

Portland State University

PDXScholar

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on
Transportation

Oregon Sustainable Community Digital Library

6-11-1987

Meeting Notes 1987-06-11

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation, "Meeting Notes 1987-06-11 " (1987). *Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation*. 94.

https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact/94

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.



METRO

2000 S.W. First Avenue
Portland, OR 97201-5398
503/221-1646

Agenda

Meeting: JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION
Date: June 11, 1987
Day: Thursday
Time: 7:30 a.m.
Place: Metro, Conference Room 330

Governor Goldschmidt is tentatively scheduled to attend the JPACT meeting. His actual attendance is dependent upon potential schedule conflicts in the closing days of the legislative session. If the Governor is able to attend, Committee members should be prepared to describe the role of JPACT in regional transportation decision-making and discuss with the Governor his interest in participating in the process and his suggestions on how to coordinate regional transportation with his regional economic development strategies.

Regular Business Agenda

- *A. MEETING REPORT OF MAY 14, 1987 - APPROVAL REQUESTED.
- *B. DISCUSSION OF A PROCESS FOR SETTING REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES - Andy Cotugno.
- C. REVIEW AND COMMENT ON TRI-MET FIVE-YEAR TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM UPDATE - Tri-Met.

*Material enclosed.

NEXT JPACT MEETING: JULY 9, 1987 - 7:30 A.M.

NOTE: Overflow parking is available at the City Center parking locations on the attached map, and may be validated at the meeting. Parking on Metro premises in any space other than those marked "Visitors" will result in towing of vehicle.

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: May 14, 1987

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Richard Waker, Linore Allison, George Van Bergen, Tom Brian, Bob Bothman, Larry Cooper, Bonnie Hays, Ron Thom, Pauline Anderson, Lloyd Anderson, Earl Blumenauer, Ed Lindquist and Marge Schmunk

Executive Officer: Rena Cusma

Guests: Doug Capps and Bob Post, Tri-Met; Ted Spence and Rick Kuehn, ODOT; Lee LaFontaine, Public Transit Division of ODOT; Howard Harris, DEQ; Gil Mallery, IRC of Clark County; Richard Ross, Cities of Multnomah County; Jim Howell and Doug Allen, Citizens for Better Transit; Peter Fry, Central Eastside Industrial Council; Gary Spanovich, Clackamas County; W.E. Stark, Mayor of Wilsonville; Mike McKillip, City of Tualatin; Bebe Rucker, Port of Portland; Susie Lahsene, Multnomah County; Bruce Warner and Brent Curtis, Washington County; and Steve Dotterer, City of Portland

Staff: Andrew Cotugno, Vickie Rocker, Richard Brandman, Cathy Thomas, Bill Pettis, Jill Hinckley, John Cullerton, Karen Thackston, Robert Hart and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

MEDIA: DeeDee Harrington, The Oregonian; and Matt Buckingham, Times Publications

SUMMARY:

The meeting report of the April 9 JPACT meeting was approved as written.

UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM

Chairman Waker announced that copies of the FY 88 Unified Work Program were available for JPACT members.

AUTHORIZING FEDERAL FUNDS FOR FIVE 16(b)(2) SPECIAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

Mr. Brandman indicated that this resolution would amend the TIP to allow funding for five 16(b)(2) special transportation projects. The applicants are: Albertina Kerr Center for Children; Friendly House; Ikoi-No-Kai; Loaves and Fishes; and Waverly Children's Home. Grants

are available on an annual basis to nonprofit social service agencies that do not duplicate the services of Tri-Met's Lift Program. Tri-Met has supported these applications in writing.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval of Resolution No. 87-761 to amend the TIP to authorize federal funds for five 16(b)(2) special transportation projects. Motion CARRIED unanimously.

I-205 POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE LRT RECOMMENDATION

Richard Brandman provided an overview of the revised I-205 light-rail summary report, highlighting the recommendations of the I-205 TAC and PAC.

The alternatives studied included: the Expanded Bus Service alternative (buses operating in mixed traffic on Airport Way and on the I-205 freeway); a Busway alternative (buses operating in mixed traffic from the airport to I-205 and on a separated busway from the I-205 Airport Way interchange to the Clackamas Town Center); and light rail. A high-density scenario depicting a significant increase in population/employment levels in the zones surrounding the Town Center and airport above that of the RTP forecast was studied also. The primary findings in the summary report reflect the basic alternative utilizing the RTP forecasts.

In Mr. Brandman's review of the conclusions of the study, he pointed out that light-rail transit would be more costly to construct and operate in 2005 than the Expanded Bus Service alternative but would have longer life expectancy, that it would provide faster service, that it has the highest projected ridership of all the alternatives, and that the increased transit patronage would provide additional farebox revenue to offset the higher operating cost of LRT over buses.

The thrust of the I-205 PAC's discussions centered on the I-205 corridor's relationship to the rest of the corridors being studied for LRT. \$17 million of federal funds are available for expenditure in the I-205 corridor with a September 1989 deadline for preliminary engineering, or the funds will be lost.

The recommendations of the I-205 PAC and CAC included the following: 1) determine the procedure for starting the process to withdraw the busway and substituting light rail; 2) clarify what's needed to advance the project to preliminary engineering; 3) determine potential local and federal funding options; and 4) determine whether FHWA or UMTA will manage it. The I-205 PAC also recommended that JPACT hold a special meeting for a comparison of the LRT corridors and to establish priorities for staging.

Andy Cotugno indicated that the priorities for seeking transit funding are: 1) to secure funding for routine bus capital and related operating needs; and 2) to seek local match so that LRT can proceed in three regional corridors: Sunset (1st priority), McLoughlin, and I-205. A legislative hearing will be held shortly on House Bill 2270 pertaining to funding for the I-205 corridor.

Lloyd Anderson stressed the importance of having a JPACT meeting to review all of the LRT corridors with a clear understanding of what the priorities are and to address the allocation of resources. Bonnie Hays also commented on the need to evaluate funding options and resources. Of major importance is the development of local match resources and funds for transit operations.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to concur with the I-205 PAC recommendation and that a special meeting of JPACT be organized to review the LRT corridors, set priorities, and address the allocation of resources. Motion CARRIED unanimously.

It was suggested that the meeting be scheduled for July or August so that comparable information can be made available on all the corridors. It was agreed that additional meetings may be necessary in order to address all the issues.

ALLOCATING INTERSTATE TRANSFER AND FAU FUNDS

Andy Cotugno reviewed the Staff Report and recommendation for allocation of e(4) and FAU funds. In addition, a request was received by the City of Portland to amend the TIP for use of City FAU funds to replace the deck on a N. Columbia Boulevard bridge (Bridge No. 9685) for a total of \$350,000 of emergency repairs.

Andy indicated that the Staff Report reflected the priorities expressed at the January JPACT meeting -- to fully fund those projects already committed to in the program. The recommendation is for allocation of \$9,382,000 of e(4) funds and \$1,899,000 of FAU funds.

After describing the proposed resolution, Andy also commented on the allocation alternatives considered at TPAC, including: allocation of the e(4) reserve toward one of the regional rail transit corridors; the alternative of drawing down FAU funds more in order to reserve a greater amount of e(4) funds for transit or highway purposes; and the policy issue of whether or not to divide the FAU funds jurisdictionally in thirds or to allocate to specific projects.

Mayor Brian expressed support for a regional approach to the FAU allocation. Commissioner Hays noted that Washington County's Board of Commissioners support the City's request for bridge repairs, a regional process for allocation of funds rather than dividing the funds in thirds, and the e(4) recommendation for allocation to committed projects.

Bob Bothman suggested an alternative proposed by Ted Spence merits consideration because he felt it would maintain flexibility of the e(4) funds and not eliminate the regional approach to allocation of funds. He felt that the Section 3 funds should also be woven into this process.

In response to questions, Bob Bothman explained the various match ratios associated with the following sources of funds: Section 3 - 80/20; e(4) - 85/15; and FAU - 88/12.

Andy suggested that if JPACT is interested in another alternative, they should refer the issue back to TPAC. However, he emphasized the need for JPACT to send the direction to TPAC on the principle of maximizing the amount of e(4) funds to be reserved by drawing down on FAU funds. It was suggested that if JPACT does not agree with this principle, they should proceed to adopt the resolution. If the committee does table the resolution, it was suggested that the Committee move forward with the top four Interstate Transfer projects in the recommendation (which included the I-505 Alternatives -- estimated cost increase and landscaping, Banfield landscaping -- highway portion, Sunset/217 cost overrun, and Oregon City Bypass cost overrun); and fund the following FAU projects: Boones Ferry Road (Clackamas County), "E" Street (Forest Grove), Cornell Road (Washington County), and rehabilitation of the N. Columbia Boulevard bridge deck.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend an Interstate Transfer allocation for the I-505 Alternatives, Banfield landscaping (highway portion), Sunset/217 cost overrun, and Oregon City Bypass cost overrun projects (for a total of \$2,022,000); to allocate FAU funds for the Boones Ferry Road, "E" Street, Cornell Road and N. Columbia Boulevard Bridge projects (for a total of \$894,000); and to refer the balance of projects covered in the Staff Report back to TPAC for further consideration at its May 29 meeting in order to maximize the level of Interstate Transfer funding being reserved.

In discussion on the motion, it was agreed that it would be helpful in the future to have a chart available incorporating information such as source of funding, where it's being allocated, and amounts when deliberating on project allocations.

Motion CARRIED unanimously.

SOUTHWEST CORRIDOR STUDY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Andy Cotugno reviewed the staff responses to the comments and concerns raised to date on the Southwest Corridor Study Conclusions and Recommendations, as reflected in Exhibit 1 to the Staff Report. He then reviewed the handouts dealing with changes proposed to the materials sent in the mail.

Proposed change No. 1 dealt with adoption requirements for the Southwest Corridor Study to be more responsive to the concerns of DLCD; proposed change No. 2 dealt with execution of an interagency agreement defining the process for ensuring consistency of the Bypass with local comprehensive plans and state land use policies; and proposed change No. 3 was an amendment to the Resolution stating that the intergovernmental agreement with Washington County specify the process and timeframe to resolve the land use issues and be adopted by both parties for incorporation into the ordinance update to the Regional Transportation Plan.

In discussing the proposed changes, Commissioner Blumenauer sought clarification that a subsequent RTP amendment would not be necessary to remove the Bypass if it did not meet land use requirements. Rather, under this condition, the facility would automatically be dropped and a new process initiated to identify a substitute. This clarification was incorporated into the proposed change.

In discussing the water quality impacts in more detail, Andy cited concerns regarding runoff from the facility, runoff from development induced around the facility that is already permitted in comprehensive plans, and runoff as a result of additional development beyond that currently permitted in comprehensive plans. In response, he stated that this is addressed in an Environmental Impact Statement, and that secondary impacts would have to be assessed at that time, if required.

A good deal of discussion followed over the proposed section of the Bypass from T.V. Highway to the Sunset Highway in that it is proposed in this material as a five-lane arterial facility; it was thought to be shortsighted not to consider a freeway or limited access facility. Andy Cotugno suggested that a freeway alternative could be considered during the preliminary engineering phase inasmuch as information is not available at this time on developmental impacts, and the public hearings did not address that issue. It was agreed that this issue will be examined during the preliminary engineering phase of the study.

Douglas Allen, a resident at 2247 SE 51st Avenue in Portland and a member of Citizens for Better Transit, testified on some of his concerns regarding the Southwest Corridor Study recommendations. He felt that there should have been a reversal of the public hearing process and Environmental Impact Statement for public comment and expressed concerns over development density that would occur from the proposed Bypass; the anticipated lowering of land values in the interior of the urban area; economic pressures that would occur to expand the Urban Growth Boundary; selection of the Bypass into the RTP as premature; air quality concerns; and a request that a third alternative be included in the RTP amendment -- the inclusion of a rail transitway along Highway 217 from Cedar Hills via Beaverton to Tigard and optionally to Tualatin. His written testimony included consideration of other transportation-related improvements in the corridor.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval of Resolution No. 87-763 for adoption of the Southwest Corridor Study Conclusions and Recommendations with the following amendments:

- . Incorporation of Proposed Change No. 1 into Exhibit 1 of the Staff Report pertaining to the adoption process and requirements in response to DLCD comments.
- . That language be incorporated in the Recommended Actions of Attachment A of the Resolution, clause 2, to reflect the following:
"An alternative to consider construction of the Bypass from T.V. Highway to Sunset Highway as a limited access facility rather than a five-lane arterial will be considered during preliminary engineering."
- . That Proposed Change No. 2 be substituted for clause 7 on the last page of Attachment A of the Resolution, and that the second to last paragraph (starting with the second sentence) should read as follows: "If at the conclusion of this process, it is found that the Bypass cannot comply, a Regional Transportation Plan amendment will not be necessary to remove the Bypass. and A process will begin to address the problem in another manner."

Commissioner Blumenauer felt that if it cannot comply, an RTP amendment will not be necessary to remove the Bypass. If it violates the land use process, then there won't be a Bypass.

- . That the following reference be deleted from the Recommended Actions of Attachment A of the Resolution, clause 4: "with available funds from the Washington County serial levy" (pertaining to PE on the Western Bypass).
- . That the last eight lines of the last paragraph on Attachment A of the Resolution be amended to read as follows: "Upon amendment of the RTP, preliminary engineering and preparation of a Draft EIS for the I-5 to Highway 99W segment could proceed immediately. However, preliminary engineering will not proceed on the Highway 99W to T.V. Highway segment until compliance with land use requirements can be demonstrated. There will, however, be additional engineering and environmental reconnaissance in support of the land use process."
- . Bob Bothman's request for deletion of ODOT references stemmed from the intent that there be a separation between project decisions and that of jurisdictional responsibilities.
- . That Proposed Change No. 3 for amendment to the Resolution be incorporated (specifying the process and timeframe to resolve the land use issues and adoption by both parties for incorporation into the ordinance update to the RTP).

- . That references to committing ODOT to preliminary engineering be deleted on page 7, clause 4, of Exhibit 1 of the Staff Report pertaining to the highway engineering and environmental studies.
- . That language be incorporated indicating that, during preliminary engineering, there should be consideration of reserving right-of-way for transit.

Motion CARRIED unanimously as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Rena Cusma
Dick Engstrom
JPACT Members



METRO

2000 S.W. First Avenue
Portland, OR 97201-5398
503/221-1646

Memorandum

Date: June 2, 1987
To: JPACT
From: *AK* Andrew Cotugno, Transportation Director
Regarding: REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES

During the past several months, JPACT has considered several funding issues (Section 3 "Letter-of-Intent," Interstate Transfer, and Federal-Aid Urban) and discussed a number of issues affecting regional priorities. Most recently, JPACT tabled a proposed resolution on Interstate Transfer and Federal-Aid Urban funding, seeking an alternate proposal to deal with a broader range of issues affecting both transit and highway projects. In response to JPACT's concern, staff recommends that there be a comprehensive review of possible regional transit and highway priorities so that individual funding decisions can be made within the context of the bigger picture.

Described in Attachment "A" are the following significant transportation funding issues recommended for discussion by JPACT:

- Local highway project funding for Marine Drive, Stark Street, 185th Avenue and 82nd Drive/Railroad overcrossing (from the resolution tabled in May)
- Regional highway corridor priorities for the Sunrise Corridor, Western Bypass, I-84/U.S. 26 Connector and I-5/I-405 Downtown Portland Loop
- Short-term transit capital improvements
- Regional LRT corridor priorities and funding
- Railroad abandonments
- Local arterial funding
- Local and suburban transit service configuration and funding

Described in Attachments "B" and "C" are background data on the current availability of federal and state transportation resources.

It is recommended that JPACT review and discuss these transportation issues in order to provide staff with sufficient guidance on how to define a process for JPACT to deal with these issues. In general, it is suggested that these are the issues that must be addressed by JPACT in order to conclude with a renewed vision and set of priorities for the region.

AC/gl
7576C/D5

Attachment

ATTACHMENT "A"

Regional Transportation Issues

1. Local Highway Projects -- A commitment should be made soon on an Interstate Transfer and/or Federal-Aid Urban allocation to four regionally significant highway projects. They are all projects that have a portion of the needed funding committed for construction purposes and need a decision on the remainder in order to schedule the projects for right-of-way acquisition and construction within the next two years. It is clear that an allocation from one of these funding sources should be made in the near future.

	<u>Funds Available</u>	<u>Recommended Allocation</u>	<u>Remaining Problem</u>
Marine Drive -	\$14.0 million	\$3.2 million	\$.3 m.
Stark Street -	.7 million	1.15 million	--
185th Avenue -	7.4 million	1.68 million	2.0 m.
82nd Drive/RR -	2.5 million	1.68 million	2.1 m.
TOTAL		<u>\$7.71 million</u>	

2. Regional Highway Projects -- Four major unfunded state highway projects have been under discussion throughout the region during the past several years:

	<u>Approx. Cost</u>
- The Sunrise Highway from McLoughlin Boulevard to U.S. 26	\$180 million
- The Western Bypass from I-5 to the Sunset Highway	\$150 million
- The I-84 to U.S. 26 connector in Gresham	\$50-100 million
- The I-5/I-405 downtown Portland loop	\$150-200 million

All of the projects are intended to address clear, regionally significant problems but are very large in scope and cost. A short-term strategy should be developed to define which elements are most critical for implementation. From this assessment, regional priorities for the Six-Year Highway Improvement Program update should be adopted. In addition, other project requests should be integrated into the Six-Year Highway Program priorities dealing with various interchange and widening projects needed elsewhere in the region.

3. Short-Term Transit Capital Improvements -- Section 3 "Letter-of-Intent" funding and Section 9 funding programs

should be finalized to meet short-term transit capital requirements over the next five years. Funding should be clearly identified to meet routine capital requirements, bus replacement and construction of key stations and park-and-ride lots. Potential unfunded capital cost = \$10-15 million.

This could involve the reallocation of a portion of the Section 3 "Letter-of-Intent" funds and should be tied into adoption of a five-year Transit Development Program.

4. Regional Rail Corridors -- A comprehensive review of the regional light rail corridors should be undertaken to establish the priority of the various corridors and appropriate steps to proceed with toward implementation. From this, a short-term strategy for pursuing the Sunset LRT, I-205 LRT and Milwaukie LRT should be adopted, followed by a long-term strategy for funding the capital and operating cost of implementation. Potential costs: Sunset LRT = \$250 million; Milwaukie LRT = \$85 million; I-205 LRT = \$85 million.
5. Railroad Abandonments -- Three railroad rights-of-way are (or may soon be) for sale: the Jefferson Street line from Portland to Lake Oswego, the Bellrose line from Portland to Milwaukie to Gresham and the Burlington Northern line through Washington County. All of the corridors affect a potential LRT route, several planned highway projects and planned bike routes. A firm decision should be made on whether or not to acquire these corridors and, if so, a strategy developed for this purpose. Potential cost = \$4 million.
6. Local Arterial Funding -- With the conclusion of the Interstate Transfer Program, \$12-15 million per year is no longer available for local arterial improvements. The only viable replacement source is Federal-Aid Urban funds at \$3.8 million/year (\$1.6 million Portland/\$2.2 million balance of region). The 1987 Oregon Legislature may yet adopt a road funding increase but it will likely not include a previously proposed "Urban Arterial Program" and funding to local governments will largely be dedicated toward operations and maintenance shortfalls. With this situation, there should be a regional strategy on how to handle FAU funds (i.e., regional allocation, formula allocation or dedicate to transit projects) - and - there should be a decision on whether to pursue another regional highway funding source through state and/or regional initiatives.
7. Local/Suburban Transit -- Long-term expansion of local transit service is not possible without additional funding. In addition, it is not clear how to most effectively provide suburban transit service. A conclusion is needed on the overall level of needed local and suburban service to pursue, the most effective method of providing the service and funding strategy.

ATTACHMENT "B"

Federal Transportation Funding

<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Amount Federal/State/Local Match</u>	<u>Eligibility</u>	<u>Approval Requirements</u>
Interstate (FHWA)	\$16 m. per year statewide 92/8	For completion of previously approved segments of the Interstate system. Includes \$17.75 m. for I-205 busway.	Six-Year Program/TIP
Interstate - 4R (FHWA)	\$38 m. per year statewide 92/8	For rehabilitation and modernization of 718-mile Interstate system throughout Oregon (urban and rural).	Six-Year Program/TIP
Primary (FHWA)	\$29 m. per year statewide 88/12	For rehabilitation and modernization of 4,926 miles of major state highways throughout Oregon (urban and rural); by OTC policy 60 percent (\$18 m.) is for rehabilitation; 40 percent (\$11 m.) is for modernization.	Six-Year Program/TIP
Urban (FHWA)	\$7 m. per year statewide, including: - \$1.6 m. Portland - \$2.2 m. Portland region 88/6/6	For rehabilitation and modernization of 1,022 miles of arterials and collectors in the Portland region; eligible to be transferred to bus or rail facilities or vehicles.	TIP/OTC

<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Amount Federal/State/Local Match</u>	<u>Eligibility</u>	<u>Approval Requirement</u>
Section 3 (UMTA)	80/20	Available on a discretionary, competitive basis for major capital improvements, including fleet expansion, stations, park-and-ride lots, garages and LRT. LRT funding subject to following defined process and meeting cost-effectiveness standards.	TDP/TIP
Section 3 Letter-of-Intent (UMTA)	\$76.8 m. at \$12 m./year \$48.4 m. - grants received \$11.7 m. - programmed \$16.7 m. - under consideration 80/20	"Letter-of-Intent" approved by Congress and awarded to Portland region in 1982 for funding in 1982-1988. Provided as a commitment to "bus only" improvement program in exchange for regional "trade" of Interstate Transfer funds.	TIP/TDP
Section 16(b) (2) (UMTA)	\$320,000 per year statewide 80/20	Available to private, non-profit corporations only for capital improvements required to serve elderly and handicapped. Funds are available on a statewide basis and awarded competitively by ODOT. Applicant provides local match. Proposed service in Portland region must be service that cannot be provided by Tri-Met LIFT Program.	OTC/TIP

ATTACHMENT "C"

State Highway Funding

<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Distribution</u>	<u>Eligibility</u>
Current Highway Trust Fund at 12¢ gas tax, truck weight-mile tax, vehicle registration	\$278 m./year	13.36% to Cities	Any highway-related purposes; predominantly used for maintenance.
		21.57% to Counties	
		Mult. Co./Cities = \$ 21 m./yr.	
		Clack. Co./Cities = 8 m.	
		Wash. Co./Cities = 8 m.	
		\$ 37 m./yr.	
		65.07% to ODOT	Any highway-related purpose; predominantly used for maintenance -- except for local match on federal funding at \$14 m./year and one-time State Modernization Program at \$200 m. in five years.

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE JPACT

DATE 6-11-87

NAME

AFFILIATION

NAME	AFFILIATION
M- Earl Blumenauer	Portland
M- Bill Allison	Tri-Met
M- Bonnie Hays	Washington County
✓ G- Doug Allen	Citizens for Better Transit
✓ G- Steve Dotterer	PORTLAND STAFF
S- Karen Shackston	
✓ G- Diane Jones	City of Gresham
✓ G- Greg DiLoreto	Gresham
✓ G- RICHARD N. ROSS	CITY OF GRESHAM
✓ G- Pamela Kambur	SE Uplift Neighborhood Program
✓ G- DOUG CAPPAS	TRI-MET
✓ G- Bob Post	TRI-MET
✓ G- Denny Moore	ODOT, Transit
M- Marjorie D. Schunk	Cities of Mult. County
✓ G- Ted Spier	ODOT
MA- Rick Kuehn	ODOT
MA- Tom Beupham	DEQ
M- Ron Thom	Cities of Clack. Co.
M- George Van Bergen	Metro
M- Ed Ferguson	WSDOT
M- Vev Neysen	Clack Co. W.C.
M- Ed Diergeist	Clackamas Co.
EO- Russ [unclear]	Metro

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE T-PACT

DATE 6-11-87

NAME

AFFILIATION

M- RICHARD WAKER

METRO

M- Pauline Anderson

Multnomah County

✓ G- Grace Crunican

Portland

✓ G- Lee Hames

Tri-Met

✓ G- Gil Mallery

IRC of Clark County

G- Geraldine Ball

I-5 Corr. Transp. Comm.

S- Andy Cotugno

Metro

S- Richard Brantman

Metro

✓ G- Susie Labrene

Multnomah County

S- Vickie Rocter

Metro

G- Gary Spanovich

Clackamas County

J