

Portland State University

PDXScholar

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on
Transportation

Oregon Sustainable Community Digital Library

11-18-1999

Meeting Notes 1999-11-18 [Part A]

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 1999-11-18 [Part A]" (1999). *Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation*. 283.

https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact/283

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.

ROONEY BARKER
METRO**METRO**

MEETING: JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION
 DATE: November 18, 1999
 DAY: Thursday
 TIME: 7:30 A.M. – 9:30 A.M.
 PLACE: Metro, Conference Room 370A & B

1. Call to Order and Declaration of a Quorum.
- * 2. Meeting Report of October 14, 1999 – APPROVAL REQUESTED
- * 3. RESOLUTION NO. 99-2864 – FOR THE PURPOSE OF SELECTION AND FUNDING ALLOCATION OF \$1 MILLION TO TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATIONS FOR FY 2000 TO FY 2003 – APPROVAL REQUESTED – Andy Cotugno
4. Status of Interstate MAX – INFORMATIONAL – Fred Hansen
- * 5. Overview of Washington County Commuter Rail – INFORMATIONAL – Bob Post
6. Initiation of Discussion on Federal Funding Priorities – DISCUSSION – Andy Cotugno
- * 7. ODOT \$600 Million Bond Program – UPDATE (Adoption in December) – Dave Williams
- # 8. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – DISCUSSION OF MAJOR ISSUES – Andy Cotugno/Tom Kloster (*November 5th Adoption Draft will be provided at meeting*)
9. ADJOURN

* Material enclosed.

Available at meeting.

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: October 14, 1999

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Chair Jon Kvistad, Ed Washington, Presiding Officer Rod Monroe, David Bragdon, Metro Council; Jim Kight, Cities in Multnomah County; Fred Hansen, Tri-Met; Bill Kennemer, Clackamas County; Royce Pollard, City of Vancouver; Don Wagner, Washington State Department of Transportation; Kay Van Sickel, Oregon Department of Transportation; Andy Ginsburg, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality; Tom Brian, Washington County; Rob Drake, Cities in Washington County; Charlie Hales, City of Portland; Karl Rohde, Cities in Clackamas County; Mike Thorne, Port of Portland; Sharron Kelley, Multnomah County; Craig Pridemore, Clark County;

Guests: Dave Lohman, Port of Portland; Lise Glancy, Port of Portland; Sebastian Degens, Port of Portland; Ted Spence, Citizen; Rod Sandoz, Clackamas County; John Rist, Clackamas County; Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland; Dick Feeny, Tri-Met; Mark Lear, City of Portland; Ron Papsdorf, City of Gresham; Beth Wemple, Kittelson & Assoc.; Gary Katsion, Kittelson & Assoc.; Martha Bennett, City of Milwaukie; Beckie Lee, Multnomah County; Ross Williams, Cities for Feasible Transportation/Coalition for Livable Futures; Marc Zolton; City of Portland; Scott L. Rice, City of Cornelius; Steve Dotterrer, City of Portland; Karen Schilling, Multnomah County; Kathy Lehtola, Washington County; Elsa Coleman, City of Portland (PDOT); Dave Williams, Oregon Department of Transportation; Dean Lookingbill, Southwest Washington RTC; Mary Legry, Washington State Department of Transportation; Pat Collmeyer, Neil Goldschmidt, Inc.

Staff: Andy Cotugno, Larry Shaw, Mike Hogle, Gina Whitehill-Baziuk, Tom Kloster, and Rooney Barker, recording secretary

Media: Bill Stewart, *The Oregonian*

October 14, 1999

SUMMARY:

The meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Chair Kvistad.

MEETING REPORT

Commissioner Kelley moved, seconded by Councilor Washington, to approve the September 9, 1999, Meeting Report as submitted. The motion PASSED unanimously.

Andy Cotugno provided an overview of the Cascadia Metropolitan Forum, tentatively scheduled for April 27 – 29 or May 4 – 6, hosted by the Seattle region. Councilor Karl Rohde, who is JPACT's liaison on this, and representatives from MPAC are working on Metro's program with Andy. Andy said there are two topics that will be addressed that are tackled by all three regions – Portland, Seattle and Vancouver – transportation infrastructure, finance, and housing affordability. He felt that Seattle and Vancouver are doing better at addressing these than Portland and that we could learn from them. There was concern about the Forum's dates from some of the membership in that it would coincide with the primary election. Andy said he would inquire about the possibility of having the Forum take place on a different date.

ODOT'S \$600 MILLION BOND PROGRAM

All the public meetings are now scheduled on the RTP and ODOT's bond program so there are not two sets of hearings; the logistical sheet on staffing of these hearings was distributed. Andy Cotugno described the format staff will use regarding displays, booths and break-out tables for taking citizen comments. He asked the JPACT members to participate in the break-out tables, thus having one JPACT member, and one Oregon Department of Transportation Commissioner to hear each member of the public. He said this approach would achieve better input from the community.

The other half of the work sessions are on the RTP update; he referred to the public fact sheets which are a much shorter version of the thicker document and focus on specific geographic areas. Each work session will have detailed information for that area.

Andy then referred to the projects listed on the yellow ODOT survey form which gave two options: the front of the form (also referred to as the A list) showing ODOT's list that they plan to take to the public; the second page, the supplemental list (also referred to as the B list), show the projects that need to be looked at, e.g., the I-5/Greeley project is a questionable project – if it's taken that off the supplemental list, it's a much smaller list. He explained that today's discussion is to attempt to hone down the supplemental list. He gave the results of the choices made by the members and alternates in the handout. Since all members/alternates did not vote, and since the members/alternates who did vote did not all vote on all projects, the total number of votes did not equal the total number of voters.

Working from this supplemental list and from the ODOT list provided by Kate Deane, a discussion ensued regarding each project. Kate updated some of the information on the ODOT's list: Project #3, now called the 87th Avenue Connection, has a revised cost of \$24.5 million; Project #4, the Clackamas Industrial Connection: I-205 to 145th, has a revised cost estimate of \$72.5 million; Project #5, I-5: Greeley – N. Banfield/Lloyd District/Rose Quarter Access Phase 1, has no revised cost estimate. In response to Councilor Washington's question, Kate explained that #8 on the supplemental list (I-5: Greeley – I-84/Lloyd District Access) would let ODOT take a broader look at that area, allowing the improvements to make that area work better but be coordinated with the I-5 Trade Corridor project.

Project #7 has a \$9 million revised estimate; Project #9 has a new cost estimate of \$3.6 million. On this project, Milwaukie has received \$1.9 million leaving a balance of \$1.7 million for completion; there was not good knowledge of what the cost of the right-of-way would be.

There was a discussion as to how the committee would approach the projects. Fred Hansen asked if the MTIP was coordinated with this selection because it could be very significant. Andy responded that these projects are over and above the MTIP. The question is, with these funds, what would you choose? Fred was concerned that once priorities are set in motion, the decisions made on these projects will set priorities for the next eight or ten years. Andy replied that this is not setting priorities for future funds unless JPACT chooses. Chair Kvistad said no one knows what the funding sources are going to be, the growth patterns, what the federal government will do, etc., but that JPACT needs to choose now what they think is best.

Dave Williams clarified that unless JPACT takes an action to the contrary, ODOT's priorities are to finish the three westside projects, and then the Columbia/Killingsworth Connection, which JPACT has prioritized for after the westside projects. These are the only priorities that exist now, unless JPACT speaks differently.

Commissioner Hales asked for clarification whether what is chosen today for public review will move up in the queue. He also suggested that the committee might operate under the principles of buildability and the need to respond to political issues/criticism. He said the projects need to go out for public review and it needs to be demonstrated that ODOT can work with the communities. Barbur Boulevard should be worked on and we should persevere at least in the design state even though people are nervous. He also said the environmental community thinks the freeways just keep getting widened, and that the Sandy project is meritorious for being something different and helping the main street and Hollywood Town Center. This is the time to respond to criticism that ODOT and JPACT are dinosaurs; public review is good politics and there may be support and possible funding because of it.

Councilor Karl Rohde asked how much leeway the committee has on ODOT's list. Chair Kvistad replied that one of JPACT's strengths is taking difficult funding constraints and making them work.

Commissioner Tom Brian said the essence of ODOT's \$600 million program was to infuse cash into getting these projects done. He didn't think substituting one project for another would matter; he heard complaints from everyone about projects not getting done. It was his opinion that whatever JPACT decides on the supplemental list, it will be good sense to share that with the legislature. He said everyone wants the projects done.

Commissioner Bill Kennemer suggested caution because the legislators vary on their thoughts. He agreed with Commissioner Hales and thinks good faith with public needs to be kept, i.e., not be over optimistic and promise more than can be delivered. Referring to the unfinished projects, he said ODOT needs to update their numbers because if one starts adding the numbers to all the projects, the funding hole gets deeper. Chair Kvistad agreed that finishing the committed projects needs to be kept at the front.

Commissioner Sharron Kelley commented that JPACT needs to analyze what their mission is to the public. JPACT will interact with the public and revise projects accordingly. It doesn't make sense to send out something that doesn't meet the ODOT criteria. Unrealistic projects should be taken off. She said she is ready to listen to the people but JPACT can't send out a list that doesn't meet the criteria.

Kate Deane explained that the supplemental list is not the legislature's list, that JPACT can recommend removing a project if they so choose. The committee then voted on the following projects from the supplemental list:

1. **I-5: Greeley – I-84, Phase 1.** It was acknowledged that I-84 couldn't make it to construction in six years, which will reduce the need by \$92 million dollars. A companion project to this is #8 (I-5: Greeley – I-84/Lloyd District Access). Andy Cotugno explained that #8 has funds committed for four years.

Action taken: There was no objection to Chair Kvistad's motion that #1 be removed from the supplemental list and #8 be retained. Project #8 is RETAINED on the supplemental list and Project #1 is removed, unanimously.

2. **Tualatin-Sherwood Expressway EIS/PE.** Kate Dean said that unless you know what specific alternatives you want to look at in an EIS, ODOT recommends doing a major investment study and spending \$2 million instead of \$3 million. Mayor Drake strongly recommended keeping this project as it's critical to Washington County and impacts Clackamas County. He said the traffic nightmare here is killing the area. Kate did not know the answer to Councilor Rohde's question of having to spend more money on the EIS after completing the MIS. She said doing the EIS now would be a waste of money because there's no plan where the road will come in. Alternatives need to be revisited through an MIS. Andy Cotugno added that it's cheaper to go this route, that doing a greater number of alternatives now will allow for spending the money better later. Dave Williams said the area is so developed now that locating an area to bring in the road is quite difficult. He said if an

EIS is done, construction needs to begin within three years. Tom Brian said as long as progress is being made, it makes sense not to do an EIS.

Another discussion ensued as to whether or not projects that are not buildable in six years should remain on the supplemental list. Andy reiterated that there is now one list that totals \$189 million. There is the other list that's well over that amount, and if we or the public want to add anything to it, we have to ask what comes off. Chair Kvistad added that right now the committee needs to decide what to take out for public comment. Fred Hansen said he'd rather have a list that says these are the projects JPACT believes should have public comment, and then another list that the public can comment on but that JPACT felt wasn't feasible. He didn't think JPACT should state support at this time. Mike Thorne wondered why we would recommend that the public comment on a project or projects that are questionable (citing #7 on the supplemental list). Mayor Drake agreed, saying staff will have the recommendations after the public comment. The public may enlighten us about some of them. Councilor Rohde asked if JPACT isn't supposed to determine what to take off the list before it goes before the public. Chair Kvistad responded that if the consensus is that something isn't doable, JPACT will say that. It should become obvious which ones work and which don't.

Karl confirmed what Chair Kvistad said, that if the majority of the body thinks something should be removed, it will be and will not go out for public comment.

Action taken: Sharron Kelley moved, seconded by Councilor Kight, to remove projects #1 (I-5: Greeley – I-84, Phase 1) and #12 (Powell Boulevard: I-205 to Eastman Parkway [Birdsdale]) as unfeasible. Projects #1 and #12 were, by unanimous vote, REMOVED from the supplemental list.

3. 99E (McLoughlin): Hwy 224 to River Rd.

Action taken: Councilor Rohde moved to send this to public comment (i.e., retain it on the list); Commissioner Kennemer seconded the motion. Project #3 was unanimously approved to be RETAINED on the supplemental list.

4. Sandy Modernization (12th to 57th Avenue);

5. SW Clay/Market Reconstruction: Naito Parkway/I-405;

9. Barbur Modernization (Terwilliger to SW City Limit);

10. Lombard Modernization: I-5 to St. Johns Bridge: The discussion on these projects recognized that they are state highways that function more as city streets. The ODOT criteria provides for upgrading of the streets, the pedestrian environment, and transferring them to the cities. Councilor Rohde said he thought the ODOT criteria "of statewide importance" didn't apply. Andy Cotugno replied that the criteria was broadened to mean the state would consider projects "of statewide and regional significance" or projects of local significance if the jurisdiction then takes it over. Kay Van Sichel confirmed this.

Action taken: Commissioner Tom Brian moved, seconded by Mayor Rob Drake, to retain Projects #4, #5, #9 and #10 on the supplemental list for public comment. Councilor Rohde and Bill Kennemer voted no. The motion passed to RETAIN these projects. Andy Cotugno said the transfer of jurisdiction issue will be clarified when it goes out for public comment.

6. Powell Blvd.: Central Eastside Southbound Access, and

- 7. South Portland Circulation Phase I.** It was pointed out that these two projects involve more physical changes. There's still development in this area so there's still work to go on them. Elsa Coleman agreed on project #6 that there may not be consensus with ODOT but there is a study that addressed this. Kate Deane felt that both of these fare better than some of the other projects on the list, that they can be considered buildable within six years from today. Fred Hansen said #7 is very significant for Tri-Met as far as improving the neighborhood and keeping on-time service from Clackamas County and the inner southeast.

Action taken: Fred moved, with a second by Councilor Bragdon, to keep #7 on the supplemental list for public comment. Councilor Rohde voted no. The motion to RETAIN Project 7 was approved. Councilor Kight moved to recommend Project #6 not be included on the supplemental list, with a second by Councilor Rohde. Fred Hansen and Councilor Washington voted no. Project #6 was REMOVED from the supplemental list by a majority vote.

- 11. 242ND Avenue Connector: I-84 to Stark.** Phase 1 of the Mt. Hood Parkway will provide connection from I-84 to NE 242nd. The EIS process is under way; this provides engineering and construction.

Action taken: Council Kennemer moved, with a second by Councilor Washington, to retain project #11 on the supplemental list. With a no vote by Councilor Rohde, the motion was approved to RETAIN Project #11 on the supplemental list.

- 13. I-5: Lombard to Expo Center – PE and ROW.** This is a \$13 million construction project for the north section with two lanes going to three lanes. It was noted that environmental issues will not slow this project down.

Action taken: Commissioner Pridemore moved, with a second by Fred Hansen, to retain this project on the supplemental list. The motion passed, with no dissenting votes. Project #13 is RETAINED on the supplemental list.

- 14. I-5/Hwy. 217/Kruse Way Interchange – Phase 2.** A delay on this project would mean secondary, overlapping construction at the same interchange. Councilor Rohde asked for clarification that the printed list is incorrect in stating that this phase of the project is not needed for 10-15 years, that it's Phase 3 of the project that is not needed for 10-15 years. That clarification was confirmed. The supplemental list is citing Phase 1 of the project, which is going into construction now.

Action taken: Councilor Rohde moved, with a second by Mayor Drake, to retain this project on the supplemental list. The vote was unanimous. Project #14 is **RETAINED** on the supplemental list.

Action taken: Commissioner Brian moved, with a second by Commissioner Pridemore, to approve from JPACT the supplemental list for public comment. The motion was unanimously **APPROVED**. The supplemental list, as approved by JPACT, was recommended to be taken out for public comment.

COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL DEEPENING PROJECT

Mike Thorne gave a brief introduction to the project, stating that the region's decision to prioritize light rail is in the same category as maintaining the Columbia River channel. He said Portland is the tenth largest trade center in the United States despite a population ranking of around 25. This region is the market center for a large geographic area, and it exists because of the good transportation system. This project will enhance the environmental values of the region; less dredging will be done and 1,500 acres of new wetlands will be created. Mr. Thorne asked for JPACT's support by endorsing this project by letter to the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers and requesting issuance of a favorable Chief's report.

Sebastian Degens of the Port of Portland gave a presentation to the committee that explained the two essential elements of the regional maritime strategy: 1.) To maintain the region's position as the center for grain exports; and 2.) To support the container and general cargo facilities serving the regional market. Mr Degens' presentation also explained more on the commerce handled, the commodity flow forecast, the major users of Portland Harbor and their types of usage (forest products, technology, food/beverage, etc.), as well as highlighting the river's impact on the region's employment.

The presentation then covered more specifics of the project, i.e., dredging to accommodate the new, larger ships that are entering the world trade market, the actual construction, maintenance, scope, and cost of the project, and the transportation cost savings. Mr. Thorne interjected that the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMSA) has given a No Jeopardy letter for 40' dredging and that the Port is anticipating the same for their request for the 43' dredging.

Mayor Drake said he was convinced that the environmental issues are addressed in the project.

Action taken: Mayor Drake moved, and Councilor Rohde seconded, that JPACT send the endorsement letter.

Discussion: Commissioner Pridemore asked if there would be a value in expressing bi-state support; Andy Cotugno replied that JPACT support is bi-state. Andy Ginsburg commented that the environmental issues are highlighted in the letter and felt that no degradation finding will be made. He said if there are environmental problems that surface in the process, JPACT can address them as they come up.

Chair Kvistad informed the committee that he had been approached by the business community and the Port of Astoria on this project as well as representatives of the fishing industry, that he will sign the letter to the U. S. Corps of Engineers should the committee vote to do so, but that he will abstain from the vote on this project. Fred Hansen expressed concern about the next to last paragraph in the draft letter to the Corps with reference to what has to happen to ensure all environmental issues are addressed. He said he'd like something that this process has to evaluate. Mayor Drake concurred, saying his motion was to support the process of dredging so ships can be accommodated in both the Columbia and Willamette; if the project doesn't get federal and state environmental support, it won't happen unless the Port does something to mitigate those concerns. He amended his motion to say that JPACT supports dredging, provided the Port meets all federal environmental requirements, etc.

Mayor Pollard emphasized that Portland, Vancouver and Clark County need to take a strong and positive support position for this project. He said there should be no question that JPACT fully supports the dredging. Councilor Bragdon was comfortable with the environmental safeguards included in the process and that the letter to the U. S. Corp of Engineers would address the points made by Mr. Hansen.

Action taken: The motion to approve JPACT sending the letter to the U. S. Corps of Engineers with the amendment was PASSED unanimously.

RESOLUTION 99-2843 – ADOPTING THE PORTLAND AREA AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY DETERMINATION FOR THE FY 2000 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Andy Cotugno explained how this resolution maintains the air quality standards of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Staff is asking for JPACT approval, assuming the budget has been met. Andy Ginsburg said he was a little uncomfortable making an approval because of the time constraints without seeing the quantitative analysis. He understands the assumptions were agreed upon going in, yet he feels that seeing the final numbers is important and could raise some issues. He believes it's good policy that JPACT review numbers before taking action.

Action taken: Andy Ginsburg made a motion, seconded by Councilor Washington, that JPACT conditionally approve this resolution contingent upon seeing the numbers. He asked that staff be encouraged to build in enough time in future schedules. Fred Hansen commented that he will be surprised if the analysis doesn't come in in terms of conformity. He suggested a future JPACT discussion with DEQ about where things might be in 10-12 years. The motion was APPROVED unanimously to conditionally approved Resolution 99-2843 and forward it to the Metro Council for consideration.

ANNOUNCEMENTS Tom Brian informed the committee that Washington County is sponsoring a commuter rail demonstration on November 15 and that invitations to the demonstration will be sent. There may be a future presentation on this to JPACT.

JPACT
October 14, 1999

ADJOURNMENT There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Rooney Barker

c:\jpact\101499\1099mtgreport.doc

cc: Mike Burton, Metro Executive Officer
JPACT members

STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION OF NO. 99-2864 FOR THE PURPOSE OF SELECTION AND FUNDING ALLOCATION OF \$1 MILLION TO TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATIONS FOR FY 2000 TO FY 2003

Date: October 28, 1999

Presented by: Andrew Cotugno

PROPOSED ACTION

The Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Subcommittee of TPAC recommends selection of three existing and eight new Transportation Management Associations (TMA) for funding during the FY 2000 to FY 2003 allocation period. \$1,000,000 in regional CMAQ funds is available for the TMA Assistance Program. A total of \$250,000 is recommended for the three existing TMAs: the Lloyd District TMA, Tualatin TMA, and Westside Transportation Alliance. The remaining \$750,000 is recommended for exploratory and formative/operations phases of eight new TMAs, including the Columbia Corridor TMA, Swan Island TMA, Clackamas Regional Center TMA, Gresham Regional Center TMA, Portland Downtown TMA, Lake Oswego TMA and Troutdale TMA. Recommended funding and proposed annual allocation is described in Exhibit 1 to the Resolution.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

Earlier this year, the Priorities 2000 (MTIP) funding process allocated \$1 million to TMA assistance over the next four years. TMAs are typically nonprofit coalitions of local businesses and/or public agencies dedicated to reducing traffic congestion and pollution while improving commute options for their employees. In this role, TMAs have become an important institutional option for implementing transportation demand management strategies; particularly those designed to increase the use of alternative modes of travel.

The TMA policy basis and funding strategy is described in Metro Resolution No. 98-2676. TMA development and implementation includes an exploratory and a formative/operations stage. The TDM Subcommittee established criteria based on Resolution No. 98-2676 for ranking and allocating funding to existing and potential TMAs. The TMA funding criteria is described in Attachment B. The TMA criteria were presented to TPAC on August 27, 1999, and to JPACT on September 9, 1999. On September 10, 1999, a wide range of potential applicants were notified about the TMA solicitation, and given over thirty days to submit a proposal.

Summary of the Selection Process

Applications for the formation and regional funding of TMAs were made directly to Tri-Met, the program administrator, with a due date of October 14, 1999. Tri-Met staff then copied the proposals to TDM Subcommittee members for review. The TDM Subcommittee met on October 21, 1999, for initial screening and review of the applications. At a follow-up meeting on October

26, 1999, the Subcommittee selected TMA proposals for funding and allocation. Twelve applications were submitted. The Subcommittee considered both quantitative and qualitative attributes of the applications.

Qualitative Ranking

The qualitative ranking was a group process, based on each Subcommittee member selecting his or her top six TMA proposals. Qualitative attributes included quality of the proposal as a whole, financial need and geographic equity. Table 1 shows the qualitative ranking of all TMA applications by Subcommittee votes.

**Table 1
Qualitative Ranking of All TMAs**

Rank	Applicant	Votes
1	Tualatin	11
2	Columbia Corridor	10
2	Clackamas	10
3	Lloyd District	9
3	Swan Island	9
4	WTA	8
4	Gresham	8
5	APP (Portland)	4
6	Lake Oswego	2
N/A	Cornelius	0
N/A	Multnomah Village	0
N/A	Troutdale	0

The qualitative ranking exercise resulted in seven applicants with eight or more votes (out of a possible 12) from TDM Subcommittee members. Five of the applicants received four or fewer votes. Upon conclusion of this exercise, the TDM Subcommittee adjourned until October 26, 1999, with instructions to submit quantitative rankings to Tri-Met and Metro staff by email or fax.

Quantitative Ranking and Analysis

Eight exploratory phase proposals were compared as group, and five of the seven formative/operations phase proposals were compared as a group. Clackamas and Gresham TMAs requested both exploratory and formation/operations funding, but were scored only on the exploratory phase. Because both Gresham and Clackamas had high qualitative rankings, the Subcommittee felt that the two TMAs should be given a high priority to receive formative funds if they successfully pass the exploratory phase.

The application from the Columbia Corridor Association was divided for quantitative scoring purposes. The exploratory phase of the application focused on the Rivergate industrial area, and was compared with other exploratory applications. The subcommittee felt that the Columbia Corridor/Airport Way area was ready to proceed into the formative/operations phase.

Table 2 shows the quantitative ranking for eight exploratory TMAs and their percent score in the quantitative ranking. The percent scores break down into high, medium and low ranges. The Gresham, Clackamas and Downtown Portland proposals scored highest (75 percent or more). The Troutdale, Columbia Corridor (Rivergate) and Lake Oswego proposals scored in the medium range (50 to 60 %). The Cornelius and Multnomah Village proposals scored lowest (30% to 44%).

Table 2
Quantitative Ranking of Exploratory TMAs

Rank	Applicant	Percent Score
1	Gresham	77.3 %
2	Clackamas	76.9 %
3	APP (Portland Downtown)	75.3 %
4	Troutdale	59.0 %
5	Columbia Corridor: Rivergate	56.3 %
6	Lake Oswego	50.3 %
7	Cornelius	44.3 %
8	Multnomah Village	30.1%

The Gresham and Clackamas TMA proposals also scored high in the qualitative ranking, and were recommended for exploratory phase funding in year 2000. Through a series of votes the TDM Subcommittee decided to fund the exploratory phase of the Portland Downtown, Troutdale, Columbia Corridor (Rivergate), and Lake Oswego proposals during the four-year allocation period. The Subcommittee voted against exploratory phase funding for the Cornelius and Multnomah Village proposals. While both proposals were good efforts, the Subcommittee suggested that Tri-Met work with Cornelius to pursue other funding sources and that Multnomah Village work with the City of Portland as a sponsoring jurisdiction in submitting future TMA proposals.

Table 3 shows the quantitative ranking and percent score for five TMAs requesting formative/operations funding. Both the existing TMAs (WTA, Lloyd District and Tualatin) and the proposed TMAs (Columbia Corridor and Swan Island) requesting formative/operational funding scored high in the quantitative ranking.

Table 3
Quantitative Ranking of Formative/Operational TMAs

Rank	Applicant	Percent Score
1	WTA	89.8 %
1	Lloyd District	89.8 %
3	Tualatin	83.6 %
4	Columbia Corridor	83.0 %
5	Swan Island	81.6 %

The quantitative scoring confirmed that the seven existing and proposed TMAs with a high number of “qualitative votes” as shown in Table 1 also ranked high on the TMA funding criteria described in Attachment B.

Results of the Selection Process

The TMA funding assistance distribution initially recommended by the TDM Subcommittee is shown in Attachment A. The total program amount of \$1 million is divided over the four-year funding period, with an average allocation of \$250,000. In 2001 and 2002 the annual allocation is higher, in order to fund start-up costs for four new TMAs. The \$1 million program total does not include a 10.27 percent Tri-Met match, which totals \$114,456 over the four-year period. The Tri-Met match could be used as a contingency fund to help cover program start-up costs in 2000 and 2001.

Based on a combined qualitative and quantitative ranking process, the TDM Subcommittee recommended funding the three existing TMAs—the Lloyd District TMA, Westside Transportation Alliance and Tualatin TMA. The Subcommittee recommended that the three existing TMAs be funded a total of \$250,000 over the four-year allocation period, with the Tualatin TMA receiving \$90,000 and the WTA and Lloyd TMA receiving \$ 80,000. The TDM Subcommittee initially recommended that funds for existing TMAs be equally spread over the four-year allocation period, as shown in Attachment A.

Four of the exploratory and/or formative/operations TMAs are recommended for funding, with annual funding allocations as shown in Attachment A. These four TMAs include:

- Columbia Corridor (formative/operations)
- Swan Island (formative/operations)
- Clackamas Regional Center (if the exploratory phasing leads to a yes answer)
- Gresham Regional Center (if the exploratory phasing leads to a yes answer)

Four applicants are recommended for exploratory phase funding only, including:

- Portland Downtown (APP)
- Columbia Corridor – Rivergate industrial area
- Lake Oswego/Kruse Way
- Troutdale

The Portland Downtown proposal was allocated to the year 2000 because it has a local match of \$17,500 for a like amount of regional funds. The remaining applicants were allocated to 2002 and 2003.

Funding Schedule

Following the TDM Subcommittee recommendation, Metro and Tri-Met staff met to develop a funding schedule consistent with MTIP scheduling and reflective of regional TMA policy as described in Resolution No. 98-2676. That resolution notes that, over a three-year period, reliance on regional TMA funding should be reduced. National studies indicate that, over time, successful TMAs rely on a combination of dues, donations, and public subsidy. The regional TMA policy is to limit regional funding to a four-year period covering the exploratory, formative, and operative states on the TMA. Exhibit 1 to the resolution reflects that declining “stair-step” approach to TMA funding. The revised funding schedule maintains the same overall allocation for each TMA.

Policy Issues

TPAC recommended approval of Resolution No. 99-2864. As part of the discussion, they acknowledged that a successful TMA generally requires a combination of private sector dues or donations and public support. At issue was whether the necessary public support should be provided with regional or local funds, or both. The current regional policy phases out regional funding after four years, with an expectation that a local source would match private contributions. Current practice shows that local sources have not reached a point of replacing the regional funds. Metro staff recommends that the current policy issue for regional vs. local TMA funding be revisited prior to the next MTIP cycle scheduled to begin around May 2000.

BB:MGH:rmb

C:\Resolution\1999\99-2864TMA-sr.doc

ATTACHMENTS

- A. TMA Assistance Distribution FY2000 - 2003
- B. TMA Funding Criteria

TMA ASSISTANCE DISTRIBUTION FY 2000 - 2003
TDM Subcommittee Recommendation: October 26, 1999

	Year				Total**	Average \$/Year
	2000	2001	2002	2003		
Tualatin TMA	\$22,500	\$22,500	\$22,500	\$22,500	\$90,000	\$22,500
WTA TMA	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$80,000	\$20,000
Lloyd TMA	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$80,000	\$20,000
Columbia Corridor	\$67,500	\$50,250	\$24,750	\$0	\$142,500	\$35,625
Swan Island	\$67,500	\$50,250	\$24,750	\$0	\$142,500	\$35,625
Clackamas Reg Ctr.*	\$32,000	\$67,500	\$50,250	\$24,750	\$174,500	\$43,625
Gresham Reg. Ctr.*	\$32,000	\$67,500	\$50,250	\$24,750	\$174,500	\$43,625
Ptld. Downtown (APP)	\$17,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$17,500	\$4,375
Col. Cor. Rivergate	\$0	\$0	\$32,000	\$0	\$32,000	\$8,000
L. Oswego/Kruse Way	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$8,000
Troutdale	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$8,000
Contingency Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$625
Total	\$279,000	\$298,000	\$244,500	\$178,500	\$1,000,000	\$250,000

* Funding for 2001 through 2003 contingent on results of exploratory phase

** Total does not include 10.27 pct. Tri-Met match, which totals \$114,456 over the 4-year period

TMA Funding Criteria

Regional Transportation Demand Management System Goal 5, Objective 2 of the RTP promotes the establishment of TMAs as a means to support programs to reduce the need to travel and to make it more convenient for people to use alternative modes for all trips throughout the region.

Does the TMA application meet the above Objective? If yes, evaluate based on the following criteria.

CRITERIA [POTENTIAL POINTS]

Applications for TMA funding will be evaluated based on the following criteria.

1. Definition of geographic area. Map required from applicant.
2. Definition of employment population.
 - Employment population that would be served by the TMA (required from applicant).
 - Employment population of the area (Metro to define).
3. Definition of transportation problem(s) or issue(s) common to the geographical area. [0-10]
 - The transportation problem should be included in, or related to, other transportation plans, particularly the Regional Transportation Plan.
4. Description that the TMA is in an area of regional significance. [0-10]
 - Population/employment density.
 - 2040 Land Use Link.
5. Demonstration of community support for a TMA. [0-15]
 - Letters of interest from area employers.
 - Letter of support from local jurisdiction.
 - Letters of support from neighborhood associations.
6. Description of financial strategy. This category should identify potential public and private funding sources for the first five years of operation. [0-10]
7. Description of the TMA's potential to assist in meeting the non-auto mode split targets established for the area by Metro and the local jurisdiction. Points will be assigned based on the applicant's intended strategies to reduce VMT and single-occupant vehicle trips, increase access and develop transportation alternatives. [0-10]
8. Description of how the TMA will benefit members and non-members in the area. [0-5]
9. Demonstrated level of support of an identified anchor patron, major employer/organization, core group, chamber of commerce, developer, etc., toward the formation of the TMA. There may be a group currently working on transportation access issues in the proposed area that would facilitate TMA development. [0-15]
10. Coordination with major capital investments, current transportation strategies and/or programs in practice in the area to reduce single-occupant vehicles. [0-5]

Q:\Share\Mendozat\TMA\Final Draft PORTLAND AREA TMA FUNDING CRITERIA.DOC

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF SELECTION AND
FUNDING ALLOCATION OF \$1 MILLION TO
TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT
ASSOCIATIONS FOR FY 2000 TO FY 2003

RESOLUTION NO. 99-2864

Introduced by Jon Kvistad,
JPACT Chair

WHEREAS, Resolution 98-2676 established a policy basis and funding strategy for Transportation Management Associations (TMAs) for the MTIP/STIP development process; and

WHEREAS, The Priorities 2000/MTIP Process allocated \$1 million to TMA assistance over the next four years; and

WHEREAS, TMAs have become an important institutional option for implementing transportation demand management strategies and are a key RTP demand management strategy; and

WHEREAS, The Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Subcommittee of TPAC established criteria based on Resolution 98-2676 for ranking and allocating funding to existing and potential TMAs; and

WHEREAS, The TDM Subcommittee screened and reviewed twelve TMA applications; and

WHEREAS, the TDM Subcommittee recommends funding three existing TMAs and eight new TMAs, and proposed a funding allocation described in Exhibit 1; and

WHEREAS, The TDM Subcommittee recommends revisiting Resolution No. 99-2676 to better articulate regional funding for existing TMAs beyond the three-year formative/operations stage; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That JPACT endorse the TMA Assistance Distribution FY 2000 to FY 2003 described in Exhibit 1.
2. That existing, funded and planned TMAs will be incorporated into the current RTP update.
3. That JPACT reconsider the policy basis and funding strategy described in Resolution No. 98-2676 for existing TMAs beyond the three-year formative/operations state.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this _____ day of _____, 1999.

Rod Monroe, Presiding Officer

Approved as to form:

Daniel B. Cooper, General Counsel

BB:rmb
C:\Resolutions\1999\99-2864

TMA ASSISTANCE DISTRIBUTION FY 2000 - 2003
Tri-Met/Metro Proposal on 10/29/99


	Year				Total**	Average \$/Year
	2000	2001	2002	2003		
Tualatin TMA	\$50,250	\$24,750	\$15,000	\$0	\$90,000	\$22,500
WTA TMA	\$50,250	\$24,750	\$5,000	\$0	\$80,000	\$20,000
Lloyd TMA	\$50,250	\$24,750	\$5,000	\$0	\$80,000	\$20,000
Columbia Corridor	\$67,500	\$50,250	\$24,750	\$0	\$142,500	\$35,625
Swan Island	\$67,500	\$50,250	\$24,750	\$0	\$142,500	\$35,625
Clackamas Reg Ctr.*	\$32,000	\$67,500	\$50,250	\$24,750	\$174,500	\$43,625
Gresham Reg. Ctr.*	\$32,000	\$67,500	\$50,250	\$24,750	\$174,500	\$43,625
Ptld. Downtown (APP)	\$17,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$17,500	\$4,375
Col. Cor. Rivergate	\$0	\$0	\$32,000	\$0	\$32,000	\$8,000
L. Oswego/Kruse Way	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$8,000
Troutdale	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$8,000
Total	\$367,250	\$309,750	\$207,000	\$113,500	\$997,500	\$249,375
Total Available**	\$278,614	\$278,614	\$278,614	\$278,614	\$1,114,454	\$278,614
Balance	(\$88,637)	(\$31,137)	\$71,614	\$165,114	\$116,954	\$29,239

*Funding for 2001 through 2003 contingent on results of exploratory phase

**Resources - CMAQ - \$1,000,000; Tri-Met local match (89.73/10.27 ratio) - \$114,454



METRO

Date: November 16, 1999
To: JPACT Members and Alternates
From:  Andy Cotugno, Transportation Director
Re: November 18, 1999, JPACT Agenda

Following are agenda materials for:

Agenda Item 4. – Status of Interstate MAX

APPROVAL of this letter is requested.

Agenda Item 6. – Initiation of Discussion on Federal Funding Priorities

APPROVAL of JPACT's federal priorities is needed in JANUARY 2000.

DRAFT

November 16, 1999

Oregon Congressional Delegation

On behalf of the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), I am writing to update you on the status of the Interstate MAX light rail project (IMAX) and ask for your support of federal fiscal year 2001 construction funding for the project.

Metro submitted the IMAX Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) to the Federal Transit Administration, and on November 5th notice on the FEIS was published in the Federal Register. In addition, Metro recently adopted the Land Use Final Order for the project, establishing the necessary land use authorizations for construction of IMAX. In recent weeks, the regional funding partners for the project – Metro, the City of Portland and Tri-Met – have all officially adopted the proposed IMAX financing agreement. As a result, all approvals are complete.

The project is the region's top transportation priority for federal approvals and funding.

IMAX is now ready to move forward to construction, starting in the fall of 2000. JPACT hopes that the delegation will support the following actions over the next few months.

1. Federal Transit Administration approval of a Full Funding Grant Agreement and Authorization of \$257.5 million in Section 5309 "New Start" funds.
2. Inclusion of IMAX in the Administration's FY 2001 budget and an appropriation of \$66 million to IMAX in the FY 2001 appropriations bill.

We appreciate all of the work that you have done on our behalf in the past. The IMAX project has achieved the necessary technical and community support to move forward quickly to construction in 2000 if federal funding is available.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Jon Kvistad, Chair
Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)

JK:AC:rmb

C:\PACT\111899\Congressional Letter.Doc

Date: November 15, 1999
To: JPACT
From: Andy Cotugno
Subject: JPACT Federal Priorities

In January 2000 it is important that JPACT articulate its federal transportation priorities to the congressional delegation. These priorities should be in the content of the FFY 2001 Appropriations Bill and anticipate a new six-year Authorization Bill standing in FFY 2004.

A first draft set of priorities is described below:

1. The South/North Corridor is the region's top priority. This immediate priority is Interstate MAX to the north with a follow on the bus improvement program in the South Corridor.
 - A. **Interstate MAX:** The region will expedite Segment #1, the construction of Interstate MAX, by securing:
 - FTA approval of a Full Funding Grant Agreement,
 - An authorization of \$257 million in Section 5309 "New Start" funds, and
 - An appropriation of \$66 million to IMAX in the FY 2001 appropriations bill.
 - B. **SOUTH CORRIDOR:** The region will pursue Segment #2, the South Corridor Project, as follows:
 - Beginning with the FY 2001 transit appropriations bill, seek \$2-\$5 million per year of Section 3 bus funding by working with the Oregon transit community to establish a statewide bus appropriations request which produces this amount of funding for South Corridor improvements.
 - Program the funds received for transit projects that can be constructed on a stand-alone basis, such as transit centers and park-and-rides, until such time as an overall corridor improvement is approved by the Region and the FTA and a Letter of No Prejudice (LONP) can be secured.
 - Fund Preliminary Engineering and environmental studies aimed at securing FTA approval of an overall corridor improvement from discretionary appropriation and available regional funds.
 - At the completion of environmental studies, seek a Letter of No Prejudice (LONP) from FTA for the corridor improvement program.
 - After completion of environmental studies, seek federal funds for the corridor improvement program. Pursue federal authorization of the overall corridor improvement program in the next authorization bill (starting FFY 2004) from Federal Transit "New Starts," Federal Transit "Bus," and/or Federal Highway "Demo" funds.

- While seeking federal funds, use local funds committed to the South Corridor program by Tri-Met and Clackamas County to construct elements of the overall corridor improvement and have such funds apply as local match, under the Letter of No Prejudice, to any federal dollars which are secured.

C. COMMUTER RAIL: The region will pursue the Washington county Commuter Rail Project as follows:

- Seek \$500,000 to \$1,000,000 in New Starts preliminary engineering funds for commuter Rail in the FY 2001 transit appropriations bill from the eight percent set aside for alternative analysis and preliminary engineering.
- At the completion of planning and environmental studies, seek FTA approval of the Commuter Rail Project.
- After completion of environmental studies, seek federal funds for the Commuter Rail. The region will consider seeking New Start Funds of \$25 million depending on the status of New Start funding for IMAX.

D. I-5 TRADE CORRIDOR:

- The region will pursue FFY 2001 appropriation for selected stand-alone improvement segments along I-5 as the Trade Corridor Study continues its Phase II activities, within the context of the multi-modal strategy accepted in Phase I.

E. OTHER ISSUES WE MAY WANT TO TAKE A POSITION ON:

- Columbia River Channel deepening appropriation.
- Discretionary bridge funding for Willamette River bridges.
- FAA reauthorization to ensure Airport MAX is not jeopardized.
- Funding for a South Amtrak Station
- Central City Streetcar

AC:DF:rmb

(It remains JPACT policy that the South/No
Corridor, of which IMAX is the first segment,
is the Region's long term priority
for high capacity transit
services.)

DRAFT

If George +
Dick
were
here

November 16, 1999

Oregon Congressional Delegation

On behalf of the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), I am writing to update you on the status of the Interstate MAX light rail project (IMAX) and ask for your support of federal fiscal year 2001 construction funding for the project.

Metro submitted the IMAX Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) to the Federal Transit Administration, and on November 5th notice on the FEIS was published in the Federal Register. In addition, Metro recently adopted the Land Use Final Order for the project, establishing the necessary land use authorizations for construction of IMAX. In recent weeks, the regional funding partners for the project - Metro, the City of Portland and Tri-Met - have all officially adopted the proposed IMAX financing agreement. As a result, all approvals are complete.

The project is the region's top transportation priority for federal approvals and funding.
current or immediate
a a for

IMAX is now ready to move forward to construction, starting in the fall of 2000. JPACT hopes that the delegation will support the following actions over the next few months.

1. Federal Transit Administration approval of a Full Funding Grant Agreement and Authorization of \$257.5 million in Section 5309 "New Start" funds.
2. Inclusion of IMAX in the Administration's FY 2001 budget and an appropriation of \$66 million to IMAX in the FY 2001 appropriations bill.

We appreciate all of the work that you have done on our behalf in the past. The IMAX project has achieved the necessary technical and community support to move forward quickly to construction in 2000 if federal funding is available.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Jon Kvistad, Chair
Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)

The South/North Corridor is the region's top priority for high capacity transit service. Segment #1 the Imax light rail project to the north, is the region's immediate transportation priority for federal approvals and funding.

Corridor Map




WASHINGTON COUNTY
COMMUTER RAIL STUDY



Wilsonville to Beaverton Commuter Rail

Alternatives Analysis and Environmental Assessment



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study, made possible through funding by the 1997 Oregon Legislature, was initiated to answer the question of whether a commuter rail operation in the Wilsonville to Beaverton corridor offers a transportation solution significant enough to warrant the required capital and operating cost investments. The study was commissioned by jurisdictions located in the eastern portion of Washington County interested in exploring all possible options for addressing the rapidly increasing traffic congestion on facilities such as I-5 and Highway 217. The concept being evaluated is the use of the existing freight rail line, which generally parallels I-5 and Highway 217, for passenger rail service.

Commuter rail ... a definition

Commuter rail commonly refers to passenger rail service operated on rail lines which currently or in the past have served as heavy freight railroad lines. Although commuter rail operations have existed for decades in some metropolitan areas, only recently has it seen a substantial resurgence as regions heavily impacted by traffic congestion look for lower cost solutions. Dallas, San Diego, Los Angeles, Seattle, Sacramento and Vancouver BC are but a few of the communities where commuter rail has recently been initiated or is in the process of being implemented. The service in most applications focuses on the peak period commute, although a number of mature systems offer service all day.

Commuter rail operations usually serve longer trips and have stations spaced at a greater distance than typical for a light rail system. Commuter rail cost advantages are the result of use of existing right of way and freight rail improvements. Vehicles used in commuter rail projects vary substantially, from double decked locomotive pulled units to light weight single diesel units resembling light rail cars.



Commuter Rail vehicle near Denny Road in Beaverton

Previous study

A previous study titled the Washington County Interurban Rail Feasibility Study, Phase I, was completed in May 1997. The purpose of the study was to determine if there were technical, regulatory or legal issues which would prevent implementation of a commuter rail operation in the corridor. The following findings were reported:

- No design or engineering obstacles exist which would prevent a commuter rail operation in the corridor
- Improvements would have to be made to the current rail facilities. Stations, park and ride lots and a maintenance facility would have to be built
- The required capital costs for this corridor were anticipated to be near the lower end of recent experience in implementing similar projects
- Corridor trip characteristics suggest service should be bi-directional
- Commuter Rail travel time would be comparable to the average auto travel time and less than parallel bus service
- Estimated ridership of 1,820 in year 2000 and 2,290 in year 2015 is within the range of experience of commuter rail operations in North America, although at the lower end of the scale
- No legal issues that appear insurmountable were discovered


In summary, no fatal flaws which would prevent the project from being implemented

were discovered during the study completed in May 1997. The study provided the basis for a funding request to the Legislature to undertake the current Phase II study which is to provide a more detailed assessment of the possible implementation of commuter rail in the corridor.

Project Description

The proposed project would run from Wilsonville to Beaverton, connecting to the Westside light rail at one of two alternative locations; the Beaverton Transit Center or the Merlo Road Station. The distance is 15.3 miles to the Beaverton Transit Center and 17.8 miles to Merlo Road. The Northern 1/3 of the corridor is owned by the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), and the Southern 2/3 by the Oregon Department of Transportation. Freight rail service over the entire line is provided by the Portland & Western Railroad.

Stations are proposed to be located at:
 Wilsonville - serving residential and high employment areas



Wilsonville to Beaverton commuter rail corridor

- Tualatin - serving residential and the downtown area
- Tigard - serving the downtown area and the existing transit center
- Washington Square - serving employment and the regional shopping center
- *Central Beaverton - serving the downtown area and bus connections
- *Merlo Road - serving residential areas and connecting to light rail
- Beaverton Transit Center - serving the downtown and light rail connection

*only on the Merlo Road alternative

Corridor Condition Assessment

A detailed inspection was made of the existing railroad facilities to determine the condition of the track, crossings, bridges and structures. The line was determined to be generally in fair to good condition for the current level of service and train speeds.

Capital Improvement Plan

Rail - The report identifies specific improvements required to accommodate a 60 mph passenger operation (75 mph South of Tualatin). Selected rail replacement and improvements to ties, ballast, crossings and bridges/structures are identified. The plan calls for double-tracking between Lombard Street and the Bonita crossover, and adding sidings at Wilsonville and Merlo Road.

Signal System - To improve safety and operating efficiencies, a Centralized Traffic Control (CTC) system has been assumed for the entire line.

Stations - A prototypical station design was developed. Included is a 200-foot platform, a sheltered waiting area, benches, information



A typical commuter rail station

system and pedestrian/bike facilities. With the exception of the Beaverton Transit Center and Central Beaverton, all stations have park and ride spaces; 752 for the Merlo Road alternative and 652 for the Beaverton Transit Center alternative.

Beaverton Transit Center Alignment - The Beaverton Transit Center alternative represents a special case because it involves construction of a new track alignment of approximately 2,000 feet between the intersection of the UPRR and Farmington Road and the Beaverton Transit Center. The alignment would be located in the center of a reconstructed Lombard Street and would require modification of the signals at Beaverton-Hillsdale and Canyon Road and a new signal at Broadway.

Maintenance Facility - The recommended location for a maintenance/storage facility is in Tigard, south of Hall Blvd. near Wall Street. The facility will be designed to accommodate inspection, cleaning, storage, operator report and minor maintenance functions. Major maintenance functions and repair are recommended to be contracted to outside vendors.

Vehicles

The report reviews the full range of vehicles potentially available for use including locomotive-hauled cars and self-propelled cars. The features and characteristics of each vehicle type are described and estimated procurement costs identified. Based on the capacity requirements, operating flexibility and suitability for in-street operation if the Beaverton Transit Center alternative is selected, the recommendation is to pursue as a first priority new FRA-compliant Diesel Multiple Units (DMU) technology. These vehicles are self-propelled, can operate as individual cars or in sets of multiple cars and are designed to allow operation on lines with existing freight operation. A second choice

would be to pursue refurbished Rail Diesel Cars (RDC) which would represent the least cost option, if enough suitable cars can be located. An inappropriate option, given existing and projected freight rail operations, would be diesel-powered light rail cars.

Capital Cost Estimates

Cost estimates were developed based on current unit costs for similar construction. Vehicle costs were based on the most recent industry experience. All costs are stated in 1998 dollars. The following tables provide

SUMMARY OF COSTS - BEAVERTON TRANSIT CENTER ALTERNATIVE

ITEM	COSTS
Track, Structures, Crossing, Signal Improvements	\$38,726,760
Stations, Park and Ride Lots	5,308,240
Dispatch Center and Radio System	1,250,000
Maintenance Facility	2,200,000
Vehicles ¹	17,500,000 - 24,000,000
Total Cost	\$64,990,000 - 71,490,000

(1) 7 or 8 cars at a cost range of \$2.5 to 3.0 Million.

SUMMARY OF COSTS - MERLO STATION ALTERNATIVE

ITEM	COSTS
Track, Structures, Crossing, Signal Improvements	\$36,540,000
Stations, Park and Ride Lots	6,019,000
Dispatch Center and Radio System	1,250,000
Maintenance Facility	2,200,000
Vehicles ¹	22,500,000 - 30,000,000
Total Cost	\$68,509,000 - 76,009,000

(1) 9 or 10 cars at a cost range of \$2.5 to 3.0 Million.

estimates for the two alternatives under consideration; Beaverton Transit Center and Merlo Road. A range of costs were developed for the vehicle portion of the costs reflecting the limited North American acquisition experience for such vehicles and fluxuation of the number of cars required. The Beaverton Transit Center option is less expensive due primarily to the reduced length which requires fewer cars to operate the same service frequency.

Operations Plan

Operating plans were developed for both the Beaverton Transit Center and Merlo Road alternatives. For both alternatives, DMU technology was used to develop travel time

and schedules. Train frequency was established at 30 minutes, in both the north and southbound directions. Planned service hours are from 5:30 to 9:00 am and 3:30 to 7:00 pm. The maximum operating speed is 60 mph north of Tualatin and 75 mph south of Tualatin. The travel time from Wilsonville to Merlo Station is 31 minutes with an average speed of 34 mph. From Wilsonville to Beaverton Transit Center travel time is 25 minutes at an average speed of 37 mph. Four train sets will be required to operate the Merlo service, and three for the Beaverton Transit Center.

Annual Operating Costs

Based on the operating plan which establishes operating hours, service miles and equipment requirements, annual operating costs for each alternative were developed.

The operating costs are based on the current ownership in the corridor. With public ownership of the entire corridor some operating expenses such as access fees and liability insurance would likely be less than indicated in the following table.

ANNUAL OPERATING COSTS

COSTS	BTC	Merlo
Train operators	\$904,000	\$1,202,000
Equipment maintenance	\$592,000	\$717,000
Track maintenance / Access charges	\$341,000	\$378,000
Station maintenance	\$385,200	\$443,200
Insurance	\$804,000	\$804,000
General and administrative	\$850,000	\$850,000
Total	\$3,876,200	\$4,394,200


Operating Revenues

The primary source of funds for operating the service other than public or public/private funding sources will be the fare structure established for users of the commuter rail service. A broad range of options from no fares to a premium fare structure were explored. The recommended option is to

integrate the fare structure with the Tri-Met system which currently would result in a flat fare of \$1.10. This approach would simplify use of the system and emphasize the commuter rail line as an element of an integrated transportation system. Other potential revenue sources associated with operation of the service could include advertising, sponsorship of vehicles or stations, charter operations and possibly charges for parking at park and ride lots. These latter sources would likely provide a marginal amount of revenue. Other items such as easements, fiber optics, subsurface rights and trackage rights represent potential sources of revenues if the corridor is in public ownership and an agreement exists that such revenues would be dedicated to offsetting operating expenses.

Project Cost Effectiveness

Commuter rail in the Wilsonville to Beaverton corridor represents a low capital cost option for providing a time-competitive travel option which connects a number of the Washington County 2040 Framework Plan designated regional and town centers. The cost per route mile is substantially lower than either expanding adjacent highway facilities



or building light rail. The cost of increasing the system capacity would also be less than other options. Because the ridership levels are lower, the per passenger operating cost is greater than light rail, but due to the line's relatively short length its costs are less than comparable commuter rail systems in North America.

Project Funding

The commuter rail project is potentially eligible for funding through numerous federal, state and local sources. The study does not rank the project with respect to other regional or local priorities.

Land Use and Transportation Plans

Metro's Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) has endorsed inclusion of the Wilsonville-Beaverton line into the revised Regional Transportation Plan. The line serves the designated regional centers of central Beaverton and Washington Square and town centers at Tigard, Tualatin and Wilsonville. The project is consistent with both the Portland region and State of Oregon policies which encourage increasing the number of mobility options. A review of local transportation and land use plans did not identify any significant conflicts with the proposed project.

Environmental Review

The study was to determine if any "fatal flaws" from an environmental standpoint exist which would suggest the project should not proceed or would require substantial expense to mitigate. ODOT and consultant team members conducted an analysis of cultural/historic resources, wetlands/water resources, threatened and endangered species, hazardous materials and 4(f) properties. None of these areas exhibited impacts which would suggest the project could not

successfully move ahead. The work does indicate that a full environmental assessment will be required.

Institutional Considerations

Implementation of a commuter rail operation will require resolution of the appropriate entities to serve in the roles of owner, operator and manager of the system. In many cases the roles are split between existing jurisdictions, newly formed entities and contractors. The most common arrangement for smaller new operations such as the Wilsonville to Beaverton line is to contract significant portions or all of the operating and maintenance functions. The report concludes that the complexities of developing the line and implementing service would be simplified if the entire line were under public ownership.

Demonstration Project

Development of a full demonstration project is not recommended. In order to develop a service which reasonably representative of the travel time, station locations, access and passenger amenities important to a successful operation a substantial capital and operating investment would be required. Excursion type service such as provided on September 12 and 13, 1998 in conjunction with the Westside Light Rail opening has helped to develop public awareness and demonstrated a public interest in such service.

DATE: November 10, 1999

TO: JPACT

FR: Andy Cotugno, Metro
Kate Deane, ODOT

RE: Bonding Projects

Based on the feedback we received at the public comment meetings and discussions with jurisdictions about their priorities, we are recommending the attached list of projects to JPACT for your consideration at the November 18, 1999, meeting. This list is 135% of the amount available to Region 1. There are \$256 million worth of projects on the list; however, the Region 1 target is \$189 million.

This list is for JPACT to discuss, forwarding their final recommendation of projects to the OTC at their December 9, 1999, meeting.

AC:KD

Attc.

C:\Cotugno\JPACTmemoreODOTbondpgm.doc

ODOT/Metro Proposed Bonding List (135%)

Project #	Name	Cost in Millions
1	US 26: 217-Murray	\$24
2	Hwy 217: TV to 26	21
3	Columbia/Killingsworth/87th Ave	24
4	Clackamas Industrial Connector	73
6	Tualatin-Sherwood Expressway (MIS)	2
7	US 30: Swedetown - Lost Creek (Columbia County)	9
8	US 26: 217-Camelot	12
9	Hwy 99E: Hwy 224 - River Road (Milualkie)	2
10	Sandy Blvd (12th -57th)	17
12	South Portland Circulation	21
13	I-5: Greeley Ave to I-84/Lloyd Dist Access EIS	5
14	Barbur Blvd. (Alice St. to Capitol Hill Rd.)	3
16	242nd Avenue Connector	25
17	I-5: Delta Park to Lombard	13
new	Cornelius Gateway Enhancement	2.75
new	US 26: Wildwood to Wemme (Clackamas County)	2
	Total	\$255.75
	Region 1 Target	\$189.00
	Percent	135%



Oregon

John A. Kitzhaber, M.D., Governor

Department of Transportation

Region 1
123 NW Flanders
Portland, OR 97209-4037
(503) 731-8200
FAX (503) 731-8259

November 17, 1999

FILE CODE:

To: JPACT

From: Kate Deane, ODOT

Subject: Update of the Region 1 Supplemental STIP Process

Public Outreach

Over the course of the last month, Region 1 held six public comment meetings on the Supplemental STIP. Four of the meetings were held in the Portland metropolitan area, and one meeting each was held in Rainer and Hood River. The Portland area meetings were held in conjunction with Metro and were joint meetings to receive public comment on both the Supplemental STIP and the Regional Transportation Plan. Approximately 130 people attended the six meetings.

Status of the Region 1 Project List

Following the completion of the public meetings, ODOT's Region 1 office developed a list of projects that we recommend *continue to be considered for construction with bond funds*. This list was developed based on feedback during the public comment period and discussions with jurisdictions about priorities. This list was then reviewed with Metro. A short and long version of this list are attached.

The attached list represents a first cut to 135% of the amount available to Region 1. There are \$256 million worth of projects on the list, however, the Region 1 target is \$189 million. The following are some of the highlights of the list:

- Projects 1-4 and 6-9 were on the original ODOT project list. These projects continue to have a high level of jurisdictional and public support.
- Project #5, I-5: Greeley Ave. to N. Banfield (estimated cost \$92 million), was not recommended for funding by JPACT because the project could not be constructed within the 6 year timeframe and because the local jurisdiction does not support the current project design. This project is not recommended by ODOT.
- Project 13 is an EIS for the I-5: Greeley Ave. to N. Banfield and the Lloyd District area. This project will allow ODOT, the City of Portland and the community to come to consensus on both the freeway design and improvements to the local street network adjacent to the freeway.



- Projects 10, 12 and 14 are strongly supported by the City of Portland and likewise received support during the public comment period. These projects include three boulevard projects (Sandy Blvd., South Portland Circulation and Barbur Blvd.) in which district highways would be reconstructed with more main street features. Jurisdiction of the road would be turned over to the City as part of the agreement to fund these projects on the Sandy Blvd and South Portland Circulation projects.
- Projects 11 and 15 are not recommended for funding because the other projects within the City of Portland are of a higher priority to this jurisdiction.
- Project 16 is strongly supported by Multnomah County and cities in east Multnomah County. It also received support during the public meetings. This project will provide a more direct connection between I-84 and US 26.
- Project 17 is strongly supported by the jurisdictions and the public in Clark County, Washington. This project has emerged in the I-5 Trade Corridor Study as one of four critical bottlenecks. The first phase of the Study will be complete in December 1999.
- Project 18 is not recommended for funding because the other projects within Clackamas and Washington counties are of higher priority for those jurisdictions.
- Project 19 was identified through the public comment meetings. The Cornelius Gateway Enhancement project will allow for completion of main street treatment of Tualatin-Valley Highway as it passes through Cornelius. This is a project that the Region 1 Community Solutions Team has been working to get constructed.
- Project 20 and 21 were also identified through the public comment meetings. These projects are located in the eastern side of the Region 1 area, outside of the Portland metropolitan area. The original list contained no projects in this area.

Recommended Next Steps

ODOT and Metro recommended that Region 1 work with the OTC members prior to the December JPACT meeting to craft a 100% list that has OTC input. At the December 9, 1999 meeting JPACT would then consider a 100% list and either accept that list or suggest revisions. The list adopted at the December 9, 1999 meeting will then be forwarded to the Oregon Transportation Commission for their approval in January.

ODOT/Metro Proposed Bonding List (135%)

Project #	Name	Cost in Millions
1	US 26: 217-Murray	\$24
2	Hwy 217: TV to 26	21
3	Columbia/Killingsworth/87th Ave	24
4	Clackamas Industrial Connector	73
6	Tualatin-Sherwood Expressway (MIS)	2
7	US 30: Swedetown - Lost Creek (Columbia County)	8.5
8	US 26: 217-Camelot	12
9	Hwy 99E: Hwy 224 - River Road (Milwaukie)	2
10	Sandy Blvd (12th -57th)	17
12	South Portland Circulation	21
13	I-5: Greeley Ave to I-84/Lloyd Dist Access EIS	5
14	Barbur Blvd. (Alice St. to Capitol Hill Rd.)	3
16	242nd Avenue Connector	25
17	I-5: Delta Park to Lombard	13
19	Cornelius Gateway Enhancement	2.75
20	US 26: Wildwood to Wemme (Clackamas County)	2
21	Pacific Ave and 12th (Hood River)	0.5
Total		\$255.75
Region 1 Target		\$189.00
Percent		135%

PROJECTS PROPOSED FOR BONDING *

Region 1

	Project Name	County	Route or Highway Name	Current Construction Cost Estimate **	Notes	Recommend for 135% list.
1	US 26: OR 217 to Murray Blvd. with Barnes Road Ramp. Adds lanes EB and WB, restores Barnes Road on-ramp, and improves Cedar Hills interchange.	Washington	Sunset Hwy., US-26	\$24,000,000	This project has been identified by Washington County and the City of Beaverton as a priority.	Yes
2	Hwy 217: Tualatin Valley Hwy to HWY 26 - improves interchange	Washington	Beaverton-Tigard Hwy., OR-217	\$21,000,000	This project has been identified by JPACT as a regional priority. It is a deferred element of Westside Corridor Project	Yes
3	Columbia/Killingsworth/87th Avenue connection; improves Port of Portland freight access and access from South Airport to I-205 (Port of Portland)	Multnomah	Northeast Portland Hwy, US 30B	\$24,500,000	This project has been identified by JPACT as a regional priority.	Yes
4	Clackamas Industrial Connection - I-205 to 135th: Extend the Milwaukie Expressway over I-205 to join Hwy 212/224 at 145th.	Clackamas	new alignment of Hwy 224 - the Milwaukie Expressway	\$72,500,000	Project limits have been revised. Project will end at approximately 135th, not 145th as originally described.	Yes
5	I-5: Greeley Ave. to N. Banfield/ Lloyd District Rose Quarter Access	Multnomah	Pacific Hwy., I-5	\$92,000,000	This project cannot be constructed in 6 years and is not recommended by JPACT. Please see project #13, that is proposed as a replacement.	No
6	Tualatin-Sherwood Expressway - conduct Major Investment Study (EIS) for roadway between I-5 and 99W	Washington	new alignment	\$2,000,000	JPACT and ODOT recommend conducting a Major Investment Study (MIS) instead of an EIS as originally proposed. The MIS will better define the alternatives that should be examined in an EIS.	Yes
7	US 30: Swedetown to Lost Creek - safety improvements; widen shoulders, extend climbing lane, left turn lane at Lingberg (Carlson) Road.	Columbia	Lower Columbia River Hwy., US-30	\$8,500,000		Yes
8	US 26: OR 217 to Camelot - Complete widening of US 26 to 3 lanes in each direction by adding an eastbound lane.	Washington	Sunset Hwy., US-26	\$11,500,000	This project has been identified by JPACT as a regional priority. It is a deferred element of Westside Corridor Project	Yes
9	99E: Hwy. 224 to River Rd. - improve McLoughlin Blvd. through downtown Milwaukie	Clackamas	Pacific Hwy. E., OR-99E	\$1,700,000	This project received an allocation through the MTIP 2000 process that will fund right of way acquisition. This funding applies to construction.	Yes
10	Sandy Modernization (12th to 57th Avenue) - Reconstruct Sandy to Main Street design guidelines.	Multnomah	Northeast Portland Hwy, US 30B	\$17,000,000	This project includes transfer of Sandy Blvd from ODOT to the City of Portland.	Yes
11	SW Clay/Market Reconstruction between Naito Parkway and I-405: Reconstruct US 26 thru Downtown Portland.	Multnomah	US 26	\$5,000,000	<i>This project is not recommended to JPACT for the 135% list.</i> This project includes transfer of Clay and Market from ODOT to the City of Portland.	No
12	South Portland Circulation Phase I: Improve local connections to redevelopment area.	Multnomah	SW Naito Parkway	\$21,000,000	This project includes transfer of Naito Parkway from ODOT to the City of Portland.	Yes
13	I-5: Greeley Ave to I-84/Lloyd Dist. Access: Conduct EIS to develop I-5 design between I-84 and Greeley Avenue and local street design in adjacent project area.	Multnomah	Pacific Hwy., I-5	\$5,000,000	JPACT recommends this project as a substitute for project #5.	Yes
14	Barbur Modernization (Alice St. to Capitol Hill Road): Demonstration Project: Reconstruct Barbur to Main Street design guidelines.	Multnomah	Pacific Hwy. W., 99W	\$3,000,000	This project is recommended to be scaled back. The original project was \$13,000,000.	Yes
15	Lombard Modernization: I-5 to St. Johns Bridge: Reconstruct segments to Main Street design guidelines.	Multnomah	Northeast Portland Hwy, US 30B	\$20,000,000	<i>This project is not recommended to JPACT for the 135% list.</i> This project includes transfer of Lombard from ODOT to the City of Portland.	No
16	242nd Avenue Connector: I-84 to Stark: Change alignment of 242nd connection to I-84.	Multnomah	Columbia River Highway, I-84; extension of 242nd Ave	\$25,000,000		Yes
17	I-5 (Delta Park to Lombard): Widen I-5 freeway to 3 lanes in each direction.	Multnomah	Pacific Hwy., I-5	\$13,000,000		Yes
18	I-5/Hwy 217/Kruse Way Interchange - Ph. 2	Washington & Clackamas	Pacific Hwy., I-5	\$35,000,000	<i>This project is not recommended to JPACT for the 135% list.</i>	No
19	US 26: Wildwood to Wemme	Clackamas	US 26	\$2,000,000	This project was identified through public comment meetings in Hood River County. ODOT has a petition for this safety project signed by 300 persons.	Yes
20	Comilius Gateway Enhancement Project	Washington	Tualatin Valley Hwy	\$2,750,000	This project was identified through public comment meetings and in conversations with jurisdictions.	Yes
21	Pacific Ave. and 12th	Hood River		\$500,000	This project was identified through public comment meetings and in conversations with jurisdictions.	Yes
Total Estimated Construction Cost				\$406,450,000		
135% List Estimated Construction Cost				\$254,450,000		
Amount Available in Region 1				\$189,000,000		

* Projects 1-9 were originally proposed by ODOT. Projects 10-18 are supplemental projects to the ODOT list added by JPACT.

** Cost estimates are under review and should be considered draft.

it provides for stop-work orders and fines of as much as \$1,000 a day for violators.

Saltzman's amendment includes all machine digging in the ordinance, not just digs that require permits through the Bureau of Buildings.

But small-scale violators would receive only an educational visit from a Bureau of Environmental Services worker, Saltzman said, and wouldn't be fined even if they didn't mend their ways.

Hales said he's skeptical about the extent of the erosion problem from nonconstruction activities.

The Unified Sewerage Agency in Washington County has taken the same basic approach since 1990 without problems, agency officials say.

Saltzman said he expects about 200 erosion complaints a year.

The final vote on the amended ordinance is scheduled for Wednesday, with the ordinance taking effect in March.

QUOTABLE

"If people are going to hose away their gardens, and it's going to go into our storm sewers, and we have to pay to get it out, I think that's an issue."

— Commissioner
Dan Saltzman

OTHER ACTION

The council also:

◆ Voted 4-0 to approve a resolution opposing any efforts in Congress to overturn Oregon's assisted-suicide law. Commissioner Jim Francesconi, a devout Catholic, would have had a tough call to make on the issue given Catholic opposition to assisted suicide. But Francesconi was absent Wednesday, traveling in Japan.

◆ Approved a \$50,000 contract with Global Action Plan for the Earth to provide a sustainable-lifestyle campaign for Portland residents.

— Scott Learn

Street youths assail City Hall, claim

The mayor talks to them briefly, and others sign their petitions as they prepare for a campout Wednesday

By PETER FARRELL
THE OREGONIAN

About 30 youths, some of whom said they have lived on Portland streets for years, complained Wednesday to Mayor Vera Katz that Portland police officers are harassing them, sometimes physically abusing them.

The mayor talked briefly with the group members as they prepared to camp out for the night under the portico of City Hall. She

asked them to write a letter for an appointment so she could set up a meeting to discuss the issues. Katz is police commissioner.

Dozens of people going in and out of City Hall signed a petition asking for an end to the harassment.

"Most of us are what we call 'old school' and have been on the street for a while, and we're doing this to protect the 'newbies,'" said Renee McDonald, 16, who talked to the mayor. She said a similar protest eight years ago brought some relief for street youths.

Holly Baugh, 19, who said she has lived on the street for most of the past eight years, said that when they sleep under bridges or in parks, some police officers will kick

them in the head to wake the
"Most of us come from ex-abusive backgrounds and a the street to get away from a Baugh said.

Detective Sgt. Mike Hefley, a formation officer for the Portland Police Bureau, said he could respond to the general actions, but that the bureau provide ways for anyone to complain about police conduct.

Several of the youths said they had the names of officers who mistreated street youths.

"We aren't saying all the police are bad," Baugh said. "It's just some that harass us. We want to see them disciplined."

Multnomah County administration programs that serve Por

THE OREGONIAN
THURS., NOV. 18, 1999

METRO AREA ROUNDUP

PORTLAND

Second round of bids creates hope for I-5/217 interchange

Oregon transportation officials will try today for the second time to launch a reconstruction of one of the state's busiest and most congested freeway interchanges.

If all goes as planned, a face-lift of Interstate 5 at its interchange with Oregon 217 could begin as early as next spring. The project's first phase is scheduled to take about two years.

The first attempt to award a contract, estimated at \$35 million, stalled in June when only one private construction company submitted a bid. It was at least 10 percent higher than state officials had anticipated, prompting the decision to wait until the busy summer construction season was over before trying again.

Bids from interested companies are scheduled to be opened this morning in Salem.

Motorists, as well as merchants

along the frontage road facing the interchange, say they can't wait for the project to get under way. Any slowdowns caused by the construction, they add, will be worthwhile if the completed project improves traffic flow.

The interchange carries more than 141,000 automobiles a day toward destinations in Portland, Beaverton, Lake Oswego and Wilsonville.

Continuing residential and business growth in the suburbs feeding into the interchange is projected to add 50,000 more cars a day within 20 years, according to state estimates.

Police investigate shootings of two Tuesday night in NE

Portland police are investigating two Tuesday night shootings in Northeast Portland that left a 29-year-old man and a 40-year-old woman hospitalized.

About 9:15 p.m., Mallaan Saffron was shot while in a rear parking lot of an apartment complex in the 5800 block of Northeast Sixth Avenue, said Detective Sgt. Mi-

chael Hefley, a Portland Police Bureau spokesman.

A friend drove Saffron to the east Precinct, where he was by ambulance to a Portland hospital. Saffron was in fair condition Wednesday with wounds to his lower torso, a spokeswoman said.

At 10:34 p.m., Kimberly Cophy was shot while in the southeast Precinct on Northeast 10th Avenue and Worth Street. She suffered a facial wound to her right lower lip and was in good condition, a spokeswoman said.

Although the shootings occurred near the same time, "we don't know if the two are connected," Hefley said. "Detectives are looking to see if there are any similarities."

TROUTDALE

Native American artifact halts construction of plant

The discovery of what is believed to be a Native American artifact has halted the construction of a manufacturing plant along No-