

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: April 9, 1981

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Charlie Williamson, Larry Cole, Ernie Bonner, Bob Bothman, Dick Pokornowski, Al Myers, John Frewing, Vern Veysey, Mildred Schwab, Jim Fisher, Robin Lindquist, and Ed Ferguson

Guests: Steve Dotterrer, Bebe Rucker, Dave Peach, Winston Kurth, Gil Mallery, Sarah Salazar, Anne Sylvester, John Rosenberger, Dave Hill, Elton Chang, Paul Bay, James Kuffner, John Price, and Lee Hames

Staff: Rick Gustafson, Andy Cotugno, Keith Lawton, Bill Pettis, Karen Thackston, and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

MEDIA: Claudia Brown, KPTV; Bob Ballantyne, KPTV; and Ron Baker, KXYI

SUMMARY:

At the onset of the meeting, Chairman Williamson introduced and welcomed Ed Ferguson of the Washington Department of Transportation who has replaced Richard Carroll's position on JPACT.

1. AMENDING THE TIP TO INCLUDE AN IMPROVEMENT TO THE SOUTHBOUND ON-RAMP TO HIGHWAY 217 AT BEAVERTON-HILLSDALE HIGHWAY

Following review of the Agenda Management Summary by Andy Cotugno, it was clarified that funding for this project would be allocated by the State and that it was prompted from a water drainage problem.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval of the TIP amendment for an improvement to the southbound on-ramp to Highway 217 at the Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway. Motion CARRIED.

2. REALLOCATION OF THE SAFER OFF-SYSTEM ROAD FUNDING

Following review of the Agenda Management Summary by Andy Cotugno, action was as follows:

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval for reallocating City of Portland uncommitted Safer Off-System Road (SOSR) funds for use by the city of Gresham, and that the TIP be so amended. Motion CARRIED.

3. AMENDING THE FY 81 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO INCLUDE PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING FOR WESTSIDE CORRIDOR HIGHWAY PROJECTS

In review of the Agenda Management Summary, Andy pointed out that the UMTA Interstate Transfer grant did not provide for detailed highway/street studies of the Westside Corridor and was geared to be used to study transit options. This amendment of the TIP is necessary for completion of the project.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval of the FY 81 TIP amendment to include funding for highway elements of the Westside Corridor project. Motion CARRIED.

4. ENDORISING THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE BI-STATE TASK FORCE

Andy Cotugno related that two reports are available documenting the conclusions of the Bi-State Task Force, one prepared by the Washington Department of Transportation, and the other contracted out by Economic Consultants of Oregon, Limited. There was mutual agreement that a third bridge would neither be feasible nor cost-effective, that low-cost improvements should be sought as an alternative, that the study recognizes the fact that some level of congestion will persist, and recommends the establishment of a permanent Bi-State Coordinating Committee that would function under the auspices of Metro and the Clark County Regional Planning Council.

Andy explained that two major line-haul trunk services were planned across the I-5 and I-205 bridges, one from downtown Portland and Interstate Avenue to the new transit center in downtown Vancouver, and the second from the I-205 bridge connecting from the Gateway light-rail station to the Vancouver Mall transit center. The two Clark County transit centers would serve as two major hubs of their system. The question to be assessed by a continuing study is whether that service in the I-5 or I-205 corridors can be more cost-effectively provided by light rail.

One Committee member questioned why the Coordinating Committee would report to the Metro Council rather than to JPACT. It was explained that the Bi-State Coordinating Committee's function with regard to interstate coordination was not restricted to transportation and that it would deal with other areas of interstate significance. The details of how the Committee is to be organized is still in the planning stage and no money, other than for transportation, has been budgeted for.

Commissioner Veysey related that he envisions the Coordinating Committee as trying to accomplish what the report recommends relating to improvement of the I-5 corridor with the additional task of developing the political strategy for getting that proposal funded. He emphasized that the year 2000 is unacceptable as a goal for solving the problems. He felt that the Bi-State Coordinating Committee's top priority should be the follow-through on the recommendations contained in the Bi-State study. With regard to the formation of the Coordinating Committee, Commissioner Veysey felt that specific tasks should be spelled out before endorsing such a Committee. Inasmuch as the proposed Resolution encompassed the need to work out the scope and organization of such a Committee with the Clark County Regional Planning Council, the following action was taken:

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval for endorsement of the conclusions of the Bi-State Task Force; with the further recommendation that the revised Work Program be accepted; and that a Bi-State Coordinating Committee be established whereby Metro agrees to work out the organization and scope of such a Committee with the Clark County Regional Planning Council. Motion CARRIED.

It was also the desire of JPACT that Commissioner Veysey's comments be conveyed to the Task Force regarding the need to proceed with the proposals contained in the Bi-State study as top priority.

5. ELIGIBILITY OF CLARK COUNTY AND CITY OF VANCOUVER FOR INTERSTATE TRANSFER FUNDS

A letter was presented at the meeting to JPACT members relating the City of Vancouver and Clark County's intent to prioritize those projects which would be appropriate candidates for Interstate Transfer funds for future consideration. At the meeting, Commissioner Veysey indicated that this was a request to get into the priority system for regional considerations on Interstate Transfer funds. He then named four projects of significance in the Clark County area, citing the Mill Plain extension between I-5 and I-205, the SR 500 link, the transit mall, and the Mill Plain truck route within the city limits of Vancouver. Dick Pokornowski also emphasized the need for a unified front on both sides of the river for a total lobbying effort in Washington, D.C.

Commissioner Schwab expressed concern in adding new projects into a program that was developed and approved three years ago and is now faced with limited funds. A discussion then followed on whether Clark County's needs might be prioritized in

terms of the Regional Transportation Plan as opposed to funding needs. Commissioner Veysey indicated that the intent of their letter was also to make the region aware of Clark County's needs.

Ted Spence related that criteria has been developed to see what projects would go first in the Interstate Transfer program over the next ten years. Committee members emphasized that it would be impossible to try to add more projects in an already crowded program of limited funding, encouraging Clark County's projects to be evaluated by criteria set for the Regional Transportation Plan.

After further discussion, Commissioner Veysey related that, by prioritizing Clark County's projects in terms of regional significance, it was hoped that, over a ten-year period, a reassessment might be made as to rank of priority and that some consideration might be given to Clark County's priorities.

Inasmuch as the two Metropolitan Planning Organizations are involved, it was suggested that the Bi-State Task Force look into the total relationship rather than a fund-by-fund basis. Dick Pokornowski stated that he did not wish to have this passed on to the Bi-State Task Force, as suggested by some Committee members, and felt that, as a community, it was paramount for JPACT to address these issues. The question was then raised of Clark County as to why they have never initiated an Interstate Transfer project in the past.

Rick Gustafson indicated a loss of \$37 million in Interstate Transfer funds affecting the Oregon side of the river. He felt that this issue is more substantial than the request submitted and added that the relationship between the two MPO's should be explored further to determine whether a combined effort would be sensible in order to meet the region's interests. He stressed the point that the financial losses must be taken into consideration.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to refer this matter to the staff for a recommendation on how to respond to the letter from the Clark County and Vancouver participants.

In discussion on the motion, Commissioner Schwab expressed concern over the feasibility of going back now and adding new projects and categories to a program which was developed and approved three years ago. The City of Portland's understanding at that time was that Clark County identified I-205 and I-5 improvements as their highest priority. Commissioner Schwab pointed out that the new I-205 bridge (cost of \$300 million)

and the I-5 improvements (approximately \$100 million) were paid for by Oregon's regular Interstate funds and that, although it's true that no local Clark County projects are being funded with Interstate withdrawal, many Oregon communities likewise have not been funded. She hesitated in disturbing the prioritized list at this time.

In calling for the question, the motion CARRIED.

6. OVERVIEW ON INTERSTATE TRANSFER FUNDING

Andy Cotugno related that Paul Bay has had contact with Federal officials in an effort to seek funding for our full Interstate Transfer program rather than for one particular project, recognizing that there will likely be a stretch-out of funds. Andy added that the U.S. DOT announcement on Wednesday, April 8, indicated that the Banfield will be allowed to proceed under the "No New Rail Starts" policy. Two points have yet to be clarified, one being the status of Section 3 (UMTA Capital Assistance) funds for the Banfield, and the other is the question of whether this commitment to the Banfield represents our entire Interstate Transfer funding or whether we will still be in contention to receive funding for our other projects as well.

Paul Bay indicated that the information coming from the Federal Government was a bit vague in some areas as to the use of Section 3 funds. James Kuffner, Executive Assistant to Mayor Ivancie, stated that the Mayor had received a telephone call from the Federal representatives indicating that the Banfield would be funded entirely from Interstate Transfer funds rather than Section 3. Mr. Kuffner indicated that a response from this region was in order. The Committee indicated, however, that more concise information is needed before a proper response could be executed.

Robin Lindquist felt that the decision for determining where the money is spent should be reached by a committee such as JPACT rather than the Federal Government. While she acknowledged that the Banfield had been placed in a Number 1 priority position, she suggested that perhaps the needs of the region should be re-evaluated if all the Interstate Transfer funding were confined to the Banfield. She indicated further that this was also the position of the Clackamas County Committee member not in attendance.

Rick Gustafson cautioned the Committee in responding to the proposal until more definite information is received and that it continues in its unified effort to seek the needed Interstate Transfer funds.

Action Taken: The Committee indicated agreement to wait until a definite proposal has been offered with more complete information at which time the Metro staff will schedule a JPACT meeting to propose a response.

7. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Rick Gustafson
Denton Kent
JPACT Members