



TRANSPORTATION POLICY ALTERNATIVES COMMITTEE  
July 19, 2013  
Metro Regional Center, Council Chamber

MEMBERS PRESENT

Karen Buehrig  
Chris Deffebach  
Courtney Duke  
Adrian Esteban  
Carol Gossett  
Nancy Kraushaar  
Katherine Kelly  
Margaret Middleton  
Cora Potter  
Jeff Swanson  
Rian Windsheimer

AFFILIATION

Clackamas County  
Washington Co.  
City of Portland  
Community Representative  
Community Representative  
City of Wilsonville, representing Cities of Clackamas Co.  
City of Gresham, representing Cities of Multnomah Co.  
City of Beaverton, representing Cities of Washington Co.  
Community Representative  
Community Representative  
Oregon Department of Transportation

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Mike Clark  
Steve Entenman  
Elissa Gertler, Chair  
Scott King  
Dave Nordberg  
Dean Lookingbill  
Alan Lehto  
Heather McCarey  
Satvinder Sandhu  
Karen Schilling

AFFILIATION

Washington State Department of Transportation  
Community Representative  
Metro  
Port of Portland  
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality  
Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council  
TriMet  
Community Representative  
Federal Highway Administration  
Multnomah Co.

ALTERNATES PRESENT

Ken Burgstahler  
Phil Healy  
Eric Hesse  
Tom Kloster, Chair  
Joanna Valencia

AFFILIATION

Washington State Department of Transportation  
Port of Portland  
TriMet  
Metro  
Multnomah Co.

STAFF: Grace Cho, Mia Hart, Ted Leybold, John Mermin, Josh Naramore, Kelsey Newell.

**1. CALL TO ORDER, DECLARATION OF A QUORUM**

Chair Tom Kloster declared a quorum and called the meeting to order at 9:32 a.m.

## **2. COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

Mr. Rian Windsheimer updated members on the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) enhancement committee process. ODOT is in the process of scoping projects. The timeline was shifted for the 100% list and is slated for completion by July 31, 2013. Further information will be presented to TPAC prior to the ODOT region 1 meeting in September. Mr. Ted Leybold asked if there will be a draft project list to be narrowed. Mr. Windsheimer stated there is no clear answer. There was discussion at the July 18 OTC meeting, but a decision has not been reached.

Chair Tom Kloster provided an overview of Metro's Public Engagement Guide. The Public Engagement guide has been updated to ensure activities are effective, reach diverse audiences, and create opportunities to learn and participate in decision-making, while guiding Metro's efforts to meet FTA and FHWA regulations associated with receiving federal funds. There is a public comment period August through September. The Public Engagement Guide will be refined and brought to TPAC for recommendation to JPACT October 25.

Mr. Ted Leybold of Metro provided an update on the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). Metro staff will continue to bring a quarterly summary of MTIP amendments to TPAC. 2012-2015 MTIP programming adjustments are outlined in the MTIP memo to TPAC. Issues should be presented to Mr. Leybold or TPAC. There are approximately 50 to 60 changes each quarter.

Mr. John Mermin of Metro provided an overview of the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update. In conjunction developing transportation networks in the 2014 RTP, Metro creates a No Build network for the 2040 RTP. Projects completed by spring 2010 have been incorporated into the 2010 network with committed funding. Committed future roadway projects identified for Climate Smart Communities (CSC) Scenario A are identified in the 2040 RTP No Build memo in the packet. Metro staff request review of projects and any additional projects, which must be submitted to Ms. Grace Cho of Metro by September 1, 2013. This is the first year bicycle projects can be modeled. An email will be sent to TPAC members listing upcoming workshops related to revenue assessments, modeling, and RTP project solicitation and overview in the week of August 19.

Additional member comments included:

- Mr. Windsheimer reminded members that I-84 westbound is closed from I-5 to I-205 for construction beginning July 20. Mr. Windsheimer announced an Immediate Opportunity Fund project in Gresham was proposed for funding through at the next OTC meeting and that details of the request would be released with OTC materials.
- Chair Kloster stated Mr. Josh Naramore of Metro has resigned and accepted a position as Transportation Planning Manager at Cleveland's Metropolitan Planning Organization.
- Ms. Courtney Duke stated Mr. Paul Smith has resigned. Ms. Duke is replacing Mr. Smith at TPAC and JPACT. Mr. Robert Hillier is the alternate for TPAC. Mr. Greg Jones is the interim Group Manager.
- Mr. Jeff Swanson stated he accepted a position as Rail Employment Corridor Program Manager at Clark County and is no longer a community representative for TPAC.

### **3. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS ON TPAC ITEMS**

There were none.

### **4. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES FOR JUNE 28, 2013**

MOTION: Mr. Dean Lookingbill moved, Mr. Rian Windsheimer seconded, to adopt the Minutes for June 28.

RESULT: With all in favor, the motion passed.

### **5. CORRIDOR BOTTLENECK OPERATIONS STUDY**

Mr. Rian Windsheimer of ODOT provided an overview of the Corridor Bottleneck Operations Study (CBOS). Reoccurring bottlenecks are caused by decision points (ramps, merge areas, weave areas, or drop lanes) and physical constraints (curves, underpasses, narrow structures, or no shoulders). The objective of CBOS is to examine operational improvements and to improve safety to achieve a minimum 30% reduction in crashes related to reoccurring bottlenecks on I-5, I-205, I-84, I-405, and US26.

Reoccurring bottlenecks are defined by area of influence, congestion duration, contributing factors such as, mainline volumes, spacing of interchange and ramps, or speed change, and frequency of crashes. Over 30 reoccurring bottleneck locations were identified and 20 potential solutions were recommended based on the level of effectiveness and maintaining costs below \$10 million. The most frequent cause of reoccurring bottlenecks in Region 1 is inadequate interchange spacing, which results in congestion and traffic slowing. The proposed solution is to provide additional space by way of an auxiliary lane for merging and weaving of traffic that is distinct from the freeway through-lane.

Mr. Windsheimer provided an overview of recently completed improvements including, I-5 southbound auxiliary lane constructed in 2010, I-5 southbound Nyberg Rd exit-ramp widening constructed in 2010, and I-5 southbound Carmen Dr. to Lower Boones Ferry auxiliary lane constructed in 2012. Bottleneck improvements under construction include, I-84 eastbound auxiliary lane from Halsey St. exit ramp to I-205 northbound entrance and re-striping the I-5 divergence on I-84 westbound. Three CBOS projects have been submitted to the STIP Enhance and recommended for the 150% list: auxiliary lane addition on I-5 southbound, lower Boones Ferry Rd. exit to entrance; Lower Boones Ferry Rd. exist ramp reconfiguration on I-5 northbound; auxiliary lane from I-84 eastbound entrance to Stark St. exist ramp on I-205 southbound.

Mr. Windsheimer addressed questions formerly raised in regards to the effects of CBOS improvements on freeway capacity and encouragement of thru trips. Improvements do not increase thru trips to the freeway system. CBOS improvements are designed to address specific bottleneck areas to improve operations and safety and reduce diversion and out of direction travel.

Member comments included:

- Members asked if the bottleneck projects are improvement projects. Mr. Windsheimer stated all CBOS bottleneck projects are improvement projects, most of which focus on safety and operations.

- Ms. Chris Deffebach recommended consideration of broader measures of success to prioritize project improvements. Ms. Deffebach commented that higher cost improvements may be associated with greater benefits and should be taken into consideration. Mr. Windsheimer confirmed there is an extended list of projects separate from the high priority list associated with the low cost requirement. Consideration of the broader benefits will be most helpful following the current stage in order to gauge and quantify benefits of specific improvements.
- Members inquired how the public will be informed of restriping changes as part of the upcoming I-84 maintenance work. Mr. Windsheimer stated ODOT has distributed informational pamphlets and confirmed media coverage. There will be an education campaign surrounding project changes and clarification through on-road signage.
- Members discussed the incorporation of an auxiliary lane definition in the RTP. Comments included:
  - Ms. Katherine Kelly stated that additional substantive discussion may not be necessary, but helpful for some basic parameters for auxiliary lanes, e.g. length, as a good starting point for discussion of future auxiliary lane projects.
  - Mr. Windsheimer stated he has met, or is currently scheduled to meet with select Metro Councilors and staff to discuss the CBOS report and redefining auxiliary lane in the RTP. Mr. Windsheimer stated he supported discussing specific CBOS projects that contained auxiliary lanes, but not the standalone auxiliary definition.
  - Ms. Nancy Kraushaar asked why there was controversy surrounding the issue. Mr. Kloster provided a brief overview of Metro staff's concerns that there is no existing definition of auxiliary lane in the RTP, so it is unclear how to distinguish an auxiliary lane from a through lane. Mr. Windsheimer stated there is a common established technical definition of auxiliary lane and did not support providing a definition of auxiliary lane in the RTP that may create an unnecessary layer of complexity. Mr. Windsheimer expressed frustration that the auxiliary lane definition discussion continued to be raised by metro staff at TPAC and believed from his conversations with select Metro councilors that they were amenable to reviewing the projects in the CBOS report for inclusion in the RTP without pursuing a new policy or definition on auxiliary lanes.

## **6. DRAFT REGIONAL ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (ATP)**

Ms. Lake McTighe of Metro provided an overview of the purpose and framework of the Regional Active Transportation Plan (ATP). The ATP knits together the aspirations and plans of jurisdictions, agencies, and stakeholders into a comprehensive regional vision. Visions and guiding principles reflect the aspiration of the plan, which is mirrored in the RTP. The purpose is to provide a detailed look to inform and aid achievement of the goals and objectives identified in RTP.

Ms. McTighe provided an overview of the draft resolution, which acknowledges the current version of the draft ATP and directs staff to provide opportunities for further review and refinements in conjunction with the RTP update. The ATP is considered draft until adopted as a component of the RTP in July 2014. The plan will be refined while Metro staff continues stakeholder engagement through spring 2014. The final Draft ATP will be released for public comment March 2014 after which time it will be proposed for adoption in July 2014. Changes made to the RTP will be reflected in the ATP. The project timeline is available in the TPAC packet, which summarizes the extended timeline providing further opportunities for discussion.

A regional plan for active transportation is needed to coordinate development of routes that cross jurisdictions, as well as provide strategy for funding opportunities, including health, community, sustainability, and livability. The ATP effectively integrates with regional transit and effective allocation of regional funds.

Staff identified new routes through stakeholder engagement, a technical evaluation and analysis to update the regional bicycle and pedestrian networks, which are based on existing networks in the RTP. The network concepts and new routes were identified through extensive evaluation. Data and analysis informed how routes were classified, for example high demand routes were identified for Parkways. Bicycle “highways” and pedestrian corridors are integrated with transit and destinations, and integrated with established 2040 districts. Mr. Kloster noted the state is working on an active transportation plan and asked if the intention is to create an Oregon active transportation network map, highlighting the intersection for freight movement. Ms. McTighe stated she does not know if this is the state’s intention, but has encouraged them to employ a system plan for bicycle and pedestrian networks. Metro staff is currently examining how bicycle and pedestrian network projects intersect and overlap with designated freight routes.

Ms. McTighe stated one of the implementation strategies is to focus on bicycle and pedestrian districts and connectivity. The project list identifies major bikeways, pedestrian corridors and pedestrian/bicycle districts as projects. Ms. Cora Potter asked if there is a way to measure how investments are made and focus on switching investments from corridors to districts. Chair Kloster stated this falls under federal funding.

Regional bicycle design guidelines are drawn from existing guidelines already being implemented in the region. Metro uses best practices to achieve the vision of the ATP with the purpose of providing consistency and connectivity for bicycle and pedestrian networks while ensuring the active transportation network equitably and completely serves all people.

The funding strategy is a multi-prong approach that leverages existing investments, coordinates with other projects, develops a pipeline of projects, aligns projects with funding opportunities, and is flexible and strategic. The funding strategy focuses on identifying opportunities, working collaboratively, and providing a framework for local jurisdictions to choose to invest in active transportation. Implementation strategies and projects focus on completion of the network to drive outcomes with complete benefits. All transportation modes are prioritized together and a project list is in development.

The ATP provides information to local jurisdictions and agencies to inform elected officials in policymaking and work for highest return on investment. The plan helps to ensure that any projects funded achieve the best desired outcomes and provides information to jurisdictions as they are determining what projects are needed to help reduce congestion, increase safety, and make it easier to get around quickly and safely.

Member comments included:

- Members asked for further information related to the maintenance section of the ATP, given constrained funding. Ms. McTighe stated staff is working on a regional estimate of maintenance costs. The state and regional strategy takes a “fix-it-first” approach, which will be emphasized.
- Mr. Eric Hesse stated TriMet is hopeful their concerns are being addressed.

- Members asked about documenting market and existing conditions and how this impacts existing marketing conditions. Ms. McTighe stated there was an extensive existing conditions report evaluating the gaps in the network, as well as research examining the economic impacts of bicycling and walking. Increasing access to destinations supports local business and correlates with increased economic vitality.
- Members inquired how to identify new projects in the update project list. Ms. McTighe stated a project list will be released in August, identifying projects in the RTP that will help complete bicycle and pedestrian parkways and corridors. The project list is aimed towards the corridor and district projects concept, which will be available for jurisdictions for consideration.
- Members asked how new versus enhancement projects effect prioritization and funding. Ms. McTighe stated the ATP does not determine prioritization in this respect and focuses on increased access and completing the network according to decisions made by each community.
- Mr. Kloster stated he would like to ensure the state RTP is linked with the regional RTP and ATP, noting this should be communicated to ODOT for coordination.
- Members recommended several changes to the report, including adding citations and emphasizing differences between communities and providing examples to highlight the one size does not fit all approach. Additionally, members noted many cities have new TSPs and recommended holding workshops to inform and discuss network maps to ensure clarity.
- Members asked if the report data is applicable to communities outside the Portland region. Ms. McTighe stated ATP data and analysis is only applicable to the Portland region.
- Members asked for clarification in regards to the ATP referencing the 2014 or 2018 RTP. Ms. McTighe stated the intention of the ATP is to be proposed for adoption into the 2014 RTP and changes to the functional plan can be considered during the 2018 RTP update as necessary.
- Members expressed concern surrounding adequate time for review of the draft ATP prior to making a recommendation to JPACT. Members asked for a summary of changes to be incorporated in the next draft ATP. Ms. McTighe assured members that changes will be made visible.

## **7. COLUMBIA MULTIMODAL CORRIDOR STUDY**

Mr. Swanson provided an overview of the Columbia Multimodal Corridor (CMC) Study, a study conducted for the Port of Portland by DKS to identify high priority intermodal projects within the Columbia Corridor. 15 projects were identified in the Corridor, which stretches 18 miles along the Columbia River with significant economic activity, encompassing 2,600 businesses or 65,000 total jobs. Major transportation gateways including I-5, I-84, I-205, marine terminals, rail lines, and airport facilities service the Corridor.

Mr. Alan Snook of DKS Associates provided a technical overview of the data and analysis utilized in the study. INRIX is all-hours data representing transit use represented throughout areas of the CMC. Traffic was coded based on amount of congestion and congestion areas were pinpointed to identify congestion areas to compare to the RTP. The Regional Travel Demand Model focused on origin and destination, particularly between the Rivergate Industrial District, the Portland Airport, and Troutdale, link capacity, and travel time. Significant congestion is a threat to economic vitality as

the delay in movement of goods and services is inefficient for existing business and deterrence for new businesses.

Mr. Swanson stated interviews were conducted with ten businesses were in area to gain a better understanding of how businesses use the area and what problems they face on a day-to-day basis for operations and mobility. The survey results indicated the primary reason businesses located to the Corridor was easy freeway access, as well as access to rail, marine, and air cargo facilities. Business representatives identified congestion as the primary issue facing business operations.

Approximately 35 projects were identified to have expected benefits related to freight movement, or mobility and access, ranging from localized intersection improvements to longer corridor improvements. The total estimated cost is approximately \$290 million dollars.

Mr. Snook provided an overview of four improvement projects: Burgard-Lombard North Street; NE Columbia Boulevard; NE 181<sup>st</sup> Avenue; Regional ITS projects, some of which are already in place. Future implications of the CMC study include support of advocacy and education, increased funding, and freight transportation policy coordination.

Member comments included:

- Members noted updates on two projects, NE 181<sup>st</sup> Avenue and NE Sandy Boulevard, and noted the Troutdale Interchange improvements projects has been approved for construction and NW Graham Road improvements project will be built in accordance with the RFFA.
- Mr. Eric Hesse stated TriMet is open to discuss safe and efficient movement of goods and services in the CMC to provide access to jobs and relieving congestion.
- Members asked about future development capacity in the CMC. Mr. Swanson stated there is a shortage of land supply, including West Hayden Island and the golf course in NE Columbia Boulevard project, as well as railroad and marine terminals. Enhancing site access would increase efficiency and increase economic output for business in this limited industrial land supply area.
- Members noted several valuable projects are held back by transit and indicated regional coordination and funding support could be of support.
- Members asked if the Columbia River Crossing (CRC) is still relevant to the CMC study. Mr. Snook stated there is more extensive opportunity to move forward with the CRC and its completion may ultimately depend on the region coming together, as opposed to one stakeholder.

**8. ADJOURN**

Chair Kloster adjourned the meeting at 11:41 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Mia Hart

Recording Secretary

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>DOCUMENT TYPE</b>	<b>DOC DATE</b>	<b>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>DOCUMENT No.</b>
5	Handout	04/2013	CBOS Project Atlas	071913t-01
5	PowerPoint	N/A	Corridors Bottleneck Operations Study	071913t-02
5	Report	12/2012	Columbia Multimodal Corridor Study Final Report	071913t-03
6	Memo	07/16/13	Draft Regional Active Transportation Plan	071913t-04
6	Handout	07/17/13	Draft Active Transportation Plan Resolution	071913t-05
6	PowerPoint	07/19/13	Draft Regional Active Transportation Plan	071913t-06