

## MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: March 11, 1982

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Charlie Williamson, Dick Pokornowski, Jim Fisher, Mildred Schwab, Larry Cole, Ed Ferguson, Corky Kirkpatrick, John Frewing, Marge Kafoury, Vern Veysey, Bob Bothman and Al Myers

Guests: Steve Dotterer and Vic Rhodes, City of Portland; Ted Spence, ODOT; Larry Rice and Marty Nizlek, Washington County; John Price, FHWA; Winston Kurth, Clackamas County; Paul Bay, Tri-Met; Bebe Rucker, Multnomah County; David Peach, WSDOT; Sarah Salazar, Port of Portland; and Bruce Etlinger, Metro Councilor

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

MEDIA: None

### SUMMARY:

Bob Bothman stated that he will be moving to Salem as Assistant State Highway Engineer and administer ODOT's planning, financing and programming section but that he will remain on JPACT. Ed Hardt has been promoted to Metro Administrator.

Chairman Williamson, on behalf of JPACT, congratulated Bob Bothman on his new position and wished him well with his new responsibilities.

#### 1. ENDORSEMENT OF TIP AMENDMENT TO INCORPORATE ODOT'S SIX-YEAR HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM OF PROJECTS IN THE URBANIZED AREA

This TIP endorsement would amend our five-year Transportation Improvement Program to align with the construction schedule in the State's adopted Six-Year Plan.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval of the TIP amendment to incorporate ODOT's Six-Year Highway Improvement Program of projects in the urbanized area. Motion CARRIED.

#### 2. ENDORSEMENT OF FY 81 AND FY 82 UWP AMENDMENT FOR ADDITIONAL SCOPE OF WORK ON REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Andy explained that this amendment shifts resources within the Transportation Department to enable completion of the Regional

Transportation Plan. Changes to the FY 81 and FY 82 UWP's include deferring Urban Goods Movement, cutting in half the Energy Contingency effort, and a shift in resources from TIP into the South McLoughlin Improvement Program.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval of the FY 81 and FY 82 UWP amendments. Motion CARRIED.

Some Committee members felt that Urban Goods Movement should be considered as a work task in FY 83.

3. REVIEW OF COMMENTS ON THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND APPROVAL OF DOCUMENT WITH NECESSARY CHANGES FOR PUBLIC REVIEW

Andy explained that the memo under consideration details the specific changes for incorporation into the RTP document. He related that a public review period (from the date of release until the end of April) has been slated, during which time formal review by the local jurisdictions will also take place. A number of the proposed changes were generated by comments which were received at meetings with the various jurisdictions, ODOT and Tri-Met over the past three-month period.

Andy then proceeded to review the local comments and recommendations from TPAC.

With regard to LRT Right-of-Way Preservation (change #3), Andy reported that Metro's Regional Development Committee has recommended that there be a tie to those transitways that have completed an Environmental Impact Statement. The Committee concurred with the need to modify the language to strengthen requirements for dedication for those transitways with a completed EIS. The question was raised as to whether there should be a policy that the local community would bear the extra costs (with regard to transitways) if the right-of-way is not protected.

Larry Rice of Washington County related that the region presently does not have an adopted transitway plan and questioned whether the RTP, if adopted, would preclude the Westside Corridor process from deciding whether a transitway should be built. He added that Washington County has adopted a Community Plan (for the 185th east/west area) where a specific corridor has been identified for a potential transitway. He indicated that it is very difficult to protect the right-of-way from development when construction is so long-range. Winston Kurth reported that, in some instances, Clackamas County has reserved (not purchased) an unencumbered area for future development. The RTP encourages local jurisdictions to protect logical right-of-way opportunities.

During discussion, Larry Rice stressed the need for a summary version of the RTP that could be used in dealing with the public, indicating costs and projects in the counties. Andy stated that he proposed incorporating a more specific description of comprehensive plan requirements. In addition, he proposed printing Chapter 1 (policy section), Chapter 4 (the basic plan description), and Chapter 8 (plan implementation) on colored paper, highlighting the key sections of the report. Next year's budget proposes an RTP Executive Summary be prepared for use in dealing with the public or with local jurisdictions that covers all the issues in the Plan. Andy did not feel that the three chapters mentioned previously could stand alone as representative of the RTP. Cost information and implications on making that investment are a key reason for adopting the Plan. Highlighting the key sections is indicated, but we should not delete the portion regarding costs and the impacts of building or not building in the future.

Larry Rice suggested that the financial data by counties and by city be placed in a table with a map depicting the projects. Referencing the projects was important to Washington County in terms of court cases.

A discussion was held in regard to the question of whether sign-off by the various jurisdictions was necessary to gain federal implementation of the Plan. John Price of FHWA related that, in order to gain MPO consensus and endorsement, all the jurisdictions must participate but no formal sign-off is required. It was generally agreed, however, that every jurisdiction should be given a presentation on the RTP before its Planning Commission or Council. The cover letter sent to these jurisdictions should encourage questions concerning the RTP to be directed to their respective JPACT representative.

It was agreed that Metro would contact each of the counties and cities for a decision on who would make the RTP presentation in their jurisdiction.

Chairman Williamson pointed out the need to solicit endorsements of the RTP from the various jurisdictions at each of these presentations.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to release the draft Regional Transportation Plan including the suggested changes. Motion CARRIED. It was further clarified that an accompanying letter would reference Chapters 1, 4 and 8, which would be printed on colored paper with the ability to extract those pages for use as a logical complete document, and that the projects described in Chapter 5 would be numbered and keyed to the map.

JPACT  
March 11, 1982  
Page 4

4. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Rick Gustafson  
Don Carlson  
JPACT Members