

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: October 8, 1981

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Charlie Williamson, Bob Bothman, Larry Cole, Dick Pokornowski, Ed Ferguson, John Frewing, Robin Lindquist, and Al Myers

Guests: Metro Councilors Bob Oleson and Mike Burton; Ted Spence, ODOT; Bebe Rucker, Multnomah County; Winston Kurth, Clackamas County; Carl Neuburger, Citizens for Better Highways; Greg Kullberg, Jerry Markesino, and Steve Dotterer, City of Portland; John Price, FHWA; David Peach, WSDOT; Paul Bay, Tri-Met; Alan Willis and Sarah Salazar, Port of Portland; and Gil Mallery, Regional Planning Council of Clark County

Staff: Andrew Cotugno, Keith Lawton, Terry Bolstad, Peg Henwood, Karen Thackston, and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

MEDIA: None

SUMMARY:

1. REVIEW OF OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION'S SIX-YEAR PLAN

Bob Bothman, Administrator of ODOT, presented ODOT's proposed Six-Year Plan which constitutes the capital improvement program and includes all highway projects for the next six-year period. The Plan is updated every two years and this year's program has been compiled from incomplete projects in the program and a "want" list that was developed from previous hearings, high accident studies, signal investigation warrants, etc. Projects were prioritized at the ODOT-regional level and then integrated into a statewide priority list.

Mr. Bothman stated that there are 32 different funding sources available from federal revenues and that the projects were categorized accordingly. Eighteen public hearings would be held throughout the State, five of which would be held in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Bothman further indicated that the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) policy at the present time is for preservation of the system; 75 percent of the program is planned for preservation with the remaining 25 percent to be utilized for new projects and improving the system. He stressed the fact that they've experienced an average inflation rate of 14 percent on

highways while the current program anticipated only an 8 percent inflation rate -- leaving more projects in the current program than could be funded.

Another factor affecting the program is that revenues have dropped off in the last sixteen months. Factors such as deterioration of the present highway system, the present rate of inflation and a decrease in revenues have caused a shift in funding from construction to maintenance. The effect on the improvement program has been a delaying or slipping of projects and the deletion of others. Mr. Bothman then reviewed the projects listed for deletion in the Six-Year Plan.

Andy Cotugno explained to the Committee that \$300 million of Interstate Transfer projects and the approximate \$300 million of Interstate projects comprise the two major components of this region's highway program. Approximately \$288 million of Interstate funds is proposed to be deleted from the Six-Year Plan -- being deferred with no certainty of when they might be built.

A draft letter was presented to the Committee in response to the proposals in the Six-Year Plan. It cited the need for the State to consider breaking down projects based on need or phasing projects over a two to three-year period. The Committee indicated support of the requests that the State give further consideration not to delay the I-5/Greeley Avenue ramps and the I-5/N. Tigard - South Tigard projects nor to delete the following projects: I-405/ramps to Yeon Avenue (I-505 Alternative); I-5/East Marquam and Water Avenue ramps; I-5/Slough Bridge/Delta Park interchange; and I-84/181st Avenue interchange.

Questions raised by Committee members included how the projects were prioritized, what distinction is made between maintenance projects and construction or reconstruction projects, whether traffic volume weighed in ODOT's prioritization, whether the number of accidents on a freeway entered into project consideration, and what chances there were of getting any of these priorities changed.

The Committee was in agreement that 1) the State should commit to building the highest priority segment of all the projects concerned to ensure maximum benefit from the limited available funding; 2) ODOT should take into consideration existing and projected traffic volume in setting priorities for use of scarce funding; 3) ODOT should pursue discretionary Interstate funds available for the completion of "critical gaps" to advance I-205 as well as retain a "backup" program of projects in the event

additional discretionary funds are available and actively pursue preliminary engineering and right-of-way acquisition on all deferred projects; 4) ODOT should ensure that their program for use of State funds includes previous match commitments toward Interstate Transfer funded projects; 5) If the Six-Year Plan results in the loss of federal funds due to insufficient State match, ODOT should consider releasing these funds for use by local jurisdictions; 6) ODOT should consider lowering their maintenance standards on low-use State facilities; and 7) ODOT should reconsider the decision to delete proposed improvements on the Tualatin Valley Highway through Hillsboro and Highway 43 at Marylhurst College.

Committee members expressed interest in having WDOT respond to the program because of improvements going into the western part of Clark County vs. I-82. Mr. Ferguson assured the Committee that there would be a response from WDOT and added that the two transportation commissions would be meeting in November to discuss the problem with the intent of producing some policy guidelines.

Chairman Williamson indicated that he felt the Metro Council may wish to make a separate recommendation regarding the I-405 Freeway because of its relationship with the garbage hauling.

Bob Bothman pointed out that the Six-Year Plan has not addressed projects based on the 3¢ proposed gas tax and indicated that the 1¢ gas tax would give the State funds to match the federal funds on these projects.

Action Taken: The Committee was in agreement that Andy draft a letter on behalf of JPACT, to be signed by its Chairman, reflecting the comments stipulated above for transmittal to the Oregon Transportation Commission.

Ed Ferguson, Administrator of WDOT, announced that bids would be opened on the SR-14/I-5 interchange just north of the river on Wednesday, October 14, and that the project would be underway and completed in the next two to three years.

2. REPORT ON STATUS OF LEGISLATIVE FUNDING FOR TRANSPORTATION

Andy reviewed the current status of dealings in Washington, D.C. on the Interstate Transfer program. He stated that the House Appropriations Committee adopted both Section 3 and Interstate Transfer funding to keep the Banfield on schedule plus \$34.5 million for other Interstate Transfer highway projects, which would maintain a number of priorities in each jurisdiction. The Senate

Appropriations Committee started their work on September 16. The proposal from Senator Hatfield was a recommendation that the Interstate Transfer "transit" funding fund \$50 million of Banfield construction and that the Banfield be funded strictly with Interstate Transfer funds. His proposal was for increasing the Interstate Transfer level on the Banfield and dropping Section 3 funds for that purpose. He also suggested that the Committee appropriate \$200 million of highway funding, the amount appropriated last year, with the understanding that the House and the Senate would compromise at the Conference Committee at a little more than \$300 million of highway funding. It was anticipated that Oregon would receive 19 percent of that amount, which is the latest calculation of what our pro-rata fair share is.

The \$60 million share to Oregon would include the \$34.5 million needed for other highway projects plus \$14.5 million that Salem needs for its program plus about \$12 million for some of the highway aspects of the Banfield. Before the Senate Committee adopted this Appropriations Bill, they received the President's request for 12 percent across-the-board cuts. If the Senate cuts 12 percent across the board, the Interstate Transfer transit funding would be cut from \$600 million to \$528 million and our ability to get \$50 million of that amount would be jeopardized. The Interstate Transfer highway program would be cut from \$200 million to \$177 million. Andy related that there are several suggestions that the 12 percent be taken out of different parts of the Appropriations Bill at different rates. He stressed the fact that Senator Hatfield's proposal did present a program that included everything we need but it carried that program without the Section 3 funds for the Banfield. It did, however, include the provision for Section 3 funds for other transit purposes that would otherwise use Interstate Transfer funding. Whenever this is cleared up, Andy pointed out that it will likely be a Federal decision rather than a local one as to how much funding will be received. Andy related that Bob Duncan is still maintaining communications in this regard.

If the Section 3 trade of the Banfield funds for the Westside and a few other Interstate Transfer transit projects is the only manner in which we'll receive a funding package, then Washington County has indicated that that's an acceptable program (if that includes the commitment that Section 3 funds will flow for those other projects).

3. REVIEW OF REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Andy Cotugno reviewed past presentations and draft material on the Regional Transportation Plan and opened discussion on the policy framework which will help answer the questions of whether

the Plan does work, what it is we're trying to make work, the level of service and mobility needs, and where the regional interest is. It also helps to define the desirable level of mobility of performance on that highway and transit system so that we can measure whether or not the system has been improved.

Andy cited the need for identifying transitways as a means of protecting that right-of-way for the future. He noted three major components of the transportation system necessary to provide the mobility -- how we want the highway system laid out, how we want the transit system laid out, and what kind of demand management programs we can actually use to reduce our need for investing in highway and transit.

In addition to traffic congestion measures, Andy stated that we should also have a minimum level of service defined for the transit system. He then reviewed those measures relating to guidelines for transit minimum level of service. Criteria has been developed to determine where regional trunk routes should go and what type of service should be provided by that regional trunk route. Those routes should be recognized as providing the most frequent and the most reliable service.

Andy then followed up with a review of the Demand Management section of the report, particularly the goal for 35 percent ridesharing. He indicated that what staff will be coming back with will be information on how well the recommended system works, what it consists of, how much it buys and how much it costs.

4. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Rick Gustafson
JPACT Members