

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: January 18, 1990

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Chairman Mike Ragsdale, George Van
Bergen and David Knowles, Metro Council; Dave
Sturdevant, Clark County; Marjorie Schmunk,
Cities of Multnomah County; Craig Lomnicki
(alt.), Cities of Clackamas County; Ed Lind-
quist, Clackamas County; Roy Rogers (alt.),
Washington County; Nick Nikkila (alt.), DEQ;
Gary Demich, WSDOT; Bob Bothman, ODOT;
Clifford Clark, Cities of Washington County;
Scott Collier, City of Vancouver; Jim Cowen,
Tri-Met; and Mike Lindberg (alt.), City of
Portland

Guests: Rena Cusma, Executive Officer,
Metro; Steve Nouser and Bebe Rucker, Port of
Portland; Vic Rhodes, Grace Crunican, Steve
Dotterrer, Stuart Gwin, Ted Leybold, Barrow
Emerson and Chris Beck, City of Portland; Ted
Spence, Erik East (Public Transit), Don Adams
(JPACT alt.); Wink Brooks and Dave Schamp,
City of Hillsboro; Susie Lahsene, Multnomah
County; Bob Post (JPACT alt.), Dick Feeney,
Doug Capps, Bruce Harder, G.B. Arrington, Joe
Walsh and Dan Caufield, Tri-Met; Gussie
McRobert (JPACT alt.), City of Gresham; Rick
Kuehn, consultant; Geoff Larkin, consultant;
Walt Peck, Dennis Mulvihill and Bruce Warner,
Washington County; Tom VanderZanden and Rod
Sandoz, Clackamas County; Mary Tobias, Tualat-
in Valley Economic Development Corporation;
Diane Luther, Multnomah County Board; Greg
Baldwin, Zimmer Gunsul Frasca Partnership;
Peter Fry, CEIC; Molly O'Reilly, Forest Park
Neighborhood Association; Rodger Clauson,
City of Gresham; Howard Harris, DEQ; and
Leslie White, C-TRAN

Staff: Andrew Cotugno, Richard Brandman,
Richard Marshment, Ethan Seltzer, Karen
Thackston, Keith Lawton, Harlan Miller (FHWA
intern), and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

MEDIA: Robert Goldfield, The Daily Journal of
Commerce; and Jim Mayer, The Oregonian

SUMMARY:

The meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Chairman Mike Ragsdale. He introduced David Knowles and David Sturdevant, new appointees to the Committee (representing Metro Council and Clark County, respectively), Roy Rogers (Washington County's JPACT alternate) and Mike Lindberg (City of Portland alternate).

MEETING REPORT

The December 14 JPACT meeting report was approved as presented.

LRT DECISION-MAKING

Andy Cotugno reported that the handout (regarding the Regional LRT System attachment) replaced the mailed-out version in the agenda packet. Resolution No. 90-1179 proposes a comprehensive organizational structure for the LRT corridor studies and methods for Clark County involvement. The corridor planning organization is ready for adoption but direction is needed from JPACT on Clark County involvement.

Andy then reviewed the LRT corridor planning activities consisting of three components: 1) the Westside Planning Management Group is in place to deal with the Hillsboro extension; 2) an I-205/Milwaukie corridor Alternatives Analysis is proposed to be a coordinated effort with JPACT serving as the Steering Committee; and 3) a bi-state organizational structure (IRC/JPACT) will address bi-state and river crossing issues. Andy indicated the need to establish an overall Technical Advisory Committee for these bi-state studies.

Discussion followed on the need for balanced representation for corridor planning and regional systems planning. It was recommended that there be some degree of Clark County involvement on the I-205/Milwaukie corridor.

Andy then reviewed Attachment A outlining options for Clark County involvement. He noted that staff needs basic policy direction from JPACT for inclusion in the resolution.

Chairman Ragsdale felt that discussions have been focused primarily on Clark County's role, noting that he had met with Commissioner Sturdevant to discuss conflicts of interest. Both agreed that it would be useful to defer action for a period of 30 days. Commissioner Sturdevant stated that Option B was a comfortable compromise, adding that the delay would allow him time to meet individually with concerned parties. He felt a regional perspective and common ground would be reached to resolve the

JPACT

January 18, 1990

Page 3

problems.

James Cowen expressed concern about the status of the Westside project and spoke of a recent discussion with Brian Clymer, Administrator of UMTA, who commented that the Portland region is "out of control." His comments centered on the proliferation of projects submitted through the UMTA process, the need to move the Westside LRT project forward and the critical timeline. Mr. Cowen urged JPACT members to postpone all other LRT corridor projects until a Full-Funding Agreement is reached for the Westside project. Even with the backing of our Congressional delegation, Mr. Cowen reported that UMTA is paying little attention to the Westside project. He felt this was happening primarily because of the size of our delegation and because it is heavily Democratic.

A discussion followed on the need to settle planning for future projects and determine which corridor is next. Mr. Cowen suggested making an accommodation with UMTA so that the focus will remain on the Westside/Hillsboro Extension project.

Bob Bothman had also met with Brian Clymer and concurred with Mr. Cowen's comments. Mr. Clymer's concern was that the amount of UMTA funds being sought exceeded the funds available for the entire country. Mr. Bothman pointed out that only one project could be planned at a time, that the state's highest priority is the Westside corridor, and that he would oppose anything that would jeopardize the Westside LRT project. He did not feel we had the resources to do all the planning and proceed with more than one corridor at a time. He pointed out that, after the Alternatives Analysis stage in the other corridors, funding would not be available for construction.

Commissioner Rogers noted that Washington County has received similar messages from Washington concerning the number of LRT funding requests. He did not feel that the Hillsboro project should be regarded as anything other than an extension of the Westside project. Commissioner Rogers felt it was inappropriate for a joint IRC/JPACT management structure to deal with the Hillsboro Alternatives Analysis and asked for clarification of Option B. In response, Chairman Ragsdale stated that exclusion of the Hillsboro AA from a bi-state process was intended in the language for Option B. Commissioner Sturdevant felt that the term "Westside" meant LRT to 185th and was not inclusive of the Hillsboro Extension. It was clarified that Congressman AuCoin's intent is that the Westside route includes the Hillsboro Extension.

JPACT

January 18, 1990

Page 4

Clifford Clark stated that the cities of Washington County are anxious for Hillsboro to be the terminus for the Westside LRT and expressed concern about other non-Westside jurisdictions' involvement.

Commissioner Lindberg stated that the City of Portland believes the Westside LRT is the top priority but regional planning should continue on with a regional LRT agenda.

Councilman Lomnicki commented that the cities of Clackamas County also acknowledge that the Westside LRT is the region's number one priority and the McLoughlin project as next in priority.

Andy Cotugno provided an overview of the LRT corridor planning process: planning activity leading to an Alternatives Analysis; formal approval by UMTA to start preliminary engineering; and signing of a full-funding contract with the Federal Government. Andy indicated there is a question as to how soon implementation proceedings can start with a second corridor. UMTA rules state only when a full-funding agreement is in place.

Andy reported that I-205/Milwaukie is the next corridor ready to commence the Alternatives phase, but the question is when. Commissioner Lindquist asked JPACT to defer action on the Milwaukie/I-205 corridor until a meeting with our Congressional delegation could be held. He suggested having Dick Feeney, James Cowen, Chairman Ragsdale and Andy Cotugno consult with the delegation and report back to JPACT at its February 8 meeting. Commissioner Lindquist cautioned against letting a new Administrator set this region's LRT agenda. Chairman Ragsdale indicated he would be meeting with the Congressional delegation in the next week.

Chairman Ragsdale spoke of the need to develop a better understanding of the region's priorities and to stay with them. He cited "freelancing" by JPACT members as a problem.

Chairman Ragsdale felt there were two issues to be resolved at present: 1) whether or not to defer the matter regarding Clark County relationships; 2) and how we proceed with LRT projects in this region.

After further discussion, the Committee agreed to defer the component relating to Clark County's participation to the February 8 JPACT meeting.

Andy explained that this resolution would reaffirm the organizational structure for the Westside/Hillsboro EIS and for the Bi-State Study. Further discussion needs to take place on how to proceed and coordinate the Milwaukie/I-205 AA.

JPACT

January 18, 1990

Page 5

Action Taken: Chairman Ragsdale proposed, and the Committee concurred, to recommend approval of 1a under "Corridor Planning" of the LRT Decision-Making memo (pertaining to addition of the Hillsboro Alternatives Analysis to the Westside Corridor Project management structure).

Chairman Ragsdale proposed, and the Committee concurred, to recommend approval of 1c under "Corridor Planning" of the LRT Decision-Making memo (pertaining to establishment of a joint IRC/JPACT management structure for the bi-state related studies).

Chairman Ragsdale proposed, and the Committee concurred, to defer action on clause 1b (relating to establishment of a coordinated I-205/Milwaukie corridor management structure) until the next agenda item and clause 2 (relating to Clark County involvement) of the LRT Decision-Making memo for a period of 30 days.

OPTIONS FOR PROCEEDING ON I-205 LRT

An issues paper on I-205 was reviewed by Andy Cotugno. Points included: 1) the I-205 corridor is now estimated at a total of \$150 million rather than \$40-50 million for each segment; and 2) no decision has been made on how a \$15.00 vehicle registration fee would be spent. (It would be possible to construct the Westside and one additional rail line costing less than \$200 million assuming 50 percent federal funding.)

Chairman Ragsdale pointed out that we have a responsibility to let Congress know what our preferences are. Congress is seeking a request coordinated through JPACT. Councilor Van Bergen concurred in the need to talk to our Congressional delegation; wanted more time to think about the I-205/Milwaukie corridor management structure before an approach is taken with UMTA; and did not wish to do anything that would jeopardize the Westside project. He commented that he attended a Chamber of Commerce meeting at which Michael Hollern stated that the second LRT corridor would be in the McLoughlin/I-205 corridor.

Commissioner Lindberg supported moving ahead with the recommendations in the packet inasmuch as they (I-205 and Milwaukie) could be delayed a period of up to 18 months.

Commissioner Rogers questioned whether it was premature to adopt recommendation No. 3 (referring to the I-205 Issues paper) and cited the need for clarification on the McLoughlin and I-205 projects to our Congressional delegation.

Andy Cotugno stated JPACT's previously adopted position: 1) that the McLoughlin corridor is the next Section 3 priority after the

Westside project; and 2) that an Alternatives Analysis should also be done in the I-205 corridor without Section 3 funds.

Commissioner Lindquist requested a clarification from Congress on the Section 3 requirements.

In summation, Chairman Ragsdale felt there was JPACT concurrence in: reconfirmation of the Westside project; reconfirmation that it is our intent to proceed with the McLoughlin/I-205 Corridor following advice from our Congressional delegation; and that we should consult with our delegation regarding funding constraints imposed on I-205.

Bob Bothman did not agree with Recommendation No. 2 (I-205 Issues paper) as he felt it would jeopardize the Westside project. It was noted that if we proceed with an Alternatives Analysis for I-205 that is not Section 3 funded, there would be no problem with UMTA. A discussion followed on how best to deal with the UMTA problem. Mr. Bothman stated he would go along with Recommendation No. 2 of the I-205 issues paper if the Alternatives Analysis reference were eliminated.

James Cowen indicated he would be meeting again shortly with UMTA Administrator Brian Clymer.

A discussion followed on whether JPACT should recommend continuing with the Alternatives Analysis for I-205 or deferring the projects for an 18-month period until a Westside Full-Funding Agreement is signed, or adopt a position to proceed with the I-205/Milwaukie corridor AA, the date of which will be determined so that it will not affect the Westside project. Councilor Lomnicki did not feel it was prudent to delay the I-205/Milwaukie project, pointing out that national factors could impact later development.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to amend the I-205 Issues paper recommendations as follows:

- . Rewording for Recommendation No. 1: "Reconfirm that the Westside LRT to Hillsboro is the region's No. 1 priority and will be the priority focus of attention locally, with UMTA and with our Congressional delegation."
- . Rewording for Recommendation No. 2: "Reconfirm that it is our intent desire to proceed with Alternatives Analysis in both the I-205 and Milwaukie corridors and that they will be conducted in a coordinated manner....."

- . Rewording for Recommendation No. 3: "Seek advice from our Congressional delegation on how to best proceed with Alternatives Analysis for the Milwaukie and I-205 corridors and not unduly jeopardize future funding options for these corridors or for the Westside Corridor."

In discussion on the motion, Councilor Van Bergen took issue with the wording of Recommendation No. 2 and felt it should instead state "Reconfirm that we shall proceed" rather than "it is our desire to proceed" (relating to the Alternatives Analysis for the Milwaukie and I-205 corridors).

Bob Bothman questioned whether Recommendations 2 and 5 were consistent.

The motion was then amended to delete Recommendation No. 5. The motion, as amended, CARRIED. Councilor Van Bergen dissented.

RESOLUTION NO. 90-1189 - JPACT BYLAWS

Andy Cotugno reviewed the three amendments proposed to the JPACT Bylaws. Clifford Clark raised the following concerns:

- . Whether the largest city represented from a county should convene a forum to take remedial action against unexcused absences (as noted in Article V, clause g).
- . That Section 2f under Article IV be changed to read "Members and alternate from the State of Washington will be either elected officials or principal staff representatives from Clark County, the cities of Clark County, the Washington Department of Transportation and or C-TRAN....."
- . Rather than members and alternates from the Cities of Multnomah, Washington and Clackamas Counties being appointed through use of a mail ballot, he suggested nomination through the Transportation Coordinating Committees.
- . No mention or specification of special meetings was made in Article Va.
- . Clarification of intent and power of subcommittees.

Action Taken: The Committee agreed to defer action on this matter to the February 8 JPACT meeting. Councilor Van Bergen requested that Clifford Clark submit any proposed amendments in writing for consideration of the members at that time.

RESOLUTION NO. 90-1177 - AMENDING THE TPAC BYLAWS

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval of Resolution No. 90-1177 amending the TPAC bylaws. Motion PASSED unanimously.

RESOLUTION 90-1200 - ALLOCATING THE INTERSTATE REGIONAL RESERVE AND AMENDING THE TIP ACCORDINGLY

Andy Cotugno reported that TPAC was supportive of Recommendations 1 and 2. Other options for Recommendations 3 and 4 were for arterial-type projects to be allocated through a formula approach or a discretionary basis. Andy then reviewed the alternative projects as noted in the Staff Report.

Clifford Clark questioned whether there are additional needs for the Banfield Freeway. Don Adams responded that this is the last requirement on the Banfield.

Councilor Van Bergen pointed out past history on the Banfield when concern was raised in UMTA over Section 9 funds being transferred for operating purposes. Andy noted that Recommendation No. 4 would allow funding for expansion of the light rail fleet. He explained that TPAC's recommendation is to approve the resolution or, if another alternative is preferred, to recommend approval of Recommendations 1 and 2 and refer the remainder of the proposal back to the TIP Subcommittee.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval of Resolution 90-1200 allocating the Interstate Transfer Regional Reserve and amending the TIP accordingly. It was noted for the record that approval of Recommendation No. 3 (pertaining to the \$2 million toward Convention Center area transportation improvements) does not allocate funds for hotel site acquisition for Project Breakeven.

In discussion on the motion, Commissioner Lindquist suggested approving Recommendations 1, 2 and 4 but raised questions pertaining to funds for the Convention Center transportation improvements.

The motion CARRIED. Craig Lomnicki, Ed Lindquist, George Van Bergen and Marge Schmunk dissented.

WESTSIDE STATUS REPORT

Chairman Ragsdale referred this agenda item to the February 8 JPACT meeting.

JPACT
January 18, 1990
Page 9

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Rena Cusma
Dick Engstrom
JPACT Members