



Agenda

Date: May 10, 1979

Day: Thursday

Time: 7:30 a.m.

Place: Riverway Inn

1.a. VOTING PROCEDURES FOR THE JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION (JPACT)

Major Issues:

1. Do votes of various JPACT members get combined in some way?
2. How do the votes of various JPACT members get presented to the MSD Council?

TPAC Recommendation: None

Staff Recommendation:

The staff concurs with the proposal of Charlie Williamson that attempts not be made to combine votes of various members. Instead, a listing should be presented to the MSD Council showing who voted on each side of an issue.

1.b. FUTURE JPACT MEETING SCHEDULE

Major Issues:

Should committee continue to have breakfast meetings?
Should other times be considered?

TPAC Recommendation: None

Staff Recommendation:

1. Establish regular day, time and location.

2. TRI-MET RADIOS -- TIP AMENDMENT

Major Issue:

Approval of revised cost authorization.

TPAC Concerns:

1. Why is the average cost per radio approximately \$2,000?
Tri-Met response: This level of expense is necessary because of the unique features of this equipment (emergency silent alarm, automatic system to monitor the location of buses, high quality to ensure low maintenance costs, and ability to tie into passenger counting equipment).
2. Will additional costs be involved?
Tri-Met response: These funds will enable Tri-Met to have a fully operational system for their present fleet.
3. Why not install portable units on buses?
Tri-Met response: Portable units would end up costing more in the end.
4. Any health hazards as far as microwaves?
Tri-Met response: No such hazards have been found.

TPAC Recommendation:

Recommend approval of the TIP amendment.

Staff Recommendation:

Forward to the Council recommending adoption.

3. WORK TRIPS AND AIR QUALITY (STAFF INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION)

Major Issues:

Can controls on auto commuters alone bring about achievement of air quality standards?

TPAC Concerns:

It was pointed out that the estimates of reductions in pollution emissions resulting from removal of auto work trips is overstated. As work trips by autos are reduced,

some of the trips made in the off-peak would move to the peak hour; thus congestion will not be reduced to the degree estimated in the analysis.

TPAC Recommendation: None

Staff Recommendation:

Continue efforts to identify and evaluate measures directed toward reducing the dependency of work trips on single occupant autos. However, significant emphasis is needed to develop control measures which will reduce the emissions from other sources (non-work trips, trucks, stationary sources, and area sources).

4. AIR QUALITY STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (SIP)

Major Issue:

Compliance with federal requirements that a plan be approved describing: (1) the severity of the air quality problem, and (2) planning efforts to identify and evaluate control measures.

TPAC Concerns:

TPAC concerns are described in the attachment to the Management Summary. Staff responses to these concerns are included.

TPAC Recommendation:

Recommend approval of the SIP.

Staff Recommendation:

Forward to the Council recommending adoption of the ordinance approving the SIP.

5. FY 1980 UWP

Major Issue:

Policy direction on which transportation planning studies should be carried out in the coming fiscal year.

TPAC Concerns:

1. WSDOT has not had sufficient time to review the section concerning Washington MPO activities.
2. The RPC funding chart (#4) needs to be adjusted to be consistent with the other charts (show \$55,000 pass through to MSD).

TPAC Recommendation:

Recommend approval of the FY 1980 UWP subject to:

1. Approval by Clark County Regional Planning Council and
2. Adjustment of the RPC budget Table 4 to show a \$55,000 pass-through to MSD.

Staff Recommendation:

Forward to the Council for approval subject to conditions recommended by TPAC.

6. PRIORITY FOR THE OREGON CITY BYPASS

Major Issue:

Does MSD agree that the policy criteria laid out in the Management Summary are adequate to designate the Bypass project as the first project to receive additional state funding commitments?

TPAC Concerns:

1. What is meant by "if the state receives new funds?"
ODOT response: This means that one of a number of measures presently being considered by the Oregon legislature to increase funds to improve the State Highway System would be passed.
2. What is the state position on matching Interstate Transfer funds?
ODOT response: The position has not changed.
3. Can the decision be deferred until after the hearing process on the Bypass is complete?
Staff response: This decision is closely related to state legislature considerations of state funding

commitments. It therefore needs to be dealt with while the legislature is in session.

4. If new state money becomes available, shouldn't other projects beyond the Bypass be funded?
Staff response: The proposed action would establish the Bypass as having the first priority use of new state funds. It is anticipated that additional projects would be specified for receiving state funding after the Bypass.

TPAC Recommendation:

Recommend approval of the resolution with the following two changes:

1. The last resolve would substitute the word "first" for "highest priority."
2. Another resolve would be added "subject to completion of required environmental approvals of the project including route selection."

Staff Recommendation:

Forward the revised resolution to the MSD Council for approval.

7. CRITERIA FOR IDENTIFYING AND SELECTING PROJECTS TO USE INTERSTATE RESERVE

Major Issue:

Policies to be used in: (1) screening a large number of problem areas to a manageable set, and (2) determining which projects should be funded with the MSD Interstate Transfer Reserve.

TPAC Concerns:

1. What is a major regional travel flow?
2. Why is energy not a consideration?
3. Why shouldn't cost overruns on already funded projects be eligible?

TPAC Recommendation:

None. To be considered at next month's meeting.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff will review the draft document to respond to TPAC and JPACT concerns. A revised draft will be considered at next month's JPACT meeting.

8. Emergency Energy Planning

Major Issue:

Who should take the lead role in coordinating emergency energy planning?

TPAC Concerns:

1. Why shouldn't MSD take a lead role in that they are a regional coordinating agency?
2. How would coordinating functions be funded?

TPAC Recommendation:

TPAC recommended that MSD take the lead in coordinating contingency planning energy conservation efforts in the Portland metro area.

Staff Recommendation:

Funding for these types of efforts are not explicitly available in the MSD budget. The only way that MSD could take this responsibility would be if: (1) coordination was limited to a low-level effort to ensure all possible actors know their responsibilities should a gasoline crisis present itself, and (2) funding for such an effort came from the Technical Assistance program (this could mean that some requests for assistance may not be met).

9. COORDINATION OF COMPUTERS

Major Issue:

Have MSD and Tri-Met coordinated their efforts to purchase computers?

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: April 12, 1979 *(Before local jurisdictions had members)*

SUBJECT: Meeting of the Transportation Committee of the Council

IN ATTENDANCE:

- . Council Transportation Committee: Charlie Williamson (chairman), Donna Stuhr, Betty Schedeen
- . Implementation Agency Representatives: Bill Young (DEQ), Bob Bothman (ODOT), Dick Carroll (WSDOT), John Frewing (Tri-Met), Ken Johnson (Port of Portland)
- . Others: Bebe Rucker, Ted Spence, Bill Ockert, Gary Spanovich, Laurel Wentworth, Paul Bay, Karen Thackston

Charlie Williamson called the meeting to order and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

He explained the reason for establishing a joint transportation committee, what it will be involved in, and what it will try to accomplish.

I. Voting Procedures for the Joint Policy Advisory Committee for Transportation (JPACT)

Bill Ockert explained the TPAC concerns about their role, the role of elected officials, the role of citizens on TPAC, voting procedures, etc. Charlie Williamson offered to meet with TPAC at its next meeting in May to discuss these concerns.

The Committee approved the staff recommendation to 1) delay action on voting procedures until the local elected officials are chosen and 2) asking staff to prepare a report on the roles of the various committees, delegation of decisions, and possible voting procedures.

Dick Carroll, WSDOT, suggested that an effort be made to explain to Vancouver and Clark County officials how they would relate to the transportation committee. Charlie Williamson suggested that he and Mike Burton talk to Vancouver and Clark County officials.

II. Future Meeting Schedule--The decision as to a permanent location and schedule for the JPACT meeting will be put off until elected officials are named.

The May meeting will be held Thursday, May 10, at 7:30 a.m. Karen Thackston will notify members of the location.

III. Air Quality State Implementation Plan (SIP)

Bill Ockert explained the delay in releasing the SIP for review and comment. He explained that because of the short review time TPAC had named a subcommittee to review the draft plan and prepare recommendations for TPAC consideration in May.

Paul Bay commented that he felt TPAC should concentrate on uncovering policy issues and bring them to JPACT. He suggested that JPACT be made aware of any trade-offs.

No action was required.

IV. Citizen Appointments to TPAC--

Solicitation of citizen members has begun. Mr. Williamson felt that in light of TPAC concerns about citizen roles on TPAC he would meet with them before going any further with the citizen selection.

V. Process for Allocating the MSD Interstate Transfer Reserve

Bill Ockert explained that the proposed process had been reviewed with the jurisdictions and that jurisdictional concerns were addressed in the final draft. He stated that TPAC was concerned with the criteria and its development.

Bill Young felt that problems should not be fully identified until criteria have been established. The Committee asked that the flow chart be redone to show the criteria being developed at the same time as problems are identified. With that change, the proposed process was agreed to by the Committee. Staff will prepare draft criteria and describe the types of problems being proposed at the May meeting. Criteria are scheduled for approval at the June meeting of the Council.

VI. City of Portland Request to Fund PE on the South Portland Project

As per requirements, staff has developed a systems planning report on this project which identifies objectives to be met by the project, the potential effectiveness of the project, and the effect of the project on the regional transportation system. City staff agrees with the report. Laurel Wentworth stated that the project ties in with many of the regional projects being developed on the Westside. Concerns were raised as to consistency with transit corridors and its impact on the Interstate system.

Donna Stuhr asked if there were any policy implications. Bill Ockert said that the major policy consideration is the commitment of Interstate Transfer funds to the project. The City of Portland intends to request I-505 withdrawal funds to build the project. The Committee approved forwarding the project to the full Council.

VII. Cost Overruns

1. Hwy 212
Using \$58,000 of the contingency fund set aside for Clackamas County/Clackamas County cities.
2. Progress Ramps
Using \$75,250 of the contingency fund set aside for FAU projects.

Discussion centered on notification of the jurisdictions that might later wish to use a contingency account that consideration is being given to drawing down an account. Bebe Rucker stated that the representatives of those jurisdictions were at the TIP Subcommittee meeting and TPAC and that they voted for use of the contingency on these projects.

The Committee approved the use of the contingency funds and directed staff in the future to directly notify jurisdictions that might later desire to use a contingency fund.

Bob Bothman requested that the Progress ramps be sent to the Council that evening so as not to delay construction. The Committee agreed.

VIII. FY 1980 Unified Work Program (UWP)

Bill Ockert explained the purpose of the UWP. He pointed out this would be an action item in May so that it can be adopted with the MSD budget.

IX. TIP Amendment to Fund Repowering of Zoo Buses.

Paul Bay explained that it is more cost effective to repower buses than to buy all new ones. Tri-Met is proposing to use UMTA Section 5 funds.

The Committee approved the TIP Amendment for forwarding to the Council.

X. May Agenda Suggestions:

John Frewing suggested the following items be considered at the May meeting:

- . Fuel Shortage Plan
- . Computer Purchases

CWO:bc
3287A
D/3