made by Dick

Feeney) indicated that the transit program should be tripled and the highway program should be doubled in the next STA Update for a balanced highway/transit program.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval of the February 8 JPACT minutes as corrected. Motion PASSED unanimously.

#### AMENDING THE JPACT BYLAWS

Chairman Ragsdale noted that these bylaws have been before the Committee for a long time and have not received final Metro Council approval. He asked the Committee whether they wished to adhere to a 30-day advance notice under these circumstances. He also indicated that since JPACT had approved the bylaws, he would rule that a two-thirds vote on amendments would be required. Since JPACT formally adopted the bylaws on January 18, it was agreed to implement the two-thirds majority vote ruling. The Committee agreed to proceed with the action rather than wait an additional 30 days. Clifford Clark objected to proceeding.

Andy Cotugno explained that the JPACT bylaws would be considered at the March 8 Metro Council meeting. In view of discussions held at the last JPACT meeting regarding the ability to conduct a phone vote in the absence of a quorum at a regular or special meeting, a proposed amendment was distributed that had been reviewed by legal counsel and complies with the Public Meetings Law requirements.

In discussion on the provision for a phone vote, Committee members concurred in the need to have that capability as long as it met with the State of Oregon legal requirements.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval of Proposed Amendment No. 1 (Article V -- Meetings, Conduct of Meetings, Quorum) to read as follows:

- a. Regular meetings of the Committee will be held monthly at a time and place established by the chairperson. Special or emergency meetings may be called by the Chairperson or a majority of the membership. In the absence of a quorum at a regular monthly meeting or a special meeting, the chairperson may call a special or emergency meeting, including membership participation and vote by telephone, for deliberation and action on any matters requiring consideration prior to the next regular meeting. The minutes shall describe the circumstances justifying membership participation by telephone and the actual emergency for any meeting called on less than 24 hours' notice.

The motion PASSED unanimously.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval of Proposed Amendment No. 2 (Article IV - Committee Membership, Section 2. Appointment of Members and Alternates) which stipulated the following: "The member and alternate will be from different jurisdictions, one of which will be from the city of largest population (after the City of Portland)."

In discussion on the above motion, the following issues were raised:

- . Councilor Gardner expanded on his memo to JPACT, expressing the IGR Committee's concerns that there be equal and fair representation from all the major jurisdictions on JPACT. The regional priorities referred by JPACT have been recognized by Metro Council as having been through an open and collaborative process although absence of Gresham would raise doubts in the minds of the Councilors.
- . Commissioner Lindquist commented that he respected Councilor Gardner's efforts to effect a change to solve the problem but the proposed amendment could affect an area where changes are not needed, such as in Clackamas County. He asked that the bylaws be kept status quo unless a specific population number was cited. He felt the cities within that county should solve their own problem.
- . Commissioner Anderson felt that a previous amendment that dealt with criteria for eligibility of cities of over 60,000 was a better solution but did not feel this compromise was in JPACT's best interests.
- . Clifford Clark felt that the IGR memo challenged the credibility of JPACT because of the representation issue and was presented in a threatening nature. He pointed out that any city in the region has the opportunity to speak from the floor at any time. Councilor Gardner responded that the memo was in no way intended as a threat but to encourage fair representation from the significant players of the region.
- . George Van Bergen expressed opposition to the proposed amendment.
- . Commissioner Blumenauer supported the over 60,000 population amendment and the fact that Gresham, as the state's most rapidly growing city, needs to be involved in this process and dialogue. He noted that the adoption of this amendment

wouldn't advance anything as far as Washington or Multnomah Counties and, in fact, would complicate the efforts in Clackamas County where there's been a conscious effort to involve the two jurisdictions that appear to have the greatest interest in JPACT. He subscribed to the overall objective of the amendment but felt its passage would pose some problems for Clackamas County. He suggested holding this amendment in abeyance for some future consideration.

- . Chairman Ragsdale did not feel this amendment was the appropriate way to address the question although he felt it was an issue that needs to be dealt with.
- . The question was raised as to whether any consideration has been given for allowing the largest city of a jurisdiction the option of participating on the Committee.
- . Mayor McRobert (Gresham) indicated that she has spoken with the Mayor of Lake Oswego and their jurisdiction resents not being included in the decision-making in their county.

In calling for the question, the motion failed to carry a two-thirds majority, being DEFEATED by a vote of 9-6. Those dissenting included: George Van Bergen, Clifford Clark, Craig Lomnicki, Ed Lindquist, Earl Blumenauer and Don Adams.

Chairman Ragsdale introduced Les White, Executive Director of C-TRAN, who will be serving as alternate representative from the City of Vancouver and Clark County. Keith Ahola will remain the alternate for WSDOT.

#### CLARK COUNTY INVOLVEMENT IN LIGHT RAIL PLANNING

Andy Cotugno noted that a brief discussion was held in January on Clark County involvement in regional LRT planning. An extensive discussion was held on other aspects of organizing light rail planning activities. Portions of the organizational structure that have been approved for overseeing the high-capacity transit study were highlighted in the agenda packet and focus on the detailed planning for those corridors. Andy emphasized that the decisions yet to be made on prioritization, staging and financing with respect to Clark County involvement are the issues.

JPACT must reach some basic conclusions on the fundamental issue of Clark County involvement. The two concerns involve: what the bi-state decision-making process means and what structure it will take; and what kinds of decisions should be involved in that bi-state decision-making process. Andy asked the Committee whether those decisions should affect the Westside and Hillsboro LRT

funding, the Milwaukie and I-205 LRT funding and staging, whether they should affect which corridor comes after the Westside or implementation of the priorities that recognize the Westside, and whether those decisions should deal with what corridor comes after the Milwaukie and I-205 area analysis.

The memo from the Washington State JPACT members indicated support of Option B, which would involve Clark County in decisions on the No. 2 LRT corridor (after the Westside). Gary Demich felt the level of Clark County participation should first be decided before the organizational structure is discussed. From the State of Washington's perspective, they are interested in how the Clark County representatives and their agencies fit into the regional rail planning process. Mr. Demich stressed being part of a four-county region, the fact that they are actively encouraging LRT into Clark County, and that they have been given several local options by the Washington Legislature for raising taxes that would provide them with substantial funds on the north side of the river.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to involve Clark County in decision-making on LRT corridors after the Westside, with details to be proposed by staff in the coming month.

A discussion followed on whether or not Clark County was planning to bring funds from the north side of the river to put into the regional pot. Mr. Demich indicated he couldn't promise funds to the Oregon side because of constitutional limitations but spoke of the interrelationship of ridership and river crossing issues as well as benefits to Clark County. Because of Clark County's ability to raise a substantial amount of local match money, he felt it would be beneficial for LRT to the Oregon side of the river and the region.

Scott Collier emphasized Clark County being part of the public sector environment and the need to create a forum for these two sides to get together. He noted that the decisions made on the southern part of the corridor can and do affect what happens in the other part of the regional system in terms of the overall financial picture. He felt that, by working together, a unified effort would transcend at all levels, local and national.

Les White spoke of a tradition of working cooperatively with Tri-Met and of additional facility and maintenance costs for rail coming into Clark County.

Jim Cowen was supportive of Clark County's participation but expressed concern for the success of the Westside project, some of the details, the composition of the committees that would be

formed, and causing any unnecessary concern for UMTA. Commissioner Hays also expressed UMTA concerns with regard to the Westside project.

Chairman Ragsdale wanted clarification from the Washington State representatives to be made, prior to a vote being taken, that there is understanding on what JPACT's regional LRT priorities are: 1st, the Westside; 2nd, the Milwaukie/I-205 corridor; and that the issue of priorities will not be reopened. Mr. Demich acknowledged that they recognize that if funding is not available to do the #2 priority, they still want to be part of the process that determines what the next priority would be.

Motion: It was moved and seconded that the motion on Clark County involvement be tabled for 60 days. Motion FAILED.

In calling for the original motion, the motion PASSED unanimously.

Chairman Ragsdale indicated that he and Commissioner Sturdevant would work with staff to prepare a proposal for consideration at the April 12 JPACT meeting. Regardless of the decision made on structural relationships, he felt that joint JPACT/IRC meetings could be productive and meaningful. He suggested that the June meeting be a joint one to discuss policy and detail issues of common interest to both sides of the river.

#### STATUS REPORT ON CITY OF PORTLAND RAIL PROGRAM

Commissioner Blumenauer provided an overview of the City of Portland's Rail Program, stating that the primary focus is on projects within the City of Portland. He spoke of their responsibility to involve, inform and cooperate with their regional partners. Significant investments have tentatively been allocated to accelerate the downtown trolley loop and continue to work with the individual corridor committees to help plan the various rail corridors. The bulk of the money is proposed for allocation to the Westside light rail. As part of their local match, they are suggesting that \$1.25 million go into a regional fund.

Commissioner Blumenauer spoke of this as an ongoing program and that such recommendations would be advanced each year to look at what the range of projects might be. If approved, the City would work with Tri-Met and other interested members of JPACT on how the \$1.25 million could most effectively be spent to accelerate the process.

Commissioner Lindquist wished to thank Commissioner Blumenauer and the City of Portland for taking the initiative on this study but wanted to be assured that it would not detract from any of the decisions and priorities made by JPACT. Andy Cotugno responded that these rail planning activities are complimentary and supplementary to Metro LRT studies. Commissioner Blumenauer indicated that periodic updates would be provided to JPACT. He stated that the City would be receptive to questions, clarification, or refinement along the way as they did not wish to complicate matters.

Chairman Ragsdale commended Commissioner Blumenauer for his leadership in this effort.

#### REVIEW OF FY 91 UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM

Andy explained that the draft FY 91 Unified Work Program reflects Metro's work program, the Clark County IRC work program and some aspects of the Tri-Met work program. Based on UMTA review, some additions will need to be made relating to the regional rail program and Tri-Met's planning work program, which are funded locally.

#### ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Ragsdale announced appointment of a committee to work on the Surface Transportation Act (STA) update. The intent of the Committee will be to develop recommendations for a JPACT position paper relative to renewal of the STA and to recommend strategies for lobbying on any decisions made. He noted the following appointments and asked to be apprised should anyone else wish to participate: Ed Lindquist, David Knowles, Earl Blumenauer, Bob Bothman, Gary Demich, Jim Cowen and himself.

Bob Post briefed the Committee on the series of meetings held in Washington, D.C. to update the Congressional delegation on the LRT corridors. The briefing was held in preparation for a meeting with UMTA Administrator, Brian Clymer. Misunderstandings had occurred from material gathered by UMTA staff that led to the statement that "the region was out of control." It was their perception that all of the corridors would be completed within a nine-year timeframe and they were concerned about the region and UMTA's financial capability.

Bob reported further that, by the time the meeting of Senator Hatfield, Congressman AuCoin, Governor Goldschmidt and UMTA Administrator Clymer had concluded, Mr. Clymer had agreed to expedite consideration of the Westside project to 185th and

authorize approval of the Alternatives Analysis to Hillsboro. With regard to the I-205 and Milwaukie corridors, the Administrator was insistent that AA not be formally entered into. It was felt that once AA has begun, the project is then on track for construction, noting their concern once again about the region and UMTA's financial capability. However, Senator Hatfield and Congressman AuCoin wanted to see progress made in the I-205/Milwaukie corridor and agreement was reached to allow us to move ahead short of formal agreement on an AA. The agreement was to move toward an AA and reach agreement on a scope of work before the end of this fiscal year. Bob indicated that UMTA staff has been apprised of this and they are now looking at the Westside impact statement and details of the Hillsboro extension.

James Cowen commended Dick Feeney, Andy Cotugno, Senator Hatfield and Congressman AuCoin for their efforts in Washington, D.C., expressing concern that there might be a time when our Congressional delegation will not be as receptive.

Chairman Ragsdale asked for JPACT assistance in "spreading the word" for Ballot Measure 1 and how critical it is to the region. Andy Cotugno pointed out that the Ballot Measure Factsheet, printed on ODOT letterhead, was enclosed in the agenda as well as the final Supreme Court approved ballot title for popular distribution.

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Rena Cusma  
Dick Engstrom  
JPACT Members