MEETING: JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION
DATE: September 13, 2001
DAY: Thursday
TIME: 7:30 a.m.
PLACE: Metro Conference Room 370A and B

1. Call to Order and Declaration of a Quorum.

2. Citizen communications to JPACT on non-agenda items

*3. Minutes of August 9, 2001 meeting – APPROVAL REQUESTED

** 4. Staff Report and Resolution No. 01-3098 – For the Purpose of Amending the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program to Allocate FY 2004 – 2005 Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) and Surface Transportation Program (STP) Funds (100% Recommendation) – APPROVAL REQUESTED – Andy Cotugno

5. Adjourn

* Material available electronically. Please call 503-797-1755 for a paper copy.
** Not all material on this agenda item is available electronically.

All material will be available at the meeting.
How to get to Metro Regional Center

600 NE Grand Ave. • 797-1700

Legend

- = bus route

00 = bus number

= freeway

= max

= street

= bus/max stop

( ) = public parking

Enter Metro visitor parking from Irving Street (time limit 4 hours per visit). Enter Metro Regional Center from the plaza.
At the JPACT meeting held on September 13, 2001, two corrections were requested before final approval of the August 9, 2001 meeting notes. They were as follows:

1) Roy Rogers requested a correction on page 8, first paragraph — 
   “... they have a $1 ½ billion budget.” Should read 
   “...they have a $1/2 billion budget.”

2) Fred Hansen requested a correction on page 4, the paragraph should read as follows —
   “Fred Hansen said that $16 million was originally requested for TCL but not granted. $6.4 million would be needed to fund existing TCL programs and accomplish requested expansions. Tri-Met has additional projects that it would like to pursue, but will need additional funds to do so.”
Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

August 9, 2001

Meeting Notes

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rod Monroe, Chair</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou Ogden</td>
<td>City of Tualatin, representing Cities of Washington County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Park</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Kennemer</td>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Hansen</td>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Rohde</td>
<td>City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Van Sickel</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) – Region 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royce Pollard</td>
<td>City of Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Havercamp</td>
<td>City of Gresham, representing Cities of Multnomah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Legry, alternate</td>
<td>Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonnie Roberts</td>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Rogers</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette Liebe, alternate</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Drake</td>
<td>City of Beaverton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Bragdon, alternate</td>
<td>Metro Council, Presiding Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GUESTS PRESENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave Williams</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Williams</td>
<td>Citizens for Sensible Transportation/CLF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Papsdorf</td>
<td>City of Gresham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Rist</td>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernie Bottomly</td>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susie Lahnese</td>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Peterson</td>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Ornelias</td>
<td>Oregon Health and Sciences University (OHSU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Newman</td>
<td>City of Milwaukie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Brandon</td>
<td>City of Happy Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Dotterrer</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike McKillip</td>
<td>City of Tualatin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Lehan</td>
<td>City of Wilsonville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Floyd</td>
<td>City of Wilsonville/SMART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brion Barnett</td>
<td>City of Milwaukie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Cowan</td>
<td>City of Wilsonville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeky Blizzard</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephan Lashbrook</td>
<td>City of Wilsonville</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GUESTS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ramsay Whaite</td>
<td>Washington County MTAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Angelo</td>
<td>Angelo Eaton &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Atteberry</td>
<td>Westside Economic Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta DeToledo</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Calver</td>
<td>Parsons Brinckerhoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal McFarlane</td>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Weinman</td>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April Siebenaler</td>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Paine</td>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Lasley</td>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark Berry</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Stewart</td>
<td>The Oregonian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andy Cotugno</td>
<td>Mike Hoglund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina Whitehill-Baziuk</td>
<td>Marilyn Matteson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Whisler</td>
<td>Renee Castilla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Brandman</td>
<td>Tom Kloster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Leybold</td>
<td>Kim White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY

The meeting was called to order and a quorum was declared by Chair Rod Monroe at 7:36 a.m.

No public comments.

MEETING REPORT

Action taken: The July 12, 2001 meeting minutes were unanimously approved with the following correction and notation: on page 15, 2nd paragraph, Dammasch corrected to Damascus and Karl Rohde requested his name be spelled consistently and correctly.

MTIP POLICY ISSUES FROM METRO COUNCIL AND JPACT – DIRECTION TO TPAC – DISCUSSION

Andy Cotugno stated he had several things to refer to, but that first he would start with the big pink packet and then move on to the MTIP items: memo from the Metro Council answering policy questions that were raised by TPAC in a memo to JPACT and a list of House Bill 2142 candidate projects. Andy Cotugno raised a question concerning exactly how much MTIP money JPACT wants to allocate to bond eligible projects.
Andy Cotugno stated that Attachment 1, the TPAC analysis of the Metro Council’s comments refer to the Attachment 5 survey of where JPACT members would allocate MTIP funds. There is currently $68 million worth of project requests for MTIP funds and the question is how to get that $68 million down to $38 million.

He stated that a TPAC recommended “150% Cut List” was attached.

Andy asked the JPACT members to analyze the list of projects, rank and eliminate projects and get made recommendations back to staff so it can go back to TPAC and then on to JPACT as a final program recommendation in September.

Karl Rohde stated that the transit projects appeared twice and that the planning projects did not appear. They each had separate descriptions but are not labeled correctly.

Andy Cotugno replied that the summary descriptions should be the same as the tabular list of the cut list projects and that a corrected copy of the summary list would be provided before the end of the meeting. Andy Cotugno wanted to emphasize that after completing the survey chart, the “keep” projects may not total more than $38 million. He stated that also attached is the summary of various public comments. Andy Cotugno wanted to reiterate when members are considering projects, please remember what is funded and what is not funded, that most of the time we need to spend on the issues and that the committee needs to concur with what TPAC is suggesting or revise accordingly.

In Attachment 1, TPAC identified the Highway 217 and Powell Street Corridors, as the two prospective corridors to which the $600,000 requested for “Corridor Study” would be allocated. The question put by TPAC is whether allocating $600,000 of regional funds to corridors sets a precedent since there are other sources that could be used for corridor studies. Because of the shortage of funds it has become a necessity to use these funds. There is no local or state money to begin the planning. The bond measure will pay only for implementation of projects. Tri-Met has funded Corridor Studies, ODOT has before…therefore Andy Cotugno stated that it is his position that it is not necessarily setting a precedent but it may be a necessity due to limited funding.

Lonnie Roberts asked the members if they would define MTIP priority “road modernization” and “road reconstruction.”

Andy Cotugno replied that projects for modernization equal expansion with specific applications coming from different jurisdictions and road reconstruction is mostly the surface overlay.

Karl Rohde asked that since the current funding from MTIP for corridors is $600,000, was this the estimate for both corridor studies that will be completed in 2004 and 2005.

Andy Cotugno replied that it is a ballpark estimate of funds needed to conduct a single corridor study over two years, including another $600,000 of Metro planning funds (is a total need of $1.2 million per corridor).
Andy Cotugno asked if this funding source continues to be the funding source at $1.4 million a year. Tri-Met assisted with the funding of McLoughlin Corridor and Barbur Corridor, and used capital dollars on buses and the general fund on operating expenses. Approximately two years of those funds are already allocated and now two expansions have been proposed in Beaverton and Gresham at a 2-year cost of $2.8 million. What is the right approach for use of funds? Should the MTIP fund ongoing operation in addition to start up costs? TPAC is recommending that for transit, the purpose of MTIP funds should be for capital or service start-up costs: Tri-Met has already begun service improvements on McLoughlin and will be implementing improved service on Barbur this year from the 2000 allocation of MTIP funding. If JPACT agrees with TPAC’s recommendation, it should provide funding that allows Tri-Met to transition funding of the McLoughlin and Barbur service from other revenue sources. Another policy issue is whether there should be a fund established for pedestrian to transit projects resulting from plans developed between Tri-Met and local governments.

Fred Hansen stated that utilizing MTIP dollars for transit operations is reasonable if that service is a regional priority. Regarding the pedestrian to transit funding, he emphasized that Tri-Met did not want to make those decisions alone and prefers to work with local governments as partners. Tri-Met would make investments such as bus shelters and allow local government to invest in sidewalks and safe crossings. This allows the ability to maximize dollars, and it would be a regional team to help administer funds.

Royce Pollard asked whether there was an application for I-5/Delta Park improvements.

Andy Cotugno replied that it was not an application, that the engineering is being done now and it was never a part of the discussion for MTIP funding.

Rod Monroe asked is it eligible for Bond Measure funds and was answered yes by Andy Cotugno.

Robert Drake agreed with Fred Hansen on matching dollars, leveraging dollars, TCL process, the issue to wait for buses (top three and five issues), start up money on Barbur and match funding.

Karl Rohde asked of Fred Hansen if, with respect to the Gresham and Beaverton TCL requests, he is looking for startup funding as well as an ongoing commitment?

Fred Hansen answered that $16 million was needed for continuing efforts and $5.5 million on TLC. Tri-Met has road projects they would rather do and they can make up some of that. But it will depend on additional revenue. Tri-Met can expect a 1-½ percent increase of service hours to absorb new TCL operation costs but this takes away any expansion of other service in the region. When things go back to TPAC, there needs to be a lot more conversation about what the tradeoffs will be.

Karl Rohde asked if initial startup costs can’t be covered but once rolling would be as a start up fund.

Fred Hansen replied that it would depend on money. Legally where they are able to put out
current 1 1/4 increase in hours of service, extensions to Gresham and various other places. Tri-Met doesn’t have dollars left to continue McLoughlin and Barbur. These are the choices that can be made. The Tri-Met Board did their part by raising a nickel on the fare and raised $1.6 million to match MTIP funds to provide the additional service.

Karl Rohde stated that Tri-Met will see money when the FTA money comes down for the region. He asked Mr. Hansen whether Tri-Met would use this money to fund ongoing operation of existing lines?

Fred Hansen stated that they want to expand service faster than the Tri-Met revenue base currently allows. The priority is on ongoing operational expenditure but they need to work that through the next several years.

Rod Monroe asked Fred Hansen if Tri-Met could live with the TPAC recommendation.

Fred Hansen replied that yes they could since it will be a split view decision from JPACT and not a Tri-Met decision.

Andy Cotugno asked which of these MTEP applications could be funded through the House Bill 2142 funds source and how does that effect the rest of the applications.

Andy Cotugno stated that on this list they need more detail on bond measure for possible funding, there are 20-25 different projects and a couple that might be MTIP projects; for example, the bond measure provides money to improve district highways transferred from ODOT to local government. The Farmington project would do exactly that. Pavement for preservation may not be technically eligible, but the North I-5 works is a modernization project to increase lane and interchange capacities. Whether it becomes a priority is another question. Two projects as possible crossovers have been Sunrise, (application for $4 million) and Sunset Highway, (PE application). These are not very good projects for the Bond funds because they are farther out, with a lot of question marks before they can go to construction. They should stay in the MTIP process because they wouldn’t do well under the bond measure funding.

Lou Ogden asked that the cut list table clarify what projects meet the criteria for the ODOT Bond money. On the modernization side, why wouldn’t you expand the pot to include the MTIP dollars and fit the projects to categories, such as preservation. That plus the $15 million, this group is the one that will decide.

Andy Cotugno replied that these two pots have been set-aside for different purposes. The bond measure relates to bridge and pavement rehabilitation and different kind of projects.

Lou Ogden asked what does it matter regarding the money. If you have a project that ranks high on the list and is eligible for state money then compete it - not through MTIP but through the Bond Measure program. It makes sense to make a predetermined commitment, to the extent that the project meets the criteria.

Rod Park stated that the decision is OTC’s but that OTC will rely heavily on JPACT for
assistance in making those decisions. But to remember that these are two different piles of money and we don’t have authority to obligate the bond measure money; only OTC can do that.

Rod Monroe said with the restrictions in place on both parts of the money, maybe some projects that are a higher priority but with limited funds would want to also pursue the OTC money.

Lou Ogden emphasized that the I-5 project could move from MTIP to OTC because it does not meet the state’s criteria for MTIP money.

Kay Van Sickel reminded the committee that there are added factors: the bonded money from HB 2142 allocation to the region is for the entire Region 1 area. Coming from the outside you have to be careful because the money goes to the commission as to what statewide allocation will be done.

Lou Ogden replied that the OTC Commission would rely heavily on JPACT and the Metro Council’s recommendations.

Andy Cotugno stated that that Boeckman Road in Wilsonville rated poorly because the road doesn’t exist within the 2040 point of view. The emphasis is on certain design types, regional centers, and town centers and industry areas. In extreme cases of urban areas, they treat that village like a town center and assign points on that basis. Is this a road that could relieve another road for traffic and safety and can the scoring be more closely related?

Charlotte Lehan stated that she was here mostly to answer questions and to talk about the policy shift to Boeckman road, which is critical. The commuter rail issues are very time sensitive, they are interviewing developers August 20 and 21 and they need to have the understanding that there is a regional commitment. 2040 shows that commitment, the city is prepared to commit, and the regional government seems interested as well as willing to commit. They are prepared to move forward immediately. The time sensitive issue on commuter rail needs to be tied down. Importance seems to fall on Washington and Clackamas Counties and other things get overlooked. South I-5 and South Metro corridor, its not considered a high priority compared to Sunrise and Sunset Highways. I-5 corridor going south is a critical junction - Wilsonville is not really the end but serves Canby and Salem and points south. Because South Metro corridor - Canby and Wilsonville is not considered a high priority and it services parts of Marion, Washington and Clackamas counties and it needs to have a commitment from the region.

David Bragdon stated to the committee that he has been in conversation with the community planning level on how criteria is applied and how it is viewed for this pot of money. Wilsonville should be included in the mix. Historically these types of things, intersections that are failing, move up slowly. Wilsonville is asking what are opportunities this money can unlock? The developers are putting in their money. They need to make retail work. There, its more than a road project; it is slowly moving through the process. When it is described as a corridor with more circulation that unlocks retail and housing - it starts to meet 2040 requirements.

Charlotte Lehan stated that the State of Oregon is on board with the 2040 goals to date and they are on board with knowledge of project importance, rather than just obtaining the most money
for land. Just in last month or so, the importance of this as the model project for regional and state has surfaced. Before property owner can become more engaged it needs to be demonstrated that Metro is also engaged.

Rod Monroe stated that the Metro Council was very active in not wanting a prison built on that site because it had potential for a 2040 village. They wrote letters and they were successful in that endeavor. It needs to be carried through and he is very supportive of the upgrading of those criteria. The date of the final cut would be September 13, 2001. Wilsonville would know firmly by then.

Rod Park stated that projects like these are a small example. The Gresham emphasis was on vision and what the land use was supposed to be and what it was supposed to support. And use of Civic Drive as an example of a project that anticipates land use changes. What land use is desired and how does this infrastructure support other uses we want to do. Adapting criteria is very important.

Larry Haverkamp asked the committee what was the difference between a town center and an urban village. Andy Cotugno replied that a town center is the downtown.

Andy Cotugno stated that there were additional TPAC questions. TPAC asked how the Metro Council priority list fits into this determination of TPAC/JPACT priorities. TPAC begins the process with JPACT developing the recommendations and submitting to Metro Council for approval. When did the process change – and will the Metro council continue to develop their own priority lists and submit them to TPAC and JPACT?

David Bragdon answered that the role of Metro Council is to support the entire region and that they do things with a regional perspective. They link transportation with land use decisions. They are an elected regional government; they have an equal vote in terms of seven members. JPACT allocates the money and the Metro Council is trying to make sure all areas are given the same attention. The Metro Council is considered the guardian of local and regional planning and how the region wants to grow. The Metro Council’s role is where those things come together. With the opportunity to fund in light of Measure 7, which puts planning on a much more regulatory basis, functional planning and zoning, investment component to match private, or other agencies. The Metro Council is involved to provide a regional perspective. The Metro Council wants to do that in a partnership and the memo was not an attempt to change that partnership; they just wanted to have discussion early rather than at the end. There was very good discussion around this table in early January and they are working the long path that we started at the beginning of year.

Robert Drake replied that his only issue was page 2 - #5 starting with MTIP allocation process. His support for issues is very regional in perspective. Whether its Boeckman Road for Wilsonville or I-5 either North or South. He stated that this was his ninth year on the JPACT council and that they see the big picture as much as the Metro Council does. The important thing is what’s good for the region and what’s good for transit, modernization and freight movement. Washington County supported the airport light rail because he personally saw a need for it. He can think broadly.
Roy Rogers stated that our concerns are geographically balanced. He feels JPACT has always been in partnership with the Metro Council and he thinks they have been good partners. Everyone on the committee supports other issues with Clackamas and Multnomah Counties. Things have always been a slippery slope for a long time, but they have only been effective because they can balance everyone’s needs as strategic partners. He stated that Washington County is not a small government, they have a $1 1/2 billion budget. Things can be damaged around this table by policies issued by other governments. If you have three of your counties beginning to feel less than equal, there will be a problem. Things need to be very clear on issues; they all come here because it is a collaborative effort and it would be a disaster for this region if they all go their separate ways. The Metro Council needs to carefully re-communicate exactly what the relationship to JPACT will be and if it is to be inferior to Metro Council they need to understand or be co-partners. He also stated that he understands that the Metro Council may not like the way they hammer out everyone’s interests.

Lonnie Roberts stated that in Multnomah County they have different districts. Some areas are rural and do not deal with the situation with Multnomah County. It is the largest county and contains the state’s first and fourth-largest cities. There will be a problem convincing the numerous smaller cities to support JPACT if they are not getting anything out of this process because the Metro Council is perceived to be the dominant factor.

Lou Ogden asked everyone to please keep in mind that Metro redistributes federal dollars not Metro dollars. The small cities get direct dollars and only get federal money through the MPO. It is not just regional funding. Metro is regionally elected to look out for everyone and it’s not valid with regards to MPO’s. It still requires team planning. The region, cities and counties all deal with this.

David Bragdon stated that the Metro Council was concerned because the JPACT MTIP list at 177 percent contains a geographic balance that is out of whack. It lists Washington County receiving 32 percent of the funds while Clackamas County is only getting 16 percent. The Metro Council list at 70 percent contains more geographic balance over the entire region. The Metro Council realizes that things are not just about downtown Portland and are respectful of the other cities and counties in the region.

Fred Hansen commented that he believes what David Bragdon has outlined is that the Council feels remiss in not being as involved. There will be birthing pains because this is a new process that everyone will have to work through. MTIP is one voice – the spiraling effect is not normal formula allocation. JPACT speaks with one voice in Washington DC and has the ability to work as a region at this table. This process makes receiving funds much easier.

Bill Kennemer stated to the committee that he thought they were having a good debate. He agreed with what Roy Rogers was saying but had a couple of thoughts. He feels that JPACT is a broader group than Metro. It contains Clark County, ODOT, DEQ, Port of Portland, and Tri-Met. The fact that it contains three Metro members and three county commissioners proves there is an effort to look very carefully at things regionally. This is everyone’s money and that makes the distribution of it tough and political. The success has been because they have worked within
a broad framework. They rely on their staff to do the technical work. JPACT tries not to look at the list politically or technically. TPAC works on this list and gets it to a 100 percent list. They figure out the focus on technical pieces and this in some ways help get outside boundaries. The success that Fred Hansen was alluding to is the way that they have been able to lay aside jurisdictional jealouslys and come to consensus, sometimes painfully. Sometimes proportional shares are not equal but they know it will be when's it their turn. JPACT continues moving with one voice.

Rod Park stated that in this process the question is if there is ever a right time for the Metro Council to provide input. Metro Council in its own work took a position regionally and they try to communicate that position as a regional body. The difference in the process is that they have provided that input up front and some might be comfortable or uncomfortable with the Metro Council providing input. They realize that JPACT’s border is larger than just Metro.

Rod Monroe stated that TPAC on August 28, 2001, staff will come out with 100 percent list and will be presented to this group on September 13, 2001. The recommendation will then go to the Metro Council.

OVERVIEW OF HB-2142 PROCESS, SCHEDULE, CRITERIA, CANDIDATE PROJECTS

Rod Monroe introduced Oregon House of Representatives member Bruce Starr, author of House Bill 2142 and Oregon Senator Vern Duncan. They explained how the legislation worked through the senate, how they accomplished this and came up with transportation funding money. They were asked to attend and explain to JPACT what the legislative intent was with this small pot of money and how they would like JPACT to proceed?

Representative Bruce Starr apologized for having never been to a JPACT meeting before and thanked JPACT for allowing him to observe. He stated he was glad to see House Bill 2142 approved. He stated that he understands that $400 million is small, but it’s $400 million more than has been approved during the last decade. He hopes to continue to be involved in this debate and said that this was the first step in a long series of investments in transportation infrastructure. In the beginning of the legislative session, they talked about infusion of cash into the system, and they were told no way is it going to happen. They worked through the process of a $.02 increase in gas tax as the funding base. The Attorney General came to them and said that spending tax money alone is unconstitutional. So they had to raise fees to allow extra money to be spent on the roads. There were a couple of things he wanted to stress. The first is at the legislative level and they are looking for significant results. They want to see the majority of the money being spent on roads and projects and making sure the public tax dollars are being spent right. He wants to be able to show the legislature that here is the list of projects and here is the list that still needs resources. In order for him to argue for additional money in this bill they had to have an ambitious timeline for identification, what projects can be built in a relatively short time. He understands that local governments need time to go from drawing board to a public hearing to getting projects on the road. Getting some projects started and actually seeing fruits of labor is pretty important. The other thing is to recognize the statewide perspective. The need in transportation statewide, alternative modes for transportation, the needs for eastern and southern Oregon, bridges, and roads so money can be spent in eastern/southern Oregon? They spoke with
the trucking industry regarding the fact they have to drive around bridges they can’t cross. $400 million is not a lot of money and they specifically didn’t include the traditional split between state, local, and counties and one of the reasons they did this is so that OTC is required to have a statewide perspective. Where they see the most benefit is for the entire state, basically more bang for the buck.

Senator Vern Duncan thanked Representative Starr for his efforts. He stated that for the first time in the Senate the various groups came, large truckers, small truckers, AAA, all testifying on behalf of House Bill 2142 to the committee in the Senate. He had them all up to the table together in the end and had a photographer come in because he knew this probably would be the only time they were all there together. He said that he also sits on the Judiciary Committee and spoke about the Supreme Court talking about legislative intent and for the legislature to write what you mean, don’t let the Supreme Court guess the legislature’s intent. This bill said exactly what Representative Starr intended it to. House Bill 2142 states what the legislature wants to have happen and its pretty clear what you can and cannot do. It is a very well written bill. The Senate knew early on that transportation was a non-issue and no one thought there would be anything going on. But after a little work, all of our colleagues were pretty supportive of the concept and clear of intent on this bill. This is really going to be a great start. The Senate was very happy to be a tag a long.

Roy Rogers thanked Senator Duncan and Representative Starr for their efforts. He then asked them what was their intent for House Bill 2142.

Representative Starr replied want he wanted to do with the attack of the legislature on all state departments was to change the discussion. Secondly, what he wanted to accomplish was to get that first funding package passed. One debate on the conservative side was that ODOT wants to waste money on alternative modes of transportation. He wanted House Bill 2142 to address that concern. The money spent on highway needs to include extra lane capacities, modernization, fixing congestion. In order to deal with these problems, he had to sell that side of things and make sure that not all of the money was spent on bike paths. The money spent on roads needs to deal with transportation needs, criteria, the weight limitation issue. The committee had hearings across the state and there is a need for unlimited weight on highway and bridges (moving freight). It is an item on the bill because it is a need across the state and this bill needed the votes. There are over 2,600 bridges in the state of Oregon and many are coming to the end of their life span. Included in this bill is money to be spent on interchanges on multi-lane highways, Jackson School Road on Highway 26, which is a highly used intersection and many other dangerous intersections throughout the state. An overpass solution for one year and minor safety work doesn’t address the real need. There is clearly a lot of flexibility in this bill where the money can get spent. There is not a list of projects in this bill. There is no project listed specifically in his district; OTC will do their job. He stated that he had great trust in OTC to do their best job and to develop the kind of relationships necessary to move forward on policy. OTC will spend $400 million within the state on congestion, safety, maintaining current infrastructure, roads that require preservation, (city and county) roads that have been built to preserve and allows money to be used. In order to get the Governor to sign the bill, he had to allow half of the money to be spent on modernization. He got money to modernization, dealt with the need of congestion and new roads. Clearly this package deals with problems all over
the state.

Roy Rogers asked about the matching part of the house bill and local area’s supporting their needs.

Representative Starr replied that OTC is required to move up on the priority list those projects that have a local match. He reiterated that the transportation dollars have to balance the needs of all jurisdictions. Washington County has been willing to put money on the table, but cannot expect the Highway 26 expansion to be all county money when it’s entirely a state facility. There was a bill that wasn’t passed by the Senate, which allowed for $25 million for matching. But state law says that projects, which have a local match, have to move up in the priority list.

Senator Duncan stated that some have been attacking ODOT. He is also on the Audits Committee, and feels that ODOT is doing a great job. They have had a bad image. He stated that he recently came into this particular position when he moved in as chair of a new committee called Public Affairs. He is in complete agreement with Representative Starr, but that doesn’t mean they don’t support alternative means of transportation. That is good practical policy.

Rod Monroe stated that he is the Chair of the Bi-State Committee and works with Clark County and the state of Washington. The Delta Park bottleneck which federal money was used to study developing a third lane (HOV) northbound and the state of Washington constructing a third lane south-bound now: is that the kind of project that could reasonably be funded under House Bill 2142?

Representative Starr replied that yes, they intended the money to be used on roads and expansion that creates new capacity.

Fred Hansen stated that Tri-Met was not an alternative mode and has some help in the Governor’s Office. They want to be able to get projects funded within House Bill 2142 but the projects are in fact touchable and visible.

Representative Starr replied that he would love to get another road bill passed, but needs to see some projects that he could point to and say that they could get done. Projects that just need some money to get them over the top. Allocate this money to them rather than other projects. One of those is the Dundee bypass, right-of-way and PE on the federal level; $15 million of state money is flexible and can allow this to be done. All things need to be done sooner than later. They need to see where this money was spent. It will help when they don’t have to do a $400 million bond levy to obtain additional money in the future.

Fred Hansen stated that he appreciated the hard work by Representative Starr and Senator Duncan.

Rod Park asked, do the projects have to be the kind you could see and feel? For example, ITS projects coordinate signalization, assisting more traffic and increase the current efficiency so commuters are not waiting at signal lights.
Representative Starr replied that the ITS project is not the kind of project he had in mind when drafting this bill. He wants to see additional lanes on roads.

Fred Hansen stated that the ITS system allows commuters to get from point a to point b faster.

Rod Park stated that a lot of time people are waiting – the current signalization system cannot handle the capacity.

Rod Monroe elaborated that what House Bill 2142 intends is for more visible projects and ITS is not that visible.

Bill Kennemer thanked Senator Duncan and Representative Starr for coming and stated that they are looking at Sunnyside Road because it contains a lot more congestion and that they have $22 million of match money. He stated that Sunrise would be in the next step. He asked if Sunnyside Road is considered a state highway.

Representative Starr replied that the way House Bill 2142 is written any public road is considered a highway.

Karl Rohde asked if boulevard projects could be funded under House Bill 2142.

Representative Starr asked what exactly did Karl Rohde mean by boulevards.

Andy Cotugno answered that boulevard projects don’t add lanes. Boulevards are supportive of downtown; have more amenities, sidewalks, trees, crosswalks, and makes pedestrian crossing easier.

Representative Starr replied that money needs to be spent on district highways requiring preservation. Because of the jurisdictional transfer and the criticism involved, it would not look good to have all of the road money spent on trees and sidewalks. He also reminded the committee the time line that those projects will need to be built.

Dave Williams stated that he needs to explain some things for clarity and the process involved because the commission was meeting. The lists of the projects will go out to the JPACT members as we have them and the process that has to be gone through. He reminded the committee that this is an application process, they have to be prepared and submitted to the region, with letters to Kay Van Sickel. He called to attention the House Bill 2142 calendar. The other thing that is referenced is the Oregon Highway Plan and if a copy is needed to give him a call to obtain one. He stated that to defend projects, make proper references to sections in the bill. Senator Starr’s memo on page 2 describes putting together the recommendations, inventing criteria, applying criteria they have in place and the final decisions to make. The decision that the commission will make today is that 50 percent of the $400 million will go to bridges and preservation and 50 percent to modernization. In the same paragraph of the highway plan is the notion to maintain the system before it is expanded. On a system basis that goal will have been met. The next one down is the split of modernization funds. There is no mathematical target. Sub-allocated by traditional modernization. Region 1 including Hood River County, etc. will get...
around $70 million to get to split up. Will not have a split on bridges, but will wait for submitted projects first.

He stated that Attachment A is the timeline and that the timeline is very tight but it is legislatively mandated. On September 7, 2001 we have to submit by 5:00 p.m. for bridges and preservation. On October 5, we are obliged to submit lane capacity projects, etc.

On October 8, 2001, OTC will refine draft recommendations. Then they have to go to Metro and have a turnaround time of two or three days. A statewide committee will select the bridge projects. They merely pass to the committee any applications that come through on bridges. Then JPACT meets to decide which projects could best meet criteria. There is a quick scramble to get the recommendation from JPACT. The Region 1 decisions will probably come to JPACT for recommendation. On October 16, 2001, JPACT will present the final selection.

On November 2, 2001, OTC needs something from JPACT on modernization and interchange projects. The commission reacts to those and makes draft recommendation and then obtains public comments.

On December 1, 2001, reconsider how you want to argue points, and remember that the commission has to approve applications by January. On the next page there are eligibility criteria and prioritization factors. The criteria have to be consistent with adopted plans and highway plans. The focus is on project readiness. OTC will be screening for these. The projects need to be able to make it to construction, and by the final date of 2008 everything must be done. Regarding pavement preservation, OTC will provide a list of district highways in this region and what their pavement conditions are. Pavements must be deteriorating to qualify and OTC will determine whether you have candidates in those jurisdictions.

Rod Monroe stated that with the timeline, it will require moving the JPACT October and November meetings to the first Thursday of the month. October 4, 2001 and November 1, 2001 are the new meeting dates.

Annette Liebe asked if the projects needed to be included in the TIP, OHP and Regional Transportation Plan.

Andy Cotugno replied that statues require those projects be in the fiscally constrained list of the RTP. He reminded the committee that this is an application process due September 7, 2001 and modernization projects are due October 5, 2001.

Dave Williams stated that they make the application to ODOT – anyone on their facilities share preparation on application and somebody is assigned responsibility.

Andy Cotugno stated that he has supplied a compilation list of what’s going on around region.

Lou Ogden handed out a letter from the Tualatin TMA regarding the MTIP process and repeated his annual call to action concerning long-term funding for TMAs in the region. In the beginning they had come and asked for money – and as a region we need to determine how we are going to
fund TMA. He stated that they are currently funded through start up and then are dropped off the funding but this policy is not self-supporting. MTIP needs to decide if it is funding TMAs partially or not starting up at all. The Tualatin TMA will be funding done in two years if there's not a change and he is very concerned. This issue was raised at the MTIP process by the TDM Subcommittee.

Andy Cotugno stated that they are questioning TMAs and the funding and whether it should be start up or ongoing. The funding allows for only some ongoing funds but mostly start up. MTIP set aside a certain amount of money for TMAs.

Lou Ogden stated that the MTIP process takes a lot of time. MTIP shouldn’t be allowed to fund new TMAs unless it can fund the ones in existence.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:32am.

Respectfully submitted,

Renee Castilla
DATE: August 17, 2001

TO: JPACT Members and Alternates

FROM: Rod Monroe

SUBJECT: Calendar Changes for JPACT 2001 Meetings

At the last JPACT meeting, it was determined necessary to reschedule the October meeting in order to accommodate the Oregon Department of Transportation’s deadline to receive recommendations on bridge and pavement preservation projects for HB 2142 funding. The October JPACT meeting is moved up to October 4.

Additionally, in order to submit recommendations on modernization projects to ODOT according to the timeline schedule, the November meeting was moved up a week. The November JPACT meeting is rescheduled for November 1, 2001.

Please put these new JPACT meeting dates on your calendar and plan to attend.
CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 01-3098 FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO ALLOCATE FY 2004 – 05 CONGESTION MITIGATION/AIR QUALITY (CMAQ) AND SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (STP)

Date: August 31, 2001
Presented by: Andrew Cotugno

PROPOSED ACTION

Approval of this resolution would update and amend the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) to allocate and authorize obligation of FY 2004 – 05 federal and state highway funds on projects and programs. It would authorize staff to coordinate scheduling of work phases, assignment of various funding types to specific projects and to balance projects programmed in the first two years of the new MTIP (i.e., FY 02 and 03) with funds allocated in the last two years (i.e., FY 04 and 05). This work will be shown in a complete MTIP document, that will also show programming of all other fundtypes (e.g., road preservation, bridge rehabilitation, etc.) for approval in the near future. The work will also include an air quality analysis determination and an environmental justice screen consistent with federal guidelines.

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

Metro and ODOT began coordination of the FY 2002 MTIP/STIP Update in September 2000. A revenue target of $38 million was established and procedures were approved governing public involvement and project nominations, ranking and selection. Attachment 1 summarizes the highlights of these activities. A key feature of the selection process was the decision to use the 2000 MTIP “150 Percent Cut List” as a base package of projects for consideration in the current update. The modal technical ranking criteria approved by JPACT for use in the 2000 MTIP Update were used to technically rank projects. The Metro Council also provided a set of five criteria they used, in concert with the JPACT technical ranking system, to identify a preliminary statement of Council project priorities. A Summary of the JPACT criteria are shown in Attachment 2. The Council Criteria are shown in Attachment 3.

FUNDING OPTIONS DISCUSSED BY TPAC

At TPAC, Metro staff presented a Base Recommendation totaling $39.712 million of projects. Several options were also presented for TPAC consideration that would cut this to a $38 million program recommendation. The options considered by TPAC are reviewed below.

Option 1: Future Funding Priority for East Bank/Springwater Trails Connector

Option 1 would balance the program by approving a $2.228 million first phase of the E. Bank/Springwater Trails Connector project. This phase would design the entire Connector
project and construct a first phase bridge crossing of the Railroad tracks and access from the west terminus of the bridge to McLoughlin Boulevard. On-street grade crossings of McLoughlin Boulevard and Johnson Creek would then connect to the East Bank Trail near the Sellwood bridge.

The residual $1.712 million needed to construct phase 2 bridge crossings of McLoughlin Boulevard and Johnson Creek would be identified as the Region’s highest priority for funds from the Statewide Transportation Enhancement (TE) program, assuming reinstatement of the program by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) for the FY 2006 program. If the funds were not awarded from the State-run TE program, the balance of the requested funds would be treated as a commitment against FY 2006 regional funds in the next update, or from additional FY 04/05 funds should they materialize in the next authorization. Additionally, it is anticipated that the Nyberg Interchange project sponsors will apply for ODOT Bond funding of the project. Should bond funds be awarded to the project, any released regional funds would be applied toward the Connector project.

**Option 2: I-5/Nyberg Overcrossing Strategy**

Option 2 would balance the program by award of only $1.75 million, or half the $3.5 million requested, for the I-5/Nyberg Overcrossing project. Tualatin would pursue the balance in the ODOT Bond program. Metro, and hopefully ODOT, would endorse the project to the OTC for bond funding. Should no bond funds be awarded, the $1.75 million would be treated as a commitment against FY 2006 regional funds in the next update, or from additional FY 04/05 funds should they materialize in the next authorization. This would enable the project to proceed, at the latest, in fall of 2005.

**Option 3: Overprogramming**

Option 3 was developed during the TPAC meeting. It would not balance the program. Rather, it would approve overprogramming of the fourth year of the MTIP by $1.712 million. (In other words, the Base Program in Exhibit 1 would be approved as shown.) Overprogramming would reduce revenue available for allocation in FY 06 (or earlier, depending on FY 04/05 revenue levels approved in the TEA-21 reauthorization) by $1.712 million. It would permit programming the full amounts requested for both the Nyberg and Springwater projects and would enable pursuit of flexible financing arrangements by one or both projects that would not be possible without authorization of the full requests (e.g., advance construction agreements, State Infrastructure Bank loans, tapered match, etc).

**TPAC RECOMMENDATION**

The TPAC recommended program is based on a Metro staff recommendation that was reviewed at the August 31 TPAC meeting. The staff recommendation was based on blending a number of policy objectives and analyses, including:

- The technical ranking of each project and/or administrative factors that caused one project to move ahead of another;
• Metro Council policy guidelines for the program and their recommended project list, (all but one of the Council recommended projects is included in the TPAC recommended list); and

• A modal balance that recognized the multi-modal emphasis for the region’s transportation system, as called out in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the 2040 Growth Concept; required bike, pedestrian and land use actions called for in the Portland-area Ozone and Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plans; and general public opinion identified in recent Metro surveys and the MTIP public meetings held throughout the Update process.

On an 8/7 vote (one abstention), TPAC recommended that JPACT select Option 1 (cut $1.712 million from the Springwater project) to reduce the Base Program presented by Metro Staff to $38 million.

The discussion leading to this recommendation focused on a desire to recommend a $38 million, financially constrained program; discomfort with the amount of funding contained in the Base Package for alternative modes; and the severity of congestion at the Nyberg interchange and its effects on both the Tualatin Town Center and I-5 operations.

Additionally, concern was expressed about over-programming on strategic grounds. The over-programming option developed at the meeting anticipated that both the Nyberg and Springwater project sponsors would pursue alternative funding. The Nyberg project would seek ODOT bond funds. The Springwater Connector project would compete in the State Transportation Enhancement program, which the OTC is expected to resume in FY 06. The ODOT representative questioned whether either project would fare well in these selection processes if the region had already made a funding commitment through the MTIP. Also, the Nyberg request will be small relative to most other projects expected to compete for the bond funds. Approving the modest Nyberg request might result in a decision by the OTC to drop an otherwise promising, but more expensive regional candidate.

There was also discussion about simply cutting approximately $1.7 million of the lowest ranked projects. Given prospects for other revenue sources to pursue, and the realization that most of the lower ranked projects would come disproportionately from suburban areas of the region, TPAC did not consider this to be a viable or desirable means of balancing the program recommendation.
Priorities 2002 MTIP timeline of key milestones
September 2000 to September 2001

The following dates represent highlights of the Priorities 2002 MTIP update. The activities summarized include Metro coordination with area jurisdictions to establish revenue targets and project nomination, ranking and selection procedures. At each significant point in the decision process, notice was provided to concerned citizens and agency representatives consistent with Metro’s public involvement procedures and federal public involvement requirements.

Sept. 25  Postcard notice of MITP proposed public process to 1,500 addresses (early 45-day public comment period kickoff)
Dec. 5   Postcard notification mailed regarding start of public comment period on MTIP process and selection criteria sent to 1,500
Dec. 18  Release of project ranking/selection process recommendations
Dec. 18 to Jan. 16  Public comment period on process and selection criteria
Jan. 10  News release sent to media on public hearing at Metro
Jan. 16  End of public comment period and MTIP hearing before Metro Community Planning Committee
Jan. 18  Publication of summary of public comments on MTIP process
Jan. 25  Metro Council approved process for selecting and ranking of MTIP projects
Feb. 6   First printing of MTIP fact sheet
Jan. 26 to April 2  Project solicitation period
April 12  Release of nominated MTIP projects to JPACT
April 27  Fact sheet on MTIP process and public involvement reprinted
May 21-24  Placement of ads for public comment period and meeting
May 30   Post card notification of public comment period and meeting
June 8   TPAC review of technical rankings (special meeting)
June 12  News release on public comment period and meeting
June 12 to July 11  MTIP project ranking public comment period
June 18  Open house and public comment meeting at Metro, 6 to 9 pm
July 12  JPACT review of public comments
July 27  TPAC review and discussion
August 9  JPACT review and discussion
August 23  Post card/e-mail notification of MTIP hearing on Sept. 4
August 27  News release to media on MTIP hearing on Sept. 4
August 31  TPAC recommendation on final MTIP projects
→ Sept. 4  Public hearing, Council Community Planning Committee, 6 pm
Sept. 13  JPACT consideration of MTIP resolution, 7:30 am
Sept. 20  Metro Council consideration of MTIP resolution, 2 pm (tentative)
## PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE
### Technical Project Ranking Criteria

#### ROAD MODERNIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)</th>
<th>GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)</th>
<th>GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)</th>
<th>GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROAD RECONSTRUCTION</strong></td>
<td><strong>BLVD. DESIGN</strong></td>
<td><strong>FREIGHT</strong></td>
<td><strong>GOAL: Provide Mobility at Reasonable Cost (15 points)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL: Provide Mobility at Reasonable Cost (15 points)</td>
<td>GOAL: Implement Blvd Design Elements for Least Cost (15 points)</td>
<td>GOAL: Provide Mobility at Reasonable Cost (15 points)</td>
<td>Cost/Truck hours of delay eliminated in 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/VMT in 2020 (or VT at interchanges and intersections.)</td>
<td>Cost/mile/benefit points</td>
<td>Cost/Truck hours of delay eliminated in 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL: Reduce Congestion (25 points)</strong></td>
<td><strong>GOAL: Slow vehicle speeds/enhance alt. mode access. (25 points)</strong></td>
<td><strong>GOAL: Reduce Delay of Freight &amp; Goods Move-ment In/Thru the Region (25 points)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project derives from CMS, consistent with 10% per capita VMT reduction. Compare base year V/C ratio (pm peak hr &amp; direction) against ratios with and without project.</td>
<td>Encourage projects that incorporate maximum feasible Blvd street design elements so alternative travel modes are appealing &amp; safer.</td>
<td>Truck hours of delay eliminated in 2020.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL: Safety (20 points)</strong></td>
<td><strong>GOAL: Safety (20 points)</strong></td>
<td><strong>GOAL: Safety (20 points)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Accident rate per Vehicle (use current ODOT Accident Rate Book) and qualitative assessment of bike/ped conflicts. | Accident Rate per Vehicle (use current ODOT Accident Rate Book) and qualitative assessment of bike/ped conflicts. | Target least safest/highest non-auto demand boulevard segments for improvement. | Addresses high accident locations with special emphasis on hazardous road/rail situations and conflict with bike/pedestrian modes.

#### PEDESTRIAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)</th>
<th>GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)</th>
<th>GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)</th>
<th>GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIKE CYCLE</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOD</strong></td>
<td><strong>TRANSIT</strong></td>
<td><strong>TDM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL: Provide Mobility at Reasonable Cost (15 points)</td>
<td>GOAL: Reduce VMT at Reasonable Cost (15 points)</td>
<td>GOAL: Increase Ridership at Reasonable Cost (25 points)</td>
<td>GOAL: Reduce VMT at Reasonable Cost (25 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL: Increase Walk Mode Share/Reduce Auto Trips (25 points)</strong></td>
<td><strong>GOAL: Increase Non-Auto Mode Share (25 points)</strong></td>
<td><strong>GOAL: Increase Modal Share (35 points)</strong></td>
<td><strong>GOAL: Increase Modal Share (35 points)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compute new trips made by walking (or walking to transit) instead of by auto. Use 2020 mode split after reducing VMT 10%.</td>
<td>Determine increase of transit, walk and bike trips that result from TOD program subsidy of market development.</td>
<td>Compute benefits in relation to 2020 ridership targets in areas proposed for service additions.</td>
<td>Compute non-SOV mode share increase and VMT reduction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL: Safety (20 points)</strong></td>
<td><strong>GOAL: Safety (20 points)</strong></td>
<td><strong>GOAL: Increase Density (20 points)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project corrects an existing safety problem. Factors include blind curves, high truck &amp; auto volume, soft shoulders, high reported accident rate, high speeds and especially proximity to schools will be considered in determining critical safety problems.</td>
<td>Factors include blind curves, high truck &amp; auto volume, soft shoulders, high reported accident rate, high speeds and especially proximity to schools.</td>
<td>Does the TOD project increase density within a one-quarter mile radius of transit above the level that would result without public subsidy from the TOD program?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Source: i:\trans\staff\floyd\resolutions\2001\01-3098\SR Attachment 2*
Previous MTIP updates have emphasized implementation of the Region 2040 Growth Concept. It is the intention of the Metro Council that this emphasis be even more firmly advanced in the current update. Forty percent of the technical ranking of all candidate projects is linked to support of 2040 concepts. However, final selection of projects for funding is based on a combination of technical and administrative factors. At its January 25 meeting, the Metro Council approved supplemental guidance regarding specific elements of the 2040 Concept Plan that should be reflected in transportation programming decisions. The Council agreed that the guidance would not be formally amended into the Metro transportation project ranking system but that it should be provided as part of the solicitation package material. Under this guidance, the final list of the projects or programs proposed for funding should facilitate implementation of:

1) development and redevelopment in support of the central city, regional and town centers, main streets and station areas,
2) development of transportation infrastructure that supports industrial centers and their inter-modal connectors,
3) efficient management of demand and enhancement of the operation of the existing transportation system,
4) development and promotion of alternatives to single occupancy vehicles,
5) development of a multi-modal transportation system,
6) projects for which there is no other readily available source of funding.
Explanation of Reductions to JPACT 150% List

1. Planning

- Willamette Shoreline Rail/Trail Study funding reduced from $550,000 to $300,000 to maintain geographic equity by allocating funds to other projects.
- RTP Corridor Project funding reduced from $600,000 to $300,000, conditioned upon matching resources from ODOT.

2. Road Modernization/Freeway

- Projects were selected in rank order through 5th rank.
- Gresham/Multnomah County ITS, Phase 3 (4th rank) funding reduced from $1 million to $750,000 to permit funding of more projects.
- Sunrise Corridor DEIS/FEIS/PE (5th rank) funding reduced from $4 million for PE from I-205 to US 26 to $2 million. Sunrise Corridor allocation assumes: (1) $1 million will be used to complete the DEIS/FEIS/PE from I-205 to Rock Creek Junction, to be matched by County/ODOT resources as needed to complete the study; and (2) $1 million will be used to complete RTP exceptions findings and master planning associated with potential future urban growth boundary decisions in the Damascus area to be matched by County funds.
- Sunnyside Road: 122nd/132nd (6th rank) was deferred to maintain geographic equity.
- Farmington: Murray/Hocken (7th rank) was deferred to permit funding of more projects ($8.2 million project cost) and maintain geographic equity.
- SE Foster/Kelly Creek (10th rank). Although there are immediate, existing safety and congestion problems addressed by this project that are causing land use permits to be denied by the City of Portland, the project was deferred by staff due to significant, longer-term transportation issues that will be evaluated as part of the Pleasant Valley Concept Plan process and the Powell/Foster Corridor planning project (2002 TGM program).
- Boeckman Road (11th rank) was partially retained because of Dammasch urban village land use planning issues and 92 percent funding overmatch.

3. Boulevards

- Projects were selected in rank order through 4th rank.
- Boones Ferry Road (5th) deferred because of significantly lower technical score, incomplete design process and to maintain geographic equity.
• Cornell Road (6th rank) was deferred because of significantly lower technical score, incomplete design process, and high overall cost. Previously allocated funds were retained to allow the design process to continue. Development of a revised boulevard that is more consistent with Metro’s “Livable Streets” design guidelines is encouraged.

4. Pedestrian
• Projects were selected in rank order through 5th rank.
• While the regional pedestrian access to transit project ranked high in the technical process, the scoring did not reflect the generalized nature of the project compared to other, more specific projects in the pedestrian category. For this reason, staff recommends that allocation of funds to this program be deferred until a regional pedestrian system inventory and program are in place to identify more specific needs that could be funded through future MTIP cycles.
• Forest Grove pedestrian improvements (2nd rank) funding reduced from $400,000 to $200,000 to maintain geographic equity.
• 257th Avenue (6th rank) deferred to maintain geographic equity.

5. Bike/Trail
• Projects were selected in rank order through 4th rank.
• Washington Street (5th rank) was deferred to maintain modal and geographic equity.

6. TDM
• The Regional TDM Program funding reduced by $495,000, which is proportionally similar to funding reductions in other transportation modes throughout the MTIP. Emphasis was placed on preserving the core TDM program housed at Tri-Met (1st rank), while sustaining activity in other Regional TDM components, including the SMART TDM Program, the TMA Assistance Program and the Region 2040 Initiatives Program.
• TMA Assistance (3rd rank) funding reduced from $500,000 to $250,000. The program was renamed "TMA Stabilization" and emphasizes sustaining existing TMAs rather than starting new TMAs at this time.
• The Region 2040 Initiatives (2nd rank) funding reduced from $500,000 to $280,000.
• SMART TDM (5th rank) funding reduced from $145,000 to $110,000. This amount being consistent with the past Priorities 2000 allocation.

7. TOD
• Metro TOD program (1st rank) funding reduced from $2 million to $1.5 million to maintain geographic equity

8. Transit
• SMART Transit Center and Park-and-Ride (2nd rank) funding reduced from $1.172 million to $586,000 to maintain geographic equity. This provides 50 percent of the request for right-of-way purchase of a land parcel to serve as a transit center and park-and-ride for the SMART transit system. Federal discretionary transit funds were adopted
as part of the region’s FY2002 priorities for construction. The land parcel is located near the terminus station of the proposed Washington County commuter rail project.

- Staff recommends creation of a Transit Investment Plan reserve that includes $2.85 million requested for continuation of the McLoughlin/Barber service (1st ranked) and half of the funds requested for Gresham and BV/Tigard TCL (3rd and 4th ranked). This allocation would establish a reserve for funding transit capital projects and start-up costs for new service as prioritized by a short-term Transit Investment Plan at Tri-Met. To obtain regional funding from the reserve, Tri-Met would need to identify the capital projects or start-up service from their plan and obtain an MTIP amendment through the TPAC/JPACT/Metro Council decision process.

This is intended to establish a process that encourages regional funding to be used for capital projects and start-up service while recognizing the need to transition existing service supported by regional funding to a stable source of funding from other sources. The amount proposed to be allocated is $1.794 million more than the amount requested for continuation of previous MTIP allocations for McLoughlin and Barber Boulevard bus service increases.

This allocation also supports the concept of Tri-Met developing a short-term strategy to implement the 20-year RTP priority system and to guide their annual service planning process. The development of such a short-term strategy should articulate trade-offs of providing different types of transit service and prioritize which capital investments and start-up service Tri-Met will be requesting MTIP allocations fund. Requests for start-up service should be accompanied by a strategy for long-term funding at conclusion of the TDP process.

9. Freight

- The East End Connector was deferred for reasons of geographic equity and because it is a strong candidate for ODOT Bond Program funding.
### TPAC Recommended 100 Percent Program Allocation

#### TPAC Recommended 100 Percent List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will. Shoreline Rail/Trail Study</td>
<td>Clark Ct. ITS/ATHS Ph. 2</td>
<td>$0.300</td>
<td>RTP Corridor Project</td>
<td>Eau Claire Ph. 1</td>
<td>$0.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will. Shoreline Rail/Trail Study</td>
<td>Gresham/McLoughlin Kt. ITS Ph. 3</td>
<td>$1.480</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>Multnomah/Deception (Cont)</td>
<td>$0.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So. Corridor Transit Study</td>
<td>Molalla Ave. Ped: Wind./Pearl &amp; Mntn Vtew/Hotmes</td>
<td>$4.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPAC RECOMMEND 100% LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPAC RECOMMENDED 100% LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proposed Total: $6,230

### Cuts from JPACT 150 Percent List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will. Shoreline Rail/Trail Study</td>
<td>Clark Ct. ITS/ATHS Ph. 2</td>
<td>$0.250</td>
<td>RTP Corridor Project</td>
<td>Eau Claire Ph. 1</td>
<td>$0.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will. Shoreline Rail/Trail Study</td>
<td>Gresham/McLoughlin Kt. ITS Ph. 3</td>
<td>$0.250</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>Multnomah/Deception (Cont)</td>
<td>$0.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPAC RECOMMEND 100% LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPAC RECOMMENDED 100% LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proposed Total: $6,149

### G. Pedestrian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPAC RECOMMEND 100% LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPAC RECOMMENDED 100% LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proposed Total: $6,230

### H. Bike/Trail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPAC RECOMMEND 100% LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPAC RECOMMENDED 100% LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proposed Total: $6,149

### L. Mainline Freeway Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPAC RECOMMEND 100% LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPAC RECOMMENDED 100% LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proposed Total: $1,000

### TPAC Recommended 100 Percent List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPAC RECOMMEND 100% LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPAC RECOMMENDED 100% LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proposed Total: $11,469

### Cuts from JPACT 150 Percent List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPAC RECOMMEND 100% LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPAC RECOMMENDED 100% LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proposed Total: $1,000

### A. Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPAC RECOMMEND 100% LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPAC RECOMMENDED 100% LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proposed Total: $0.550

### B. Road Modernization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPAC RECOMMEND 100% LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPAC RECOMMENDED 100% LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proposed Total: $3,114

### C. Road Reconstruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPAC RECOMMEND 100% LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPAC RECOMMENDED 100% LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proposed Total: $1,404

### D. Bridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPAC RECOMMEND 100% LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPAC RECOMMENDED 100% LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proposed Total: $1,404

### E. Freight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPAC RECOMMEND 100% LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPAC RECOMMENDED 100% LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proposed Total: $1,239

### F. Boulevard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPAC RECOMMEND 100% LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPAC RECOMMENDED 100% LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proposed Total: $2,000

### Grand Total (w/out Interstate MAX)

- $38,000
- $50,000
BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO ALLOCATE FY 2004-05 CONGESTION MITIGATION/AIR QUALITY (CMAQ) AND SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (STP) FUNDS ) RESOLUTION NO. 01-3098

) Introduced by
Rod Monroe,
JPACT Chair

WHEREAS, State and federal regulations require that funding for transportation improvements occurring within Metro’s jurisdiction must be shown in a Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program; and

WHEREAS, The Region anticipates that reauthorization of a multi-year federal transportation act (hereafter “the Act”) will occur (e.g., the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century); and

WHEREAS, Metro and ODOT concur that the Act will most likely continue to authorize both the CMAQ and STP programs and that regional funding from these programs in FY 04 and FY 2005 can reasonably be assumed to equal sums authorized in the final year of the current Act (i.e., a combined amount of $50 million); and

WHEREAS, A sum of $6 million per year for the Interstate MAX project has been previously authorized in both FY 2004 and 2005, leaving $38 million unallocated; and

WHEREAS, Metro and ODOT have cooperated in an 12-month process to solicit project nominations for the unallocated regional portion of these funds, and included extensive outreach to eligible agencies and the public and included technical analysis of each project submitted; and

WHEREAS, Metro has integrated the ODOT Region 1 Modernization Program into the MTIP process and that ODOT has at its principal discretion a sum of approximately $28 million for road expansion work which it desires to allocate to construction of the third phase of the U.S. 26 Sylvan Interchange project which is the region’s stated first priority freeway project; and
WHEREAS, The Oregon Transportation Commission will early next year approve a program of bond funded roadway expansion projects for which freeway, interchange and highway capacity expansion projects in the Metro Region as part of the statewide program; and

WHEREAS, Past federal reauthorizations have twice provided funds in excess of those anticipated by Metro in MTIP updates so that sums in excess of $38 million may be available in FY 04 and 05; now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED:

1. The program of funds shown in Exhibit A of the Resolution is approved and directed to be published in a full 2002 – 2005 MTIP document incorporating all federal program categories.

2. Approval of this program is contingent on conditions contained in Exhibit B.

3. Following approval of this program, staff is directed to immediately initiate air quality analysis for all previously conformed and exempt projects and to subsequently initiate air quality conformity determination for the remaining projects.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this ________, day of __________, 2001.

David Bragdon, Presiding Officer

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, General Counsel
PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE
CONDITIONS OF PROGRAM APPROVAL

ROAD MODERNIZATION

WM6 While the I-5/Nyberg Overcrossing project is fully funded through this MTIP, it is Bond Program eligible and could apply for funding from that program.

MM1 The $750,000 for the Gresham/Multnomah County ITS project is contingent on first use of the funds to develop and implement technology needed to implement traffic adaptive signal timing in the region.

CM 4 The $500,000 for the Boeckman Road Widening EIS/PE project is contingent on the project sponsor assuming responsibility for completion of the EIS and PE

TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT

PTOD1 The $800,000 for the Gateway Regional Center TOD is contingent on execution of an Agreement Letter between Metro’s Planning Director and the Portland Development Commission’s Development Director.

TRANSIT

The $4,106 for the Transit Investment Program Reserve is contingent on Tri-Met developing a five-year transit service and capital plan with input from the Metro Council, JPACT and TPAC. Upon completion, an MTIP amendment to allocate the reserve to specific start-up and/or capital projects will be considered.

TRANSIT DEMAND MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

TDM4&5 The TDM Subcommittee is authorized to make project allocations from 2040 Initiatives and TMA Stabilization program funds hereby approved and is directed to report on such allocations periodically to TPAC.

MAINLINE FREEWAY

WM1 The $359,000 for PE for the U.S. 26 Widening from Murray to 185th is allocated to a Reserve Account, to be made available to the project sponsor at such time as an amendment of the 2000 RTP Financially Constrained Network has been approved, demonstrating increased funding or decreased Washington County project costs and air quality conformity of the ultimate intended scope and concept of the project with
the State Implementation Plan. Additionally, this allocation is predicated on Washington County funding one-half the project construction cost.

CM5 The $2.0 million for the Sunrise Corridor EIS/PE project is intended to support the following:

- $1.0 toward the DEIS/FEIS/PE for the segment extending from I-205 to the Rock Creek Junction, with all other costs needed to complete the DEIS/FEIS/PE provided by ODOT and Clackamas County; and

- $1.0 million for completion of exceptions” findings needed for the portion of the project extending from Rock Creek to U.S. 26 and for the preparation of a Damascus Area Concept Plan upon completion of Metro’s UGB Periodic Review.

- This allocation is subject to Metro’s review of scope and budget to carry out these activities. Specific allocations to the defined work may change accordingly.

PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS

RP1 Tri-Met and Metro shall complete the transit priority sidewalk inventory, define a Pedestrian to Transit Program and coordinate with local governments for recommendation of a program of projects for consideration in the next MTIP Update.

ALL PROJECTS

- Any project, regardless of fund type, approved for funding in the MTIP, by this or any preceding action, shall coordinate with Tri-Met regarding sidewalk and bus shelter components.
Priorities 2002 MTIP Update – Options for finalizing allocations

The final 100% MTIP allocation included in the packet was balanced at the available $38 million. Option #1 reflects this option which was recommended by TPAC on an 8-7 vote (with 1 abstention). Options #2 and #3 were included in the Staff Report at the request of TPAC.

1. Option #1 – Fully fund I-5/Nyberg (recommended by TPAC; described in Staff Report)
   - Fully fund the I-5/Nyberg Interchange Project at $3.5 million.
   - Partially fund the E. Bank Trail/Springwater Connector at $2.228 million.
   - Amend the Resolution to include the following Resolve:
     “JPACT and the Metro Council designates the remainder of the E. Bank Trail/Springwater Connector ($1,712 million) as a top priority for funding through the State Transportation Enhancement Program expected to be restored for the Priorities 2004 MTIP Update. Failing successful funding through the State Transportation Enhancement Program, the project is the top priority for STP and/or CMAQ funds available through the Priorities 2004 MTIP Update.”

2. Option #2 – Reduce I-5/Nyberg and fully fund E. Bank Trail/Springwater Connector (presented in Staff Report)
   - Reduce I-5/Nyberg Interchange from $3.5 million to $1.788 million (a decrease of $1.712 million).
   - Amend the Resolution to include the following Resolve:
     “JPACT and the Metro Council designates the I-5/Nyberg Interchange project as a top priority for funding through the 2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act and will pursue an additional $1.712 million for the project through the Investment Act process. Failing successful funding through the Oregon Transportation Investment Act process, the project is the top priority for STP funds available through the Priorities 2004 MTIP Update.”
   - Increase the E. Bank Trail/Springwater Connector from $2.228 million to $3.94 million (an increase of $1.712 million).
3. Option #3 – Overprogramming (presented in Staff Report)

- Fully fund I-5/Nyberg Interchange @ $3.5 million.

- Fully fund E. Bank Trail/Springwater Connector @ $3.94 million.

- As a result, overprogram the MTIP by $1.712 million with the expectation that some project schedules will slip through their own issues to be dealt with. Upon initiation of the Priorities 2004 MTIP update, reduce the amount available to allocate by the overprogrammed amount. Note: the MTIP is already overprogrammed by 10%, representing the difference between what TEA-21 has authorized over the 6-year period and the historical amount Congress annually appropriates. Overprogramming ensures that when projects slip, other projects are ready to use available appropriation without any lapse of funds.

- Seek funds from the 2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act for all or part of I-5/Nyberg Interchange and from the next State Transportation Enhancement Program for all or part of the E. Bank Trail/Springwater Connector. Reduce the degree of overprogramming accordingly.
Priorities 2002 MTIP Update – Options for finalizing allocations

Options #4 and #5 are presented below as additional possible options for JPACT’s consideration at the request of the Chair.

4. Option #4 - Additional possible amendment: Eliminate Morrison Bridge Ped./Bike Access and fully fund E. Bank Trail/Springwater Connector

- Eliminate the Morrison Bridge Ped./Bike Access $1.345.
- Eliminate the Priorities 2000 MTIP allocation of $540,000 for right-of-way acquisition to the Cornell Rd. “Boulevard” project.
- Increase the E. Bank Trail/Springwater Connector from $2.228 million to $3.94 million (an increase of $1.712 million).
- Increase the TMA Assistance/Region 2040 Initiatives from $535,000 to $708,000 (an increase of $173,000).
- Amend the Resolution to include the following Resolve:

  “JPACT and the Metro Council designates the Morrison Bridge Ped./Bike Access as a top priority for funding through the State Transportation Enhancement Program expected to be restored for the Priorities 2004 MTIP Update. Failing successful funding through the State Transportation Enhancement Program, the project is the top priority for STP and/or CMAQ funds available through the Priorities 2004 MTIP Update.”

5. Option #5 – Additional possible amendment – Eliminate Naito Parkway Reconstruction and fully fund E. Bank Trail/Springwater Connector

- Eliminate the Naito Parkway Reconstruction $1.5 million.
- Eliminate the Priorities 2000 MTIP allocation of $540,000 for right-of-way acquisition to the Cornell Rd. “Boulevard” project.
- Increase the E. Bank Trail/Springwater Connector from $2.228 million to $3.94 million (an increase of $1.712 million).
- Increase the TMA Assistance/Region 2040 Initiatives from $535,000 to $863,000 (an increase of $328,000).
- Amend the Resolution to include the following Resolve:

  “JPACT and the Metro Council designates the Naito Parkway Reconstruction Project as a top priority for funding through STP funds available through the Priorities 2004 MTIP Update.”
DATE: September 5, 2001

TO: JPACT and the Metro Council

FROM: Andrew C. Cotugno, Planning Director

SUBJECT: Summary of Testimony Received on TPAC’s 2002 MTIP Update Recommendation

A joint hearing of JPACT and the Metro Council was held Tuesday evening, September 4, 2001, at 6:00 p.m. at Metro Headquarters. Members of the public and various agencies were invited to comment on recommendations made by the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) for selection of projects to fund in the 2002 MTIP Update. The following summary of major topics addressed at the hearing is submitted to aid your consideration of the TPAC recommendation.

1. The majority of comments received concerned TPAC’s recommendation to balance the MTIP program by cutting back the Springwater/East Bank Trail Connector project while retaining full funding for the Nyberg Interchange project.
   - A large number of comments were directed at restoring funding for the Springwater Connector project.
   - Slightly fewer comments sought to retain full funding of the Nyberg Interchange project.

2. Comments were received supporting recommended funding for various projects, including:
   - Johnson Creek Boulevard reconstruction;
   - The Gateway TOD project and the associated 102nd Avenue: Hancock/Main Boulevard project;
   - Molalla Avenue Pedestrian project;
   - McLoughlin Boulevard project in Oregon City;
   - 223rd Avenue widening in Fairview;
   - Willamette Shoreline Rail & Trail Study;
   - No. Lombard Rail Overcrossing;
   - Gresham ITS Phase 3;
   - Morrison Bridge Bike Lane;
   - So. Corridor DEIS; and
   - Fanno Creek Trail, Phase 2.

3. Comments were received encouraging restoration of funding for the following projects:
   - Washington Street bike lanes in Oregon City;
   - Full funding for the TMA Stabilization and 2040 Initiatives programs;
   - Boeckman Road construction and the SMART Park & Ride;
   - 162nd/Foster Road/Kelly Creek bridge; and
   - Cornell Road Boulevard project.
4. Comments were received on the topic of **funding mainline freeway planning from regional sources**.
   - Opinion was divided on funding any portion of the Sunrise Corridor planning/design work.
   - Opinion was generally negative on funding any portion of mainline freeway work from regional sources.

5. Comments were received indicating favorable anticipation of ODOT Bond Program financing of the East End Connector project.

**Full minutes of the hearing will be available at the JPACT meeting.**
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Priorities 2002
Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program
2002-2005

Public comments on final MTIP funding recommendation
September 12, 2001
Summary of Final Public Comments
September 12, 2001

This report provides a summary of final public comments received on final recommendations made by the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) for transportation project funding priorities in the 2002-2005 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP).

The MTIP is a regional transportation funding program that identifies projects to be constructed or programs to be funded with federal transportation revenues over the next four years. Local jurisdictions submit transportation projects to Metro for funding consideration. Eligible projects range from freeways, roads and highways to buses, bicycle lanes, boulevards, pedestrian improvements and planning projects. For the first time, freeways improvements are in the proposed project list.

Section One
Public hearing testimony

A public hearing was held at 5 p.m. on Tuesday, September 4, 2001 in Metro’s Council Chamber. The Metro Council Community Planning Committee received forty-eight oral comments. Council members present consisted of Chair Rod Park, Bill Atherton, David Bragdon, Susan McLain and Rod Monroe. Members of the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) attending the hearing included Charlie Hales, City of Portland; Brian Newman, City of Milwaukie; Bill Kennemer, Clackamas County; Kay Van Sickel, ODOT; Craig Pridemore, Clark County; and Lonnie Roberts, Multnomah County.

Oral testimony was summarized in the draft minutes of the hearing and may be found in Section One of the report, including written comments and attachments turned in to support oral testimony.

The majority of comments concerned TPAC’s recommendation to balance the MTIP program by cutting back the Springwater/East Bank Trail Connector projects while retaining full funding for the Nyberg Interchange project. Many testified in favor of restoring funding for the Springwater Connector project. Slightly fewer comments sought to retain full funding of the Nyberg Interchange project.
Comments were also received supporting recommended funding for the following projects:
• Johnson Creek Boulevard reconstruction
• Gateway TOD project and 102nd Avenue: Hancock/Main Boulevard project
• Molalla Avenue Pedestrian project
• McLoughlin Boulevard project in Oregon City
• 223rd Avenue widening in Fairview
• Willamette Shoreline Rail and Trail Study
• North Lombard Rail Overcrossing
• Gresham ITS Phase 3
• Morrison Bridge Bike Lane
• South Corridor DEIS
• Fanno Creek Trail, Phase 2

Comments were received encouraging restoration of funding for the following projects:
• Washington Street bike lanes in Oregon City
• Full funding for the TMA Stabilizing and 2040 Initiatives programs
• Boeckman Road construction and the SMART park & ride
• 162nd/Foster Road/Kelly Creek bridge
• Cornell Road Boulevard project

Comments were received on the topic of funding mainline freeway planning from regional sources.
• Opinion was divided on funding any portion of the Sunrise Corridor planning/design work
• Opinion was generally negative on funding any portion of mainline freeway work from regional sources.

Comments were received indicating favorable anticipation of ODOT Bond Program financing of the East End Connector project.
Section Two
Summary of written
and hotline comments

Written and oral comments (not made at the hearing) may be found in Section Two. Twenty-nine comments were received by mail, fax, e-mail and transportation phone hotline through September 10, 2001.

The comments are summarized in Section Two of this report. The letters, e-mails and fax documents are included following the summaries.

General summary of comments

In general, many comments were received in favor of fully funding the Springwater Trail Connection, the I-5/Nyberg Road Interchange/Widening project and the Transportation Demand Management programs, especially the TMAs.

Several comments were in favor of the Pedestrian Access to Transit program and the Southeast Foster Road and 162nd Avenue project.

Other projects were mentioned, including the Boeckman Road extension and SMART Park-and-Ride facility, South Corridor Transportation Study, Molalla Avenue Sidewalk project, North Lombard Overcrossing, Columbia/Killingsworth Connector, Sunrise Corridor PE, Sunnyside Road, Clackamas County ITS program and Harmony/Linwood final design.
Section One
Testimony at public hearing
September 4, 2001
MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL COMMUNITY PLANNING COMMITTEE/
JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (JPACT) MEETING (PUBLIC HEARING)
Part II

Tuesday, September 4, 2001

Public Hearing

Metro Council Community Planning Committee members present: Rod Park (Chair), Bill Atherton, David Bragdon, Susan McLain and Rod Monroe.

The JPACT members present: Commissioner Charlie Hales, City of Portland; Councilor Brian Newman, City of Milwaukie, representing the Cities of Clackamas County; Commissioner Bill Kennemer, Clackamas County; Kay Van Sickel, Region 1 Manager, Oregon Department of Transportation; Commissioner Craig Pridemore, Clark County; and Commissioner Lonnie Roberts, Multnomah County.

Chair Park reconvened the meeting at 5:05 p.m., then welcomed and introduced the attending JPACT members to the audience.

Chair Park then opened the public hearing.

6. Resolution No. 01-3098 – For the Purpose of Amending the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) to Allocate FY 2004-2005 Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) and Surface Transportation Program (STP) Funds

Mr. Cotugno then explained the MTIP process and the recommendations for approval. A revised version of the resolution was distributed as well as the Priorities 2002 MTIP Update Project Summary of TPAC Program Recommendation, both dated September 4, 2001, and both made a part of this record. Mr. Cotugno referred to the Priorities 2002 MTIP timeline of key milestones (Attachment 1 to the staff report of the resolution). He explained that the TPAC Program Recommendation included the overall process, the criteria, the projects recommended for funding, the projects recommended for cutting, and a series of the options considered, as well as the resolution itself. The Project Summary was a supplemental packet giving specifics of the projects. The recommended list, he said, was the result of many meetings and was the final recommendation to be used to narrow it down further to balance to the dollars available. Mr. Cotugno emphasized that this list did not address all the transportation funds available to spend in the metropolitan area, but was for the particular categories that Metro has the discretion to allocate, i.e., strictly a category of funds called Surface Transportation Program that are flexible and are intended for metropolitan areas to spend on multi-modal purposes, as well as what are called CMAQ (Congestion Mitigation Air Quality) funds which can only be spent on projects designed to reduce vehicle emissions and cannot be spent on roadway expansion projects.

Of the approximate $50 million resources to be allocated (at $25 million per year for 2004 and 2005), a little over 50% of the available funds are totally flexible and can be spent on any purpose, and a little under 50% can only be spent on alternative mode purposes.

The recommendation included in the agenda packet was the draft staff recommendation that went to the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) on August 31, 2001, he said, and which was $1.7 million too high. The packet distributed at this meeting was the TPAC recommendation from their August 31st meeting, and differed somewhat. Mr. Cotugno then highlighted the overall TPAC
recommendation, some of the alternatives that were considered for that recommendation, and some of the conditions associated with some of the projects. The fold-out matrix in the TPAC recommendation was what Mr. Cotugno used for these explanations (Exhibit A to the resolution), pointing out the $38 million of available funds to new projects and the $12 million to the past commitment toward Interstate MAX, and also stating that this matrix showed a balanced program. The options proposed in this matrix to balance the projects to the available funds were included in the staff report. Lastly, Mr. Cotugno called attention to Exhibit B to the resolution that stated certain conditions to the projects.

Councilor Monroe, as chair of JPACT, explained to the audience the political process of determining these lists, saying that this year the Metro Council opted to weigh in early and sent a list of their high priority projects to JPACT. Staff then compiled a recommended “cut” list that was then sent to TPAC, and TPAC then made their recommendation to JPACT. TPAC disagreed with the staff recommendation on one project – the Springwater Trail funding, which TPAC voted 8-to-7 to cut in half, and to fully fund the Nyberg Interchange project. A letter from the full Multnomah County Board of Commissioner was received (and is made a part of this record) stating that they disagreed with the Multnomah County TPAC member’s vote. JPACT will make the decision on September 13th, and that list is projected to come before the Metro Council September 20th for their approval or disagreement.

Chair Park opened the meeting to public testimony.

1. Mayor Gene Grant, City of Happy Valley, 11311 SE Charview Ct., Clackamas, OR 97015, urged rejection of Option 1 of the TPAC approved staff report, to replace it with staff recommended Option 3 for reasons stated earlier by Mr. Cotugno.

   Mayor Grant said he was aware that the Clackamas County representative voted in favor of the TPAC Option 1, and he felt that was a mistake. He said he’s spoken with Commissioner Kennemer and hoped to persuade him to take the same approach as the Multnomah County Commissioners. He said he has confirmed with both Lake Oswego and Milwaukie, as well as Happy Valley, support of full funding of the Springwater project. The project is a vital missing link; he personally uses it and feels it’s an extremely important, high priority project.

2. Brion Barnett, Engineering Department staff, City of Milwaukie, 6101 SE Johnson Creek Blvd., Milwaukie, OR 97206. Mr. Barnett said the City of Milwaukie also supports full funding for the Springwater project, that a large portion of this connection to the project lies within Milwaukie’s city limits. He said Milwaukie feels that building in one phase has the potential for a low overall construction cost rather than building it in two phases. Milwaukie also disagrees with Clackamas County’s recommendation to not fund it. Mr. Barnett also thanked TPAC for supporting 100% funding for the Johnson Road project.

3. Martha Waldemar, Chair, Sunnyside United Neighbors CPO, P.O. Box 306, Clackamas, OR 97015, spoke in support of funding the Sunrise Corridor. Ms. Waldemar gave a brief overview of what the congestion was like with all the trucks serving the metropolitan area.

4. Barb Stickley, (PAC), 11331 SE Alder St., 97216, asked for the financial support to move forward with the purchase of a one-acre parcel from Tri-Met, the first step for creating an integral part of the vision for Portland’s only regional center. Having a say in what happens at this corner is integral to uphold the integrity of the Opportunity Gateway Concept Plan. This Council’s support was appreciated by the people who live and work in the Gateway area, and the people who travel there.
5. Arlene Kimura, Opportunity Gateway People’s Advisory Committee, chair of Hazelwood Neighborhood Association, 112 NE 173rd, Portland, OR 97230, testified in favor of Ms. Stickley’s testimony, adding that the redevelopment of the four corners would also increase the need for parking at the Transit Center and that buying another section of acreage was critical for parking for transit.

6. Beth Baltz, Transportation Chair of the Opportunity Gateway PAC, spoke to the funding of the design work on NE 102nd. This street will be the spine of the newest urban renewal area in the city of Portland, she added.

Commissioner Charlie Hales asked for clarification that the funding in the TPAC recommended list was sufficient to accomplish what she wanted done in the next phase. Ms. Baltz agreed.

7. Nancy Kraushaar, staff, City of Oregon City and TPAC member representing the Cities of Clackamas County, testified for the Oregon City Transportation Advisory Committee and submitted written testimony (included as part of this record) in support of the Molalla Avenue Sidewalk Project and the McLoughlin Boulevard Improvements project.

8. Commissioner Doug Neeley, City of Oregon City, 712 12th St., Oregon City, OR 97045, spoke to a project that had been cut, the Washington Street Bike Lane. He said Oregon City has projects that would form links to this that will be coming up next year and they would appreciate this being considered.

9. Councilor Len Edwards, City of Fairview, 635 Lincoln St. (P. O. Box 213), Fairview, OR 97024, thanked the committee for the $134,000 proposed allocation for the right-of-way on the 223rd Overcrossing. He said the people of Fairview can’t get to the biggest regional park, Blue Lake, by walking or biking under 223rd because it’s too dangerous, and yet there was a $6,700,000 proposed allocation for Pedestrians and Bike rights-of-way elsewhere.

10. Victoria Brown, manager of the Tualatin Chamber TMA, P. O. Box 701, Tualatin, OR 97062, asked the committee and JPACT to consider full funding for the regional Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program, especially the Regional 2040 Initiatives program. TDM programs provide service against traffic congestion as well as access to jobs, she said.

11. John Bendit, Upscale Automotive and Tualatin TMA Steering Committee, 19460 SW 89th Avenue, Tualatin, OR 97062, requested full funding of the TDM programs at last year’s level. He said it’s been proven nationally that TMAs and related programs such as shuttle services need ongoing public funding in addition to private funding. This is a very, very successful program and gets people that last mile to their jobs in the Tualatin area. Without this funding the carpool and shuttle programs will cease to exist.

12. Jim Duncan, Gateway area resident, 9823 NE Irving St., Portland, OR 97220, testified as a non-business person serving on the Opportunity Gateway People’s Advisory Committee. Mr. Duncan said he supports funding of PTOD1, the Gateway Regional Center TOD project. The flow of traffic there is a major problem for residents, tied up by non-area commuters from the park-and-ride. For this reason, he supports funding of the transportation improvements in this area to proceed sooner than later.
13. Donald Dauterman, President, Durametal Corp., P. O. Box 606, Tualatin, OR 97062, testified in favor of the Nyberg Interchange project. His company employs 100 people and has 15 tons of material coming in and out of the factory every day. The area has grown, and the truck traffic connecting up with I-5/Nyberg Road has increased tremendously. He encouraged this project being on the top of the list and funding found by whatever means.

14. Lenny Dee, 2588 NE 31st, Portland, OR 97212, presented written testimony (included as a part of this record) on behalf of the Coalition for a Livable Future (CLF) made up of over 60 non-profits organizations in the region working for a just and equitable region. He urged allocation of regional transportation funds in a way that was most supportive of the 2040 Vision.

15. John LeCavalier (no testimony card), Coalition for a Livable Future, Natural Resources Working Group, 1622 SE 55th, Portland, OR, and a worker at Clackamas Community College, said that as he listened to Commissioner Neeley and Nancy Kraushaar and others from Clackamas County, it struck him how important this regional approach is. Mr. LeCavalier also supported funding for the Springwater Corridor project, one reason being to allow people to “amble.”

16. Becky Smith, Coalition for a Livable Future, Housing Working Group, 3309 SE 15th, Portland, OR 97212, and a worker in Hillsboro, said transportation issues are critical to affordable housing, and also supported the criteria established by the Council in January for the perspective of the whole region to make sure at least some of these projects meet the 2040 Plan for the region.

17. Jacob Brostoff, Transportation Advocate, 1000 Friends of Oregon, 534 SW 3rd, Suite 300, Portland, OR, said he also represented the Coalition for a Livable Future. Mr. Brostoff spoke briefly to the Coalition’s perspective of the larger picture and why the MTIP projects and the funding structure matter to the Coalition. He also said the Council’s criteria eloquently articulates the Coalition’s vision for the region’s future. He said he did not want to repeat his colleagues’ testimony, but to reiterate it. The mix of projects achieved the right mix of transportation and land use, and CLF was very pleased with that.

18. John Geffel, Senior Vice President of Marketing and Operations, Timberline Software Corporation, 15195 NW Greenbrier Parkway, Beaverton, OR 97006, submitted written testimony (included as a part of this record) relative to the Westside Transportation Alliance and their mission, formation and funding, and he urged support of the region’s TMAs.

19. Catherine Ciarlo, Executive Director of the Bicycle Transportation Alliance, 1220 SW Morrison St., Portland, OR 97205, encouraged the Metro Council and JPACT to reinstate full funding for the Springwater Corridor. She also recognized the work Metro staff did in putting together their recommendation that provides transportation options in the metropolitan area. As a member of the Board of Directors of the Oregon Climate Trust, Ms. Ciarlo asked if the committee and JPACT would consider reinstating funding of the Region 2040 Initiatives.

20. Judy Edwards, Executive Director, Westside Transportation Alliance, 15455 NW Greenbrier Parkway, Suite 210, Beaverton, OR 97006, provided written testimony (included as a part of this record) urging funding support for the TDM program housed at Tri-Met, and full funding at $500,000 each for TMAs and for the Region 2040 Initiatives.
21. Ross Williams, Citizens for Sensible Transportation, 1220 SW Morrison, Suite 535, Portland, OR 97205, submitted written testimony (included as a part of this record), supporting restoring full funding of the region’s TDM program, funding pedestrian access to transit, supporting the Cornell Road/Cedar Mill Town Center boulevard treatment, and full funding of the Springwater Corridor. Mr. Williams also commented on the Mainline Freeway Projects and suggested another choice between the Nyberg Interchange versus the Springwater Corridor of going back to not funding Mainline Freeway Projects.

22. Nancy Christie, Department Administrator for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, and Volunteer Transportation Coordinator, OGI School of Science and Engineering at OHSU (formerly Oregon Graduate Institute), OSU, 20000 NW Walker Rd., Beaverton, OR 97006, spoke in support of the Westside TMA, and the funding options Judy Edwards proposed in her testimony, and told the committee how the TMAs beneficially affect OGI.

23. Greg McPherson, 7430 SE 27th Avenue, Portland, OR 97202, spoke in favor of full funding for the Springwater Corridor.

24. Ted Gilbert, Opportunity Gateway Program Advisory Committee, a property owner and a stakeholder in the four-corners area (NE 99th and Pacific intersection), which includes the Gateway Transit Center. His company’s vision, along with PacTrust, hopes to create an area called Gateway Station in next five years, which could include as much as 50 acres, and would be a vital, lively, attractive district. Mr. Gilbert thought this was an unparalleled opportunity for this region and a meaningful investment here would allow Tri-Met and PDC to work on one of the key corners of the four corners, and he added that the potential MAX south and north lines would make this the most accessible location in the region.

25. Steve Gutman, private citizen and commercial lender at ShoreBank Pacific, 1823 SE 33rd, Portland, OR 97214, said he spoke on behalf of the hundreds of people who sent postcards, e-mails and made phone calls urging the Metro Council to fund completion of the Springwater Trail. This is the only pot of dollars for Springwater, Mr. Gutman said, and he urged full funding. Livability itself is becoming a major regional economic engine. Portland is becoming synonymous with livability and its citizens want their selected representatives to invest their hard earned money to keep it that way.

26. Dick Jones, 3205 SE Vinyard Rd., Oak Gr., 97267, submitted written testimony (included as a part of this record) supporting MTIP funding for Sunrise Corridor project.

27. Danielle Cowan, Public Affairs Director, City of Wilsonville, 30000 SW Town Center Loop East, Wilsonville, OR 97070, represented the Wilsonville City Council and Wilsonville Mayor Charlotte Lehan, testified that Wilsonville appreciates the staff and TPAC recommendations to partially fund the Boeckman Road Extension and the SMART park-and-ride facility, and she urged JPACT and the Metro Council to fully fund both of these projects as they are critical to providing an important and necessary link for commuters traveling north and south along I-5 through Wilsonville. Responding to a question from Councilor Newman, Ms. Cowan said that the 50% funding level of either project was unknown to Wilsonville until today and they hadn’t had the opportunity to determine alternative funding. It was possible, she said, that the funding reduction wouldn’t allow them to do anything.
28. Dick Cooley, Opportunity Gateway PAC Chair, 141 SW Wright Ave., Portland, OR 97201, spoke in support of two major projects in Gateway. The Gateway Regional Center TOD and the NE 102nd Boulevard Design projects will not happen without the kind of early attention asked for in these two projects, and he urged support for them.

29. Mark Schoening, City Engineer, City of Lake Oswego, P. O. Box 369, Lake Oswego, OR 97034, said Lake Oswego supports (as JPACT recommended) the planning study of the Willamette Shore Rail/Trail Line, believing even with the reduced funding that the goals of the study can be accomplished. The Boones Ferry Corridor Study, which didn’t make the final cut to the 100% list, is a project that Lake Oswego has fully funded that’s being completed and will be taken to their Planning Commission to amend their Comprehensive Plan and Public Facilities Plan. They’re disappointed that the pre-design money was cut, but have high expectations for next time.

30. Michael Wolfe, 2387 NW Northrup, #5, Portland, OR 97210, testified for full funding of the original $4 million for the Springwater Trail connection, specifically by answering three potential objections: 1) it’s a more recreation oriented than transportation oriented facility; 2) it’s only a Portland project, and 3) it’s the cost. His perspective was to look at Metro’s bike map ... the Springwater link would integrate the whole. Doing the easy and cheap will always ensure a piecemeal approach, he said, and urged approval of full funding for the project.

31. Rose Rummel-Eury, member of the Bicycle Transportation Alliance (BTA) and a TAB board member of Lake Oswego, 5010-D Foothills Rd., Lake Oswego, OR 97034, spoke in support of the Willamette Shores Trail Study. Ms. Rummel-Eury said she was also here on behalf of her parents who live in Durham, NC, and who have seen their quality of life go down, while their daughter lives car free and carefree. She said she hopes Metro continues to live by its 2040 Vision. She also spoke to the traffic problem along the highway strip between the Sellwood Bridge and downtown Lake Oswego, and how dangerous it was.

32. Jerry Foy, 15142 SE Fairoaks Ave., Oak Grove, OR, Vice-chair of the Oak Lodge CPO, a member of Clackamas County’s Concurrency Committee, and a lifelong resident of Clackamas County, thanked the committee and JPACT for funding the engineering studies required for the Sunrise Corridor project. He said this is probably the most important transportation project in Clackamas County and will likely have the biggest impact on the county growth pattern in the next decade. This project is critical to success of commercial and public transportation.

33. Margaret Pritchard, 2510 SE Concord Rd., Milwaukie, OR 97267 (Oak Grove area), testified as a member of the North Clackamas County Chamber, Land Use/Transportation Committee, that their highest priority was the Sunrise Corridor, with the main interest being livability and job availability in Clackamas County. Portland would no longer be livable if it didn’t have the freight on Sunrise Corridor.

34. Paul Grosjean, Pleasant Valley Neighborhood Association, 15714 SE Henderson Way, Portland, OR 97236, spoke to the SE 162nd and Foster (SE Foster Rd./Kelly Creek project), which made the cut list. Mr. Grosjean said this was a Portland transportation issue, but also a regional issue, which makes it a Metro issue. It’s an environmental issue regarding the fish habitat, which Metro has pledged to support, and this project would correct a substandard culvert. It’s a safety issue (or a human habitat issue) in that it’s dangerous now and is getting more so, with 16,000 cars using the intersection each day with the one stop sign. None of the transportation master plans for this area include this project, and this is a bad premise. Mr. Grosjean asked the committee and JPACT to please review and fund this project.
35. Bill DeWitt, 15842 SE Henderson Way, Portland, OR 97236, resident of Hawthorne Ridge, and on the Board of Directors of the Homeowners Association, also spoke to the SE 162nd and Foster Road intersection, and said he represented the 500+ people who use it daily. Mr. DeWitt then described a typical day at the intersection, explaining how dangerous it is. He said that five years ago the City of Portland asked the citizens to put up their own money (500 people contributed $900,000), saying no more houses could be built until a stoplight was approved. Today, the light is still not there and the City of Portland still has their money.

Councilor Monroe added that Mr. DeWitt’s description of the intersection was not an exaggeration, that it was the most dangerous one he’d ever gone through.

Commissioner Lonnie Roberts asked Mr. DeWitt if the light at SE 174th has helped, and Mr. DeWitt said it has, a little. Commissioner Roberts, Mr. DeWitt, Paul Grosjean, Councilor Atherton and Portland Commissioner Charlie Hales had a conversation about the funds the citizens had provided, and how the City of Portland could not come up with matching funds, after many attempts to do so, to put in the stoplight.

36. Jack Newlevant, 1904 SE Hemlock Ave., Portland, OR 97214, testified as a member of the City of Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee, communicating his support for the Springwater Trail, and added that he’s very enthusiastic about Metro’s acquisition of the property along the river.

37. Robert Schmidt, 824 SE Lambert St., Portland, OR 97202, Board of Directors of the Sellwood Moreland Improvement League (SMILE), and an ODOT employee, said he is a strong bicycle advocate and supports funding for the Springwater Trail connection, as it is a vital link and it supports the 2040 Plan.

38. Gary Mengis, 15706 SE Henderson Way, Portland, OR, and president of the Hawthorne Ridge Homeowners Association. Mr. Mengis testified on the SE 162nd and Foster Road intersection, saying it’s the only viable route to Portland for the area’s 500 homeowners. He said he wants to go on record that he loves bicycles, but this intersection is incredibly dangerous, and the past week there was a fatality accident there.

39. Robert Porter, 2185 NW 124th Ave., Portland, OR 97229 (Cedar Mill area of Washington County), a citizen member of Washington County’s Cornell and Barnes Road Project Advisory Committee, voiced his disappointment that the Cornell Road project was dropped from the MTIP Boulevard Projects list. One of the reasons given for withholding the funds on the project, he said, was that the design wasn’t completed. Mr. Porter said it’s difficult to design something when you don’t know how much money will be allocated for the project. He said he hopes there’s some awareness of how important it is for the Cedar Mill Town Center to be developed, and hopes for future funding set-asides for it.

Presiding Officer Bragdon told Mr. Porter that this project has been discussed, and to not give up hope, that Metro wants to encourage the design of this to continue. When Washington County brought it forward, Presiding Officer Bragdon said, it wasn’t working the way even the neighborhood wanted it, so he encouraged Mr. Porter to continue working on it. Chair Park added that he agreed with the Presiding Officer.
40. Patti McCoy, P. O. Box 55651, Portland, OR 97238, of the Columbia Corridor Association (CCA), spoke to the N. Lombard Overcrossing project, and the Gresham/Multnomah County ITS Phase 3 project, saying she fully concurred with JPACT and strongly supported these. The Columbia/Killingsworth project continues to be an extremely high priority for the Columbia Corridor Association. The region needs to look at other funding mechanisms, she added, saying that strategic investments in the transportation infrastructure are critical to maintaining the economic engine of the region. Absent the funding for the Columbia/Killingsworth east end connector project, CCA anticipates support through the 2001 Transportation Investment Act.

41. Fred Nussbaum, 6510 SW Barnes Rd., Portland, OR 97225, spoke representing the Association of Oregon Rail and Transit Advocates (AORTA), Portland Chapter, and as a 42-year resident, and said he opposes any capacity increases like the Sunrise Corridor, the Nyberg Bridge crossing, or Hwy. 26 widening, whether for construction or preliminary engineering. More effort needs to be put into alternatives. More freight can be put into railroads; everyone and every jurisdiction can do something to change this. Mr. Nussbaum also spoke in support of commuter rail and funding the Springwater Trail project, and said he particularly supported Tri-Met receiving full MTIP funding for capital projects, but not for operations.

42. Phil Goff, 1955 NW Hoyt St., #24, Portland, OR 97209, spoke representing the Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee who concurred with the recommendations to fund the Springwater Trail and Morrison Bridge projects, which has been the highest priority for their committee. In principal, he said, all non-freeway bridges in Portland need to be available for all modes of transportation. When barriers like the Willamette River are overcome, bike use explodes.

43. Mark Norberg, 4845 SW 195th Ct., Aloha, OR 97007, appeared as a member of the Bicycle Transportation Alliance (BTA), Washington County chapter. Mr. Norberg said that since the City of Portland is the most bike friendly city in the United States, he'd like to see that friendliness extended to the rest of the metropolitan area. Mr. Norberg said he was very much in favor of bicycle projects and other projects that support alternative transportation, especially the Fanno Creek Trail and the Springwater Connection Trail. He said it just makes sense to fund alternative forms of transportation as bicycling is a valid form of transportation, it doesn't take up as much room as cars, and it doesn't use or burn fossil fuels. He urged the committee and JPACT to use any remaining funds for transportation alternatives.

44. Ed Jahn, 14109 SE Fairoaks Ave., Milwaukie, OR 97267, and a television producer for Oregon Public Broadcasting (OPB), supported the South Corridor DEIS and the Willamette Shoreline Rail and Trail. Mr. Jahn said he was a regular bike commuter, but holds onto his car because bike options are limited. He said he would support any proposal that brings mass transit, etc., to Milwaukie, and if rapid transit went from Milwaukie to Lake Oswego, where he worked, he'd give away his car.

45. Mike McKillip, City of Tualatin, 18880 SW Martinazzi Ave., Tualatin, OR 97062, spoke on behalf of the City of Tualatin to fully support the staff recommendation to fully fund the I-5/Nyberg Interchange project. This project will help that area to continue growing. Forty-six percent of the respondents to a recent survey said the traffic congestion on the Tualatin/Sherwood Road was their number one concern in the city, and the next highest ranked issue was only 15 or 16 percent. Tualatin citizens think their city's done a lot in the last 20 years toward being a 2040-type development with a fairly equal balance of housing/jobs, redeveloped jobs, greenway corridor setbacks, etc. This project would serve traffic coming into and going out of their area. For these reasons, in addition to all the other comments they've made in the past, Tualatin supports full funding of the I-5/Nyberg Interchange project.
46. John Fahsbender, 4136 NE 31st Ave., Portland, OR 97211, spoke as a member of the Bicycle Transportation Alliance and said he supported full funding of the Springwater Trail and the Morrison Bridge project, and urged the committee and JPACT to continue to fund transportation alternatives.

47. Commissioner Lonnie Roberts, Multnomah County Board of Commissioner, 601 SE Hawthorne Blvd., Portland, OR 97214, spoke to the Board of Commissioner’s letter to the Community Planning Committee, faxed just prior to the beginning of the meeting (and made a part of this record). The letter stated Multnomah County’s support for full funding of the Springwater Trail project, the Morrison Bridge Bike/Pedestrian Facility and the 223rd Ave. Railroad Overcrossing Right-of-Way.

48. Clark County Commissioner Craig Pridemore said he appreciated this joint public hearing and the opportunity to hear public comment from this side of the river, particularly when so much of the testimony was positive and affirmative.

Chair Park thanked everyone who testified and participated, and reminded them that JPACT would be meeting the following Thursday, September 13, for next step in the MTIP process, and then final action by the Metro Council tentatively scheduled for September 20, 2001.

9. Councilor Communications – None.

There being no further business for the committee, Chair Park adjourned the meeting at 8:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rooney Barker
Council Assistant
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Margaret Branson
Citizen/Sellwood Moreland Imp. League
Friends of Oaks Bottom
P. O. Box 820051
Portland, OR 97282

Aleta Woodruff (in favor of the resolution)
Opportunity Gateway PAC
No address given
Portland, OR
September 4, 2001

Metro Council and Community Planning Committee:

The Oregon City Transportation Advisory Committee appreciates the opportunity to provide public comments on the recommended project list for 2005-2005 federal funding.

We support the list of projects because they strike a balance between moving forward with long range goals of providing our region with a multi-modal transportation system that will make the most of our existing roads while carefully planning roadway expansion projects that ensure mobility for drivers and trucks who cannot possible use transit, bikes, and sidewalks.

First, we want to voice our strong support for the Molalla Avenue sidewalk project. Oregon City has taken a very methodical approach at planning and trying to fund this high-need project. The current situation on this arterial is dismal, especially considering that it is a transit corridor lined with mixed use development. Our community has formally recognized the need to construct pedestrian amenities in order for this corridor to increase in bus use. Access to the frequent Tri-Met service is essential and will help those that use this corridor, which runs from the downtown regional center area all the way to the Clackamas Community College.

This project not only provides wider, ADA compliant sidewalks, but also provides bike lanes and functional enhancements (such as access management and signal timing) – all within the existing right-of-way. Four travel lanes will go to two through lanes with center turn lanes and landscaped medians. Not only are we hoping for a better transit, pedestrian corridor, we also believe that the project will invigorate a tired, ugly commercial district with the landscaping and people places.

Now, for the McLoughlin Boulevard Improvements. Again, the community worked very hard to create a plan for the Oregon City regional center – our Downtown Community Plan. This project is being methodically advanced by the Oregon City staff. The City recently successfully applied for an ODOT TGM grant to complete the land use plan process for McLoughlin Boulevard in Oregon City. This planning will directly proceed the preliminary engineering that the project on the proposed list will provide. The timing has been carefully reviewed to maintain momentum for McLoughlin Boulevard improvements – which are seen as critical in the development of the downtown plan and achieving the regional center goals that will in the long run benefit Oregon City as well as the region. We do ask that if you will be referring to the original Council MTIP Project Ranking Matrix, please review the responses to the criteria for Oregon City’s McLoughlin Boulevard project. The TAC is concerned that the original responses to not accurately reflect the characteristics of our project.

Thank you again.

Oregon City Transportation Advisory Committee
Ginger Taylor and Melanie Paulo, Co-Chairs
Testimony by Lenny Dee on behalf of the Coalition for a Livable Future
Transportation Reform Working Group

Joint Metro Community Planning Committee/JPACT Public Hearing
September 4, 2001

I am presenting this testimony on behalf of the Coalition for a Livable Future and as a member of the Coalition's Transportation Reform Working Group. The Coalition is an association of 60 diverse civic organizations working together to create a sustainable and equitable Portland-Vancouver metropolitan. CLF provides collaborative, integrated public policy solutions to social, economic, transportation, environmental, planning, and housing issues affecting our region.

The three presenters following me are part of a Coalition for a Livable Future panel. We will all be testifying to urge that the Council and JPACT allocate regional transportation funds in a way most supportive of the Region 2040 vision.

Since its inception in 1994, the Coalition has participated in regional transportation decision making in support of policies designed to create a transportation system that accommodates people, bikes and cars. We have emphasized the importance of proper choices for transportation infrastructure in determining the livability of our communities. Therefore, we strongly support allocating limited regional transportation funds to the projects that best meet regional goals.

As a result, we believe primary emphasis should be placed on the criteria that were established by the Council in January for evaluating projects' impact on region 2040. Focusing limited resources on community and industrial centers, alternatives to single occupancy vehicles and the development of a multi-modal transportation system are all vital to the success of the regional plan. Investments that improve the efficiency of the existing system just make sense.

Most important, we believe that these resources should be used to fund the parts of the system for which no other sources are currently available. We are disturbed by the decision to fund mainline freeway projects that are eligible for the state bond program. The allocations of funds for the Sunrise and Sunset freeways are made at the expense of cost effective TDM programs that would reduce demand on our roads. At the cost of pedestrian and bike improvements in the Cedar Mill town center, on 257th in east Multnomah County, in Forest Grove, and in Oregon City. At the cost of improving pedestrian access between transit stops and people's homes and employers. These are all elements that are essential to creating a complete transportation system that provides people with real alternatives to automobiles.

This is one of the few opportunities Metro has for directly implementing the regional vision. It ought to make the most of it. Thank you for opportunity to testify about this year's allocation of regional transportation funds.
THE MISSION, FORMATION AND FUNDING OF THE WTA

The mission of the Westside Transportation Alliance is to serve the transportation needs of westside employers through public/private partnerships that reduce traffic congestion, improve air quality, foster economic vitality, and improve quality of life.

- WTA was formed in 1994 with CMAQ funds under the structure of the City of Beaverton. In 1996, the WTA formed a separate non-profit organization.
- Currently, WTA has 30 employer members from Tigard, Beaverton, Hillsboro, and Wilsonville representing approximately 35,000 employees. Supporting members pay $10 per employee with a minimum of $500 and maximum of $15,000; Basic members pay $5 per employee with a minimum of $250 and maximum of $5,000.

EMPLOYERS SUPPORT TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATIONS’ PROGRAMS

- Businesses report that their #1 transportation problem is getting employees to work and they believe their greatest future barrier for doing business will be increased congestion.
- Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs are proven to reduce vehicle miles traveled, but in order for them to be successful, employers need meaningful assistance. Visibility and frequency are key ingredients of successful TDM programs. Competitions, creativity, and fun are integral as well. This is where Transportation Management Associations’ program assistance makes a real difference to the success of employer vmt reduction programs. Without constant stimulation, new ideas, promotions, and creative and fun ideas, employer programs wane from the doldrums and loss of enthusiasm and motivation. Employees need to be frequently encouraged and motivated to use alternative modes of transportation. There has to be a “what’s in it for me” element in the promotion.
- Behavior modification is the desired result. An organized approach with incentives provides positive reinforcement for changed behaviors.

PRACTICAL WORK PRODUCTS FOR EMPLOYERS FROM THE WTA

- New brochure on alternate transportation options in Washington County with a customized insert of members’ alternate transportation resources offered to their employees
- bi-monthly newsletter; monthly updates for members
- Employee Transportation Coordinator (ETC) network information sessions; FAX-on-Demand Service on key information topics; seminars and workshops
- Campaigns such as “Car Free & Carefree 2001.”
- The WTA Nimbus Shuttle connects employees between the Beaverton Transit Center and the Nimbus Business Park.
- WTA also provides ECO surveys and their analysis and writes transportation plans for members; organizes transportation fairs; disseminates TDM ideas to ETCs

John Geffel, Sr. VP Marketing & Operations    Timberline Software Corporation
• Assists members with publicizing their Transportation Demand Management (TDM) efforts. The WTA website is www.wta-tma.org.

• Employee Transportation Coordinator training manual titled “Getting to Work – A Handbook for Employee Transportation Coordinators.” The book is on CD (140 pages) with three main sections, the training manual, a complete resource in the index, and a marketing section with three new thematic promotions and promotional examples from Nike and Intel. There are six new mode illustrations and three new composite illustrations for the promotions.

• Internet based survey of commute behaviors that complies with both ECO and Tri-Met PASSport requirements.

THE WTA PRODUCES RESULTS THAT COUNT TO FURTHER REGIONAL GOALS

• 168 employers representing nearly 112,000 employers signed up to participate (84 employers representing nearly 73,000 in 2000 and 43 employers in 1999)

• 111 employers sent in "I DID IT!" employee confirmation forms (72 in 2000 and 39 in 1999)

• Super Commuters: 3,328 (2,529 in 2000 and 785 in 1999)

• Good Going Commuters: 646 (348 in 2000 and 146 in 1999)

• Total Car Free & Carefree Week Participants: 3,954 (2,877 in 2000 and 931 in 1999)

• Auto trips saved: approximately 62,390 (approximately 25,893 in 2000 and 7,795 in 1999)

• Approximate vehicle miles saved: 461,686 (181,251 in 2000 and 54,565 in 1999)

• Commuters who hadn't used alternative transportation in six months: 287 representing approximately 1,076 new auto trips saved and 7,962 new vehicle miles saved (2000: 252, representing approximately 945 auto trips saved; not identified in 1999)

THE BOTTOM LINE – TMA’S ARE WORKING FOR THE REGION’S EMPLOYERS & THE METRO AREA BUT THEY NEED THE FINANCIAL SUPPORT TO CONTINUE THE WORK

The region needs to either:

1. Adopt the $250,000 ($125,000 per year) Metro staff recommended amount for TMA Stabilization Program with a commitment that the dollars will only go to the 5 existing TMAs: Lloyd District, WestsideTransportation Alliance, Tualatin TMA, Swan Island TMA, and the Columbia Corridor TMA. or

2. Adopt the full $500,000 amount, which would keep it at the current annual level for years 2000/2003 level of $250,000 per year, which would allow for TMAs in addition to the existing 5. Otherwise, the small amount of $125,000 would be spread to thinly and none of the TMAs would benefit. A successful TMA needs between $100,000-$125,000 total each year to provide meaningful programs.

John Geffel, Sr. VP Marketing & Operations Timberline Software Corporation
Westside Transportation Alliance  
Serving the Transportation Needs of Westside Employers

Metro Public Hearing on MTIP  
September 4, 2001

The Westside Transportation Alliance (WTA) and its employer members urge you to support funding for the five existing TMAs, the Lloyd District TMA, Tualatin TMA, Swan Island TMA, Columbia Corridor TMA, and the Westside Transportation Alliance.

Westside employers are committing significant dollars by supporting auto trip reduction in several ways:

- Tri-Met payroll tax dollars
- Guaranteed ride home programs
- Transit subsidies and free passes
- Alternate commuting promotional programs with incentives such as prizes and bonuses
- Carpool matching and preferred parking
- Dues and inkind support of TMAs,
- Teleworking programs
- Subsidizing the WTA Nimbus Shuttle
- Compressed work week schedules
- Funding for existing TMAs and potential new TMAs coming on board.

The partnership of the TMAs, employers, and Tri-Met maximizes each other's efforts. We use dollars efficiently with low overhead costs. However, even though employers support our TMA, we find that mergers, buyouts, the ebbs and flows of the economy, and employers moving out of area all have a detrimental effect on our financial stability - all factors over which we have no control no matter how effective our programs and services might be. Therefore, we need some public funding that we can count on each year.

TMAs across the nation failed after initial ISTEA funding ran out. They failed at a rate of 50% in California. The Westside Transportation Alliance continues to struggle to secure enough private sector to operate at full budget. We are seeking funds tonight for the existing TMA. We are at a significant juncture - at a time where we can provide valuable regional leadership in making a difference on the reduction of vehicle miles traveled (vmt).

Other regions provide ongoing funding of TMAs for the promotion of alternate forms of commuting, such as Florida which provides $25,000 per year and Massachusetts $50,000 per year and Houston $40,000.

We ask you to consider two options and select either of them.

1. Restore the TMA funding to its current level of $250,000 per year ($500,000 for 2004/5) which would allow funding for existing TMAs and potential new TMAs coming on board. OR

2. Adopt the Metro staff recommendation of $125,000 per year with the stipulation that it go only to the five existing TMAs, the Lloyd District TMA, Tualatin TMA, Swan Island TMA, Columbia Corridor TMA, and the Westside Transportation Alliance.

Thank you for considering our testimony and supporting TMAs.

Judy Edwards, Executive Director

15455 N. W. Greenbrier Parkway, Beaverton, OR 97006, PH: 503-617-4844; FAX: 503-617-4976
www.wta-tma.org Email: wtamail@teleport.com
Ross Williams, Citizens for Sensible Transportation  
Testimony to Joint Metro Community Planning Committee/JPACT Public Hearing  
September 4, 2001

Citizens for Sensible Transportation supports the following changes in the TPAC recommendations:

Full Funding of TDM

Restore full funding to the region's Transportation Demand Management program. Funding these proven strategies that reduce demand for new transportation infrastructure just makes sense. TPAC's TDM Sub-committee's original request for $500,000 over two years was a very lean and reasonable request, but that has been cut by to $285,000.

Pedestrian access to transit

As anyone who lives, works or visits our suburban areas knows, transit access is only one part of the equation. 30% of Tri-Met's transit stops have not sidewalk access. Others are poorly served. Funding this program would reinforce the value of Portland's regional decision making in building out quality of life. Tri-Met has taken responsibility not only for getting people from one transit stop to the next, but for taking responsibility that they can start and finish their trip with adequate pedestrian facilities. Funding this program would encourage local jurisdictions to make a high priority for local sidewalks that also serve transit trips. Given the enormous task of providing a complete regional pedestrian network in many of our suburban areas, providing a focused starting point will get us moving on this task.

Cedar Mill Town Center

The boulevard treatment of Cornell Road is an important first step in the development of the Cedar Mill town center. While Washington County could pay for these improvements out of their MSTIP funds, it is important that the region make a sufficient contribution to reward that local investment. It appears that the alternative will be a typical suburban arterial that will make development of a multi-modal town center difficult, if not impossible.

Full Funding of the Springwater Corridor

While local jurisdictions may not consider it their top priority, this project has had the most support in public testimony. It will provide a visible result. It is also important to understand that the engine that has driven the regional economy over the past decade has been our quality of life and livability that have attracted a highly trained workforce.
There is no choice between economic prosperity and livable communities. Far from being a luxury to be cut in times of economic belt tightening, we must continue to invest in our communities. How well an investment in a new transportation facility enhances the quality of life is the essential measure of its importance to the region.
Subject: Support for MTIP funding of the Sunrise Corridor project

My name is Dick Jones. I live at 3205 SE Vineyard Rd. in Oak Grove Or 97267.

I am involved in numerous ways in transportation issues. I serve on Metro’s Committee for Citizen Involvement (MCCI), member of North Clackamas Chamber of Commerce and serve on the Land Use and Transportation Committee, Chair the Oak Lodge Community Council, serve on other Clackamas County transportation groups and I am a board member of Ride Connection.

I support moving forward with the Sunrise Corridor project because A) the growing needs for transportation solutions in the fast growing area east of I-205 and B) supporting this area’s strategic location for freight movement in our County.

The intersection of Highway 224 and 82nd Dr. has approximately the same level of truck traffic as the I-5 Bridge to Vancouver. As the region grows the freight traffic will grow proportionally. More people will require more goods. This project will give another access route to the Clackamas industrial area.

Several intersections on Highway 224 rank high on ODOT’s list of the least safe intersections. This certainly should be considered in the decision process as well.

Clackamas County is a “jobs poor” area with about two thirds of our people leaving each day for employment. Any effort to improve access to the industrial areas, create family wage jobs will pay big dividends regionally in reduced traffic congestion and reduced vehicle miles driven.

I thank you for considering my comments.

Dick Jones
September 4, 2001

Rod Park
Community Planning Committee Chair, Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97232

Chair Park;

We understand that TPAC voted to cut the E. Bank Springwater Trail Connector project by $1.7 million. We oppose this recommendation. Springwater Trail is a joint project between the City of Portland and the City of Milwaukie, portions of which lie in Multnomah County.

We support bike/pedestrian projects to help the region meet our 2040 goals. We request that JPACT give this project the utmost consideration and provide for full funding.

We would also like to express the critical need for full funding of our top two priorities: The Morrison Bridge Bike/Pedestrian Facility ($1.5 million) and the 223rd Ave. Railroad Overcrossing Right-of-Way ($149,000). Full funding for the Morrison Bridge project is needed since a partial facility cannot be constructed. The right-of-way funding for the 223rd Ave. Railroad Overcrossing is the second of three phases for this project. We would like to complete the right-of-way acquisition so that we are prepared to secure construction funding in the future.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Diane Lin
Chair

Serena Cruz
District 2

Lonnie Roberts
District 4
September 4, 2001

METRO Council Chair and Members:

My name is Nancy Christie. I am the Department Administrator for the Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology at the OGI School of Science & Engineering at OHSU, formerly the Oregon Graduate Institute (OGI), located on N.W. Walker Road just west of 185th Avenue at the Beaverton-Hillsboro border.

I am here tonight to speak in support of the work of the Transportation Management Associations (TMAs), in particular the Westside Transportation Alliance (WTA). OGI does not pay dues to the WTA, but we provide in-kind services, including meeting and workshop space in our classrooms.

I've worked at OGI for over 21 years, and except for a brief experiment in the early 1980's, there has not been a bus that would get me to work. The closest connections required an unsafe half-mile walk on rural roads with no shoulder and no lighting. Even with the opening of the Westside MAX, there was no bus connection planned from MAX stations to OGI, until the WTA intervened.

• Thanks to the WTA's work with Tri-Met, now there exists a peak-hour weekday shuttle (49S-Quatama) from the Quatama MAX station which comes directly into the OGI campus and also serves the surrounding AmberGlen Science Park.

The shuttle wasn't perfect, but it was a great improvement over what we had before, which was no service at all. Remember that this shuttle was running into an area where huge free parking lots were the rule.

• When Tri-Met designated the shuttle as "low performing" after its first year, WTA stepped in to save the shuttle for another year.
• WTA brought the AmberGlen property manager into the discussions to get a clearer idea of the number of new employees expected at AmberGlen developments, further bolstering the case for the shuttle.

• When users complained that the shuttle’s schedule didn’t mesh well with the MAX schedule, the WTA was there for us to work with Tri-Met on adjusting the schedule.

OGI attracts many international students, most of whom don’t have cars when they arrive to begin their graduate studies. Often they don’t know how to drive. Prior to the implementation of the shuttle, the only realistic transportation plan for our new students was for them to learn to drive and save up for a car, adding more congestion and inexperienced drivers to Washington County roads. The shuttle has made the driving and car-buying decision an option rather than a necessity for our students. As traffic congestion increases, it is not only our students, but our faculty and staff as well who have begun to see the wisdom in leaving their cars at home.

Those who already have cars are still a "hard sell" but new students and employees quickly see the wisdom of using the shuttle. Last year we had almost 100 percent participation in Tri-Met’s Passport program by our new students—that’s a discounted Tri-Met pass--and we anticipate the same this year when our fall quarter begins in a few weeks.

OGI is a better place to study and work because of the efforts of the WTA. Other TMAs have had similar successes. The WTA and the other 4 TMAs deserve all the financial support METRO can give them, not a cut. Without their efforts, hundreds of additional drivers would be on the road from OGI alone. METRO can give this relatively small amount to the TMAs to fund their excellent work, or many times that amount can be spent building more roads, parking lots, and dealing with increased pollution and congestion. Please keep our TMAs solvent!

____________________________
Nancy Christie
503-748-1070
christie@bmb.ogi.edu
The Westside Transportation Alliance (WTA) and its employer members urge you to support funding for the five existing TMAs, the Lloyd District TMA, Tualatin TMA, Swan Island TMA, Columbia Corridor TMA, and the Westside Transportation Alliance.

Westside employers are committing significant dollars by supporting auto trip reduction in several ways:

- Tri-Met payroll tax dollars
- Guaranteed ride home programs
- Transit subsidies and free passes
- Alternate commuting promotional programs with incentives such as prizes and bonuses
- Carpool matching and preferred parking
- Dues and inkind support of TMAs
- Teleworking programs
- Compressed work week schedules
- Subsidizing the WTA Nimbus Shuttle

The partnership of the TMAs, employers, and Tri-Met maximizes each other’s efforts. We use dollars efficiently with low overhead costs. However, even though employers support our TMA, we find that mergers, buyouts, the ebbs and flows of the economy, and employers moving out of area all have a detrimental effect on our financial stability - all factors over which we have no control no matter how effective our programs and services might be. Therefore, we need some public funding that we can count on each year.

TMAs across the nation failed after initial ISTEA funding ran out. They failed at a rate of 50% in California. The Westside Transportation Alliance continues to struggle to secure enough private sector to operate at full budget. We are seeking funds tonight for the existing TMA. We are at a significant juncture - at a time where we can provide valuable regional leadership in making a difference on the reduction of vehicle miles traveled (vmt).

Other regions provide ongoing funding of TMAs for the promotion of alternate forms of commuting, such as Florida which provides $25,000 per year and Massachusetts $50,000 per year and Houston $40,000.

We ask you to consider two options and select either of them.

1. Restore the TMA funding to its current level of $250,000 per year ($500,000 for 2004/5) which would allow funding for existing TMAs and potential new TMAs coming on board. OR
2. Adopt the Metro staff recommendation of $125,000 per year with the stipulation that it go only to the five existing TMAs, the Lloyd District TMA, Tualatin TMA, Swan Island TMA, Columbia Corridor TMA, and the Westside Transportation Alliance.

Thank you for considering our testimony and supporting TMAs.

Judy Edwards, Executive Director
HAZELWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
VIA Facsimile
(603) 797-1793

September 4, 2001

MTIP Comments, Metro Planning Department
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232

RE: PM1 – SE Foster Road at SE 162nd Ave.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The Hazelwood Neighborhood Association asks for your support on this project. We believe this project has significant merit and will be of benefit for all the area residents. These benefits include:

1. Multi-model access for the residents in an area whose use has been mostly vehicular.

   As with many areas of East Portland, that particular intersection was built when vehicle traffic was the only travel mode considered. With increased emphasis on alternatives to the automobile, that intersection needs a signal, sidewalks for better pedestrian access and a bike path to accommodate other modes of travel.

2. Safer commuting for new residential units already approved, but not yet built, and planned for Pleasant Valley into the current transportation mode.

   That intersection is critical to getting residents in and out of the developments on Clatsop Butte and above Kelley Creek. As more new development occurs, without an improved intersection, the likelihood of a serious and/or fatal collision between motorists, pedestrians and cyclists increases.

3. Fulfillment of the financial commitment made to residents in the area to realign that intersection.

   The residents of Hawthorne Ridge, along with others, have already paid for their portion of improvements to that intersection. This funding allows that commitment to be implemented.

4. Furthers the efforts to enhance steelhead habitat in Kelley Creek.

   By replacing the culvert over Kelley Creek, this project will create a more fish-friendly habitat for the steelhead listed as "Threatened" by the federal government.

Thank your consideration and we again urge that you give this project funding.

Sincerely,

Ariene M. Kimura
Chair and Co-Land Use Chair
Hazelwood Neighborhood Association
112 NE 133rd Avenue
Portland, OR 97230

cc: HNA Board
L. Bauer, Pleasant Valley NA
East Portland Chairs Advisory Council
September 4, 2001

Rod Park
Community Planning Committee Chair, Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97232

Chair Park;

We understand that TPAC voted to cut the E. Bank Springwater Trail Connector project by $1.7 million. We oppose this recommendation. Springwater Trail is a joint project between the City of Portland and the City of Milwaukie, portions of which lie in Multnomah County.

We support bike/pedestrian projects to help the region meet our 2040 goals. We request that JPACT give this project the utmost consideration and provide for full funding.

We would also like to express the critical need for full funding of our top two priorities: The Morrison Bridge Bike/Pedestrian Facility ($1.5 million) and the 223rd Ave. Railroad Overcrossing Right-of-Way ($149,000). Full funding for the Morrison Bridge project is needed since a partial facility cannot be constructed. The right-of-way funding for the 223rd Ave. Railroad Overcrossing is the second of three phases for this project. We would like to complete the right-of-way acquisition so that we are prepared to secure construction funding in the future.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Diane Linn
Maria Rojo de Steffey
Serena Cruz
Lonnie Roberts
Chair
District 1
District 2
District 4

Lisa Naito
District 3
The Sunnyside United Neighbors CPO strongly endorses funding for Sunrise Corridor Project, Unit 1 (preliminary design and engineering phase). We further believe that this project has been ranked lower on priority lists than it should have been -- especially in terms of congestion, safety, and the growing volume of vehicles using the roads in the existing Clackamas Industrial Area.

Several years ago the CPO membership was asked to identify the most important road in the area. The members indicated that Hwy. 212/224 had the greatest impact on the CPO, especially when drivers of cars and pickups came from Hwy. 212/224 to use Sunnyside Road as a bypass route. Today, that traffic is even greater. Sunrise Corridor is the key to alleviating transportation congestion issues in this area. Clackamas County has very limited amount of industrial land within the UGB and this is a crucial industrial area. Hwy. 212/224 is the primary access road for an area located between the slopes of Mt. Talbert and the Clackamas River.

The philosophy of "Don't Build & They Won't Come" does not apply to this area. "They" are here! Almost all of the land is built out with active businesses and very few parcels are still for sale. Urban Reserve areas 14 & 15 are closer to Sunnyside Road and Hwy. 212/224 for their main travel routes.

The majority of the manufacturing facilities, warehouses, and distribution centers use trucks to move their goods and products. The number of businesses in the area generate 11% truck traffic through the intersection of Hwy. 212/224 & SE 82nd Drive - amounting to approximately 5,000 trucks per day. There have been 364 accidents in the area over the past three years with 230 of those accidents causing injuries. ODOT ranks this area on the Top 10% SFIS Index List. It also is not unusual to have long lines of vehicles on the shoulders of I-205 waiting to access the eastbound off-ramps.

Westbound drivers can take 15 minutes or more to travel less than a mile from 106th Avenue to I-205. This section of the road has a steeper incline on the bridge over the railroad tracks. Unproductive time loss is unacceptable for business profitability. Sunrise Corridor will help alleviate this congestion nightmare.

Highway 212/224, from I-205 east also serves the through traffic to Hwy. 26 and points further east, and the people living in all the small communities throughout eastern Clackamas County. The Clackamas Industrial Area also has geographical restraints, but many of the businesses there have a tremendous impact on the entire Metro area, Oregon, and southwest Washington. There are over 200 medium-large businesses, with perhaps that many small businesses located in the business and industrial parks scattered throughout the area. The only residences are mobile home parks and some older homes that existed before the industrial area was developed.

Many of you have probably rarely traveled throughout the Clackamas Industrial Area and do not know the types of businesses located here that deliver products on a daily basis to the residents and businesses in the Metro area - as well as throughout the Northwest.
A few of the better known operations in the area include:
* FRED MEYER Distribution Center buildings have a total of 1,600,000 square feet and employ approximately 1,250 people at that site. All products used and sold in the stores are delivered to this warehouse operation and are then delivered by truck to each of the 408 stores located in the Western states.
* USF REDDAWAY TRUCKING has 500-600 employees at their site with approximately 250 trucks using the facility. Approximately 100-130 trucks with single or double trailers make deliveries in the local (Metro) area, and 120-140 are used for the road schedule, with 60 percent of the latter pulling triple trailers.
* SAFEWAY STORES has a Division Office, Distribution Center, and Warehouse operation that serve 114 stores throughout Oregon and southwest Washington.
* OREGON NATIONAL GUARD is based at Camp Withycomble and is very near the proposed route of the Sunrise Corridor.
* Two regional recyclers have started the process to obtain County approval to build new buildings and relocate their businesses to the area. Both of these businesses will generate a high volume of truck traffic at their facilities.

Other individual sites will find food brokers, several large warehouse operations with numerous brand-name clients, building product distributors and manufacturers, travel trailer and truck accessory manufacturers, and a broad variety of other companies. This does not count the numerous companies renting spaces in the multi-tenant properties.

The Sunrise Corridor was proposed over 15 years ago to improve the flow of traffic and connect the Industrial Area to the existing Milwaukie Expressway (also known as Hwy. 212/224). Some physical constraints that held up planning are no longer barriers to construction. The Evelyn Street overpass basically serves the southbound traffic. Some of the businesses are located on rail sidings and move their products through that method.

Clackamas County has done several things to improve the area. From Old 82nd Drive they built a truck bypass over the Union Pacific tracks to Evelyn Street (next to Safeway property). Although this route is on a two-lane road through a residential area that has an enforced 35 mph speed limit (in Gladstone), it is an alternate route out of the area for the south-bound traffic. Along Hwy. 212/224, bicycle lanes, curbs, sidewalks, bus pullouts, and landscaping have recently been installed in a beautification project to provide safety and an area for employees and residents to traverse along the busy highway.

When companies lose money through vehicle delays, they start thinking about moving to a less congested area. In previous cases, that move has been to the north side of the Columbia River. We can’t afford to lose these companies to another state. When these businesses move, their employees frequently commute to the new location. We want to decrease the number of commuters, not increase them. Please allocate funding to get the Sunrise Corridor Project started.

Sincerely,

Martha Waldemar, Chairperson
Section Two
Written and hotline comments
through September 10, 2001
Section Two
Written and hotline comments

Twenty-nine written and oral comments were received through September 10, since the last public comment period.

A summary of each comment is provided in chronological order below. The letters, e-mails and fax documents are included after the summary section.

August 9, 2001
E. Francisco
11727 SE Brookside
Portland, OR 97266
Springwater Trail preprinted post card with handwritten message: This trail serves a corner of the city with the lowest income and the lowest service. It’s important to me to direct resources here.

August 21, 2001
Donald P. Odermott
City of Hillsboro
The City of Hillsboro proposes to construct an additional southbound lane on 10th Avenue in Hillsboro to alleviate traffic queuing and congestion that has hampered light rail operations since opening day in 1998. The project would be from approx. 300 ft. north of E. Main Street to SW Baseline Road. The project was previously included in the MITP base package. Due to delays in submitting supporting documentation, the project failed to be scored with its merits in project evaluation and scoring. The information included in this letter should assist Metro staff in assessing the purpose and benefits of this project. (Project description, maps, history, scoring, costs, traffic counts and other documentation are on file in Metro’s Planning Department.)

August 21, 2001
Michael Jordan
Bill Kennemer
Larry Sowa
Clackamas County Board of Commissioners
Clackamas County priorities were outlined for funding with MTIP and HB2142 funds. MTIP project funding was reiterated for the following projects: Sunrise Corridor PE; Metro exception planning associated with Sunrise Corridor; Sunnyside Road PE and Final Design; Clackamas County ITS program; Harmony/Linwood final design.
August 30, 2001
Michal A. Wert and Patti McCoy
Columbia Corridor Association
Endorses the allocation of MTIP funding to the North Lombard overcrossing project, an important priority of the Columbia Corridor Association for the movement of freight in this area.

August 30, 2001
Michal A. Wert and Patti McCoy
Columbia Corridor Association
Requests the funding of the Columbia/Killingsworth Connector at 87th Avenue to meet freight and multi-modal objectives. The intersection bottleneck is very close to the I-205 interchange, limiting turning and traffic flow.

August 31, 2001
Marylou Ritter and
Washington County Commissioner Roy Rogers
One of the priority issues that surfaced in planning for elderly and disabled transportation was the lack of sidewalks from the homes of elders and those with disabilities to transit stops (plus the lack of shelters at those stops). Urges restoration of at least $600,000 for the Pedestrian Access to Transit Program requested by Tri-Met.

August 31, 2001
Ross Mathews
1932 NE Harewood Place
Hillsboro, OR 97124
Rmat@worldnet.att.net
Served on the Tri-County Elderly and Disabled Transportation Task Force and found a lack of public transportation as a barrier for seniors. The distance from residences to transit stops is too far for seniors to walk, sometimes walking in the street because there are no sidewalks. Shelters are also needed for seniors to be protected from the weather. Requests funding for Pedestrian Access to Transit funding.

September 1, 2001
Pedro Ferbel
8512 SE 8th Avenue
Portland, OR 97202
Wants to be sure the Springwater Corridor Trail is high on the list for funding. It will effect incredible change and be a possibility for alternative transportation from the Southeast to downtown Portland. (Also left a similar message on the Transportation Hotline on August 29, 2001.)
September 4, 2001
Arlene M. Kimura
Hazelwood Neighborhood Association
Requests funding for the SE Foster Road and SE 162nd Avenue project for multi-modal access for residents, safer commuting from Pleasant Valley and enhancement of steelhead habitat in Kelley Creek.

September 4, 2001
Frank Angelo and Betty Atteberry
Westside Economic Alliance
Endorses the Greenburg Road project and the I-5/Nyberg Interchange widening, in addition to the funding for the PE element of the Hwy. 26 widening and the North Lombard Railroad Overcrossing.

September 4, 2001
Linda Bauer
No address listed
Supports the SE Foster Road at SE 162nd Avenue project for the health and welfare of neighbors.

September 4, 2001
Ginger Taylor and Melanie Paulo
Oregon City Transportation Advisory Committee
Supports the balance of projects in the MTIP funding list. Strongly supports the Molalla Avenue sidewalk project for better access to Tri-Met bus service, bike lanes and signal timing. Also requests a review of the responses to the criteria for Oregon City’s McLoughlin Boulevard project, to more accurately reflect the project’s characteristics.

September 5, 2001
Frank M. Orem
Columbia Group of the Sierra Club
Wants changes for better transportation solutions in the region. Change the U.S. 26 Widening PE and Sunrise Corridor EIS/PE to corridor studies that tie land use and transportation planning together. Increase allocation for Transportation Demand Management to provide effective use of transportation dollars.

September 5, 2001
Rick Williams
Lloyd District Transportation Management Association
Encourages additional money to fully fund the 2040 Initiatives in the TDM package, especially the regional web-based rideshare program, Tualatin TMA shuttle and funds to reduce commuter trips. Cuts to these programs could jeopardize the future of the regional rideshare program and Tualatin shuttle; eliminate flexibility and creativity in funding commuter trip reduction programs and underfund everything.
September 5, 2001
Mayor James Bernard
City of Milwaukie
Conveys the city council and mayor's recommendations on the South Corridor Transportation Study. For light rail to Milwaukie, they support the Southgate Crossover Alignment (AB-1) for the greatest amount of industrial area and downtown service with the least impact on neighborhoods. They do not recommend any busway alternatives because they detract from the livability of the community. For bus rapid transit, they prefer the Bus Rapid Transit option (D3) with no park-and-ride in the vicinity of Lake Road, Linwood and Harmony.

September 6, 2001
John R. Bendit, President
Upscale Automotive
19460 SW 89th
Tualatin, OR 97062
Requests full funding for the 2040 Initiatives and TDM programs. Would like to continue the Tualatin TMA shuttle that gets employees the last mile to work in the western industrial area. Without ongoing TDM funding, the shuttle and carpool programs will cease to exist.
Notes that a new employer, Novellus, brings more than 1,000 new employees to the area.

September 6, 2001
Kevin Downing, President
Sellwood Moreland Improvement League
Requests full funding of the three bridges and completion of the Springwater Corridor Trail connection as originally proposed. It is a project of regional significance providing tremendous value for people throughout the metropolitan area. Urges that their hard choices and tradeoffs be acknowledged and full funding be restored to Springwater Trail completion.

September 6, 2001
Donald Dauterman, President
Durametal Corporation
9560 SW Herman Road
Tualatin, OR 97062
As a Tualatin TMA member, believes one of the most valuable services is the Tualatin TMA shuttle, providing their commuting employees a way to get from the bus stop to work. Asks as a business person concerned about lack of transit service in Tualatin, that full funding of the Regional 2040 Initiatives program and Regional TDM program be restored. If the shuttle ceases to exist, it will be devastating to their business community.
September 6, 2001
Lisa Searle
Durametal
9560 SW Herman Road
Tualatin, OR 97062
As a Tualatin TMA member, believes one of the most valuable services is the Tualatin TMA shuttle, providing their commuting employees a way to get from the bus stop to work. Asks as a business person concerned about lack of transit service in Tualatin, that full funding of the Regional 2040 Initiatives program and Regional TDM program be restored. If the shuttle ceases to exist, it will be devastating to their business community.

September 6, 2001
Pamela K. Anderson
Key Knife, Inc
19100 SW 125th Court
Tualatin, OR 97062
Her business is a member of the Tualatin TMA and she believes that one of their most valuable services is the Tualatin TMA shuttle. Her employees can make the last connection in their commute to work. Without the shuttle, her employees would have to walk more than one mile from the bus to work, one way. Would like you to consider her request for full funding for the 2040 Initiatives program and the Regional TDM program.

September 6, 2001
James E. Griffith, Mayor
City of Tigard
Strongly supports Greenburg Road improvements from Washington Square Drive to Tiedeman Avenue. Pleased that the project made the TPAC recommended 100% list. Project is extremely important to Tigard, to add capacity to a congested street and provide more efficient movement of traffic for Washington Square Regional Center, as well as smoother bus service in that area. Requests that JPACT and the Metro Council retain 100% funding level recommended by TPAC.

September 7, 2001
Neta George
Mary Kay Cosmetics
22445 SW Martinazzi
Tualatin, OR 97062
Concerned that Tualatin may not be granted MTIP funds for the I-5/Nyberg interchange and widening project. Unbearable traffic congestion in Tualatin adversely affects their ability to create a multi-modal city, as it is almost impossible to cross a street or ride a bicycle along many of their roads. Congestion is also adding to the costs of doing business in Tualatin because freight movement is delayed. Emergency vehicles are also delayed in trying to get to the hospital in Tualatin. Please fully fund the I-5/Nyberg road interchange project.
September 9, 2001
Ann McManamon
Chair, SMILE Transportation Committee
Supports the full funding for the Eastbank Trail/Springwater Trail Connector. Alarmed that the technical advisory committee recommended removing full funding in order to fund a highway project. Springwater Corridor project received wide support form the region and the timing of implementation is crucial. Unlike many other bicycle projects, this one interconnects the region.

September 9, 2001
Austin Pritchard
SMILE Neighborhood Association
Heard that funds for Springwater Trail bridges over McLoughlin have been further cut. Strongly urges restoration of funding for all three bridges to complete the final link in the trail, an important regional project.

September 9, 2001
Cathy Mahle
1325 SE Sherrett
Portland, OR 97202
Wants funding for construction of the bike bridges in Southeast Portland, to make travel on the Springwater Corridor Trail easier. Encourages alternative forms of transportation and helps the area be more vibrant and healthy.

September 10, 2001
Chad Madron
First Consumers National Bank
9300 SW Gemini Drive
Beaverton, OR 97008
Urges support for funding the five existing TMA’s, especially the Westside Transportation Alliance. They promote auto trip reduction programs and provides the latest information on transportation strategies. His company values the WTA Nimbus Shuttle, connecting employees from the Beaverton Transit Center to the Nimbus Business Park. Other regions provide ongoing funding of TMAs, such as Florida, Massachusetts and Houston.

September 10, 2001
Charlotte Lehan, Mayor
City of Wilsonville
Believes the Boeckman Road Extension project is vital to the whole region. The Dammasch Urban Village will provide at least 2,300 housing units within the current UGB, but without the extension of Boeckman Road, it cannot be developed. Was disappointed that the staff recommended only half of the requested funding, at the expense of the SMART Park and Ride facility. Fears that by funding half the amount requested for both projects, the viability of each is compromised. The project meets 2040 goals and needs a strong MTIP investment to continue the public-private partnership.
Completion of Boeckman Road Extension is essential to making commuter rail work. The project must happen now, not four or five years from now. SMART funding should be restored. The park-and-ride and transit center will provide a centralized point of access for pedestrians, bicyclists, car and vanpools and motorists traveling through Wilsonville.

September 10, 2001
James N. P. Hendryx
City of Tigard
Strongly supports funding of the TMAs, especially the Westside Transportation Alliance. It has been invaluable in helping Tigard with many transportation issues, including working with Tri-Met and assisting with our Washington Square Regional Center plan.

No date
Barbara McCarthy
Global Payment Processing
PO Box 1908
Tualatin, OR 97062
As a member of the Tualatin business community and chamber of commerce, she asks that MTIP fully fund the I-5/Nyberg interchange and widening project. Concerns her greatly that funding may not be granted. Deals with the city’s traffic congestion daily and it adversely affects ability to create a multi-modal city and to move regional freight.
MESSAGE:  This too shall pass.  Service a corner of the city with the lowest income.  The least service - the time to direct resources here.

NAME:  [handwritten]
ADDRESS:  [handwritten]

COUNCILOR BILL ATHERTON
METRO COUNCIL
600 NE GRAND AVENUE
PORTLAND, OR 97232
August 21, 2001

METRO
Attn: Andy Cotugno
600 Northeast Grand Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97232-2736

RE: SE 10th Avenue Southbound Right Turn Lane
Submittal of Supplemental Justification

Dear Andy:

The City of Hillsboro appreciates your staff's willingness to continue discussions on the City's proposed project to construct an additional southbound lane on 10th Avenue in Hillsboro to alleviate traffic queuing and congestion which has hampered light rail operations since opening day in 1998. The limits of the project would be from approximately 300' north of E. Main Street to SW Baseline Road. A schematic plan view of the proposed improvements with typical sections are included for your use in better understanding the scope of the project.

This project was previously included in the "Base Package" for the Priorities 2000 MTIP Update/2040 Implementation Program. Due to delays in submitting supplemental supporting documentation, the project failed to be scored consistent with its merits when METRO staff undertook the project evaluation and scoring task. The information contained in this letter and its attached reference materials should, I believe, assist METRO staff in better assessing the purpose and benefits of this project. Our goals in submitting this information are to have the project's scoring reassessed based upon this supporting information, both for current and future funding consideration, and to attempt to have this project added to the current project funding list for consideration by METRO staff and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) subcommittee.

Project History:
The construction of a third southbound lane on 10th Avenue was identified during the Hillsboro Extension of the Westside Light Rail project. Detailed operational traffic studies identified a significant imbalance in lane usage through the 10th Avenue corridor from Baseline Road north to beyond E. Main Street. This is due to the significant volume of traffic turning to westbound Baseline Road during the mid-day and p.m. peak hours of operation. The issue is one of capacity deficiency for the southbound approach to Baseline Road, coupled with a lack of adequate storage length to queue the southbound vehicles on 10th Avenue. The result of these factors is consistently long southbound queues in the curb lane which extend over and beyond the light rail tracks on SE Washington Street. The queuing issue is compounded by the occurrence of back-to-back trains which tend to combine regular platoons of traffic, both southbound and northbound, further compounding the existing deficiency.
Supporting documentation generated during the light rail project has been attached to this letter. Also, digital photographs have been included that illustrate the problem. The queues photographed are a regular occurrence during peak periods on any given weekday.

Traffic surveys conducted by Tri-Met’s consultant, DKS & Associates, identified a lane use pattern for southbound traffic north of Baseline Road of about 67%-33%. This reflects a traffic volume pattern where approximately 2/3 of the southbound traffic on this road section desires to turn westbound on Baseline Road. The DKS field survey and accompanying letter are attached. Later studies prepared by Access Engineering using VISSIM software simulated the impacts of the train interface with traffic operations to estimate the resulting impact on queuing. Excerpts from that report are included as an attachment to this letter. It should be noted that the simulation results identify southbound queuing of 630’ in the curb lane under year 2000 p.m. peak hour traffic with Tri-Met’s current train schedule. These operational studies were conducted in partnership between the City of Hillsboro and Tri-Met in order to develop an operational strategy for downtown traffic operations that would meet the needs of both the transit and road agencies within the constraints of available project funding.

Project Scoring:
To date, this project has received 31 points for its location within the Hillsboro Regional Center, and an additional 20 points for Safety. No points were given for its operational aspects as these are not identifiable through use of the EMME-2 program. As evidenced by the level of service results contained in the accompanying study excerpts, this issue is not so much one of intersection or roadway capacity deficiency but rather one of a deficiency of “lane” capacity and “storage length deficiency”. The traffic demand in this road “link” desires predominantly to travel from southbound 10th Avenue to westbound Baseline Road. This results in the 67%-33% lane use split measured in the field.

The EMME-2 program indicates capacity for this link consistent with a typical 5-lane roadway, which fails to recognize the significant imbalance in lane use caused by the directional distribution of southbound traffic at Baseline Road. As such, the EMME-2 program fails to recognize a problem under existing and future conditions because it is, simply put, a planning level software analysis tool while the problem occurring on the street is a more detailed operational issue.

The issue of movement capacity can best be understood by evaluating the time-space diagrams contained in the reference materials attached to this letter. Since SE 10th Avenue south of Baseline Road, and Baseline Road, are part of Highway 8, the signal timing for this corridor accordingly must service the highway traffic as first priority. This leaves only 20 seconds of available green time for the southbound left, through, and right turn traffic on 10th Avenue. Coupled with the unbalanced lane use due to the heavy southbound right turn volume to westbound Baseline Road, the actual capacity for the southbound approach is at or near capacity during most of the peak hour. The creation of a third southbound lane as illustrated in the attached 11x17 drawing would nearly double available capacity for this approach, thereby reducing southbound queues by nearly 50%.

These factors, which are not recognized by the EMME-2 model, result in the inability to score points for both Congestion Relief and Cost/Reduced Delay. The City believes that, with Administrative review of the scoring in these two categories, the project’s point total will rise significantly to a level

Administrative Scoring Related Factors:
The project has already been recognized under the categories of “Past Commitment” and “Link to Other Project”. Technical evaluation criteria which transcends the abilities of the standard scoring approach have been discussed above. Additional information regarding project phasing, multi-modal benefits of the project, and over-match follow.
Minimum Phase:
For consideration in re-scoring and potential funding of the project, the project could be separated into two phases. These are described below in the project cost update and are also illustrated on the accompanying 11x17 drawing. The first phase of the project would construct the supplemental lane from E. Main Street south to Baseline Road. A substantial traffic signal modifications would be required at the Baseline Road intersection while only minor signal work would be required at the SE Washington Street (Light Rail) intersection. This phase would address the capacity deficiency that results in the excessive traffic queues extending across the light rail tracks. The significant element of this project is the anticipated full acquisition of a parcel currently housing a Coffee People restaurant. Costs for right-of-way and construction are shown in the following section of this letter. Preliminary Engineering, for which the City has already been awarded funds, would be completed for the entire project in order to ensure continuity between the two phases.

The second phase of the project would include elimination of the existing traffic separator island at the northwest quadrant of the E. Main Street and 10th Avenue/Cornell Road intersection in order to allow construction of a third southbound approach lane to the traffic signal. This element of the project would provide additional intersection capacity (the intersection currently operates at an “E” level of service during the p.m. peak hour) and would allow southbound traffic to begin sorting their lane selections prior to entering the congested corridor surrounding the light rail crossing. A significant modification would be required to the traffic signal at 10th/Main, however, intersection improvements undertaken by Washington County in 1998-1999 had allowed for this future improvement by setting back new equipment to minimize costs for the third southbound lane. A 16.5 foot right-of-way acquisition from a number of residential parcels fronting on Cornell Road (10th Avenue) has been included in the cost estimates below.

Multi-Modal Benefits:
Tri-Met currently operates three bus routes that would utilize the additional southbound lane. This will reduce travel delays and should thus aid ridership figures. The project includes construction of an 8’ wide sidewalk (existing is 6’) with a landscape planter strip, including street trees, to improve pedestrian accessibility and comfort through this corridor. This will improve the buffering of pedestrians from the relatively high number of trucks traversing this roadway.

Over-Match:
The updated cost estimates indicate that the City’s share of project funding would climb from a previous 10.7% to a proposed 13.2%.

Project Cost Update:
City staff have reviewed the project’s estimated costs in greater detail, including use of recent acquisition prices paid by the City for similarly zoned property in this area. The result has been a decrease in the estimated project cost by approximately 20%. Also, the local match component has risen slightly from 10.7% to 13.2%.

Following is a summary table of project costs and right-of-way costs reflecting the total project, separated into two phases. The first phase extends from the south side of E. Main Street to Baseline Road. The second phase would extend north of E. Main Street and would include the removal of the existing traffic separator island and construction of a third southbound approach lane to the signal at 10th Avenue and E. Main Street.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FULL PROJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PHASE 1 PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>$405,000</td>
<td>$870,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$430,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$985,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PHASE 2 PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>$345,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On behalf of the City of Hillsboro, we appreciate your staff's willingness to consider the supplemental information presented above and hope that it may result in this project being scored more favorably. We recognize the late nature of this information, but ask that staff consider the possibility of including either Phase 1 or at a minimum the right-of-way portion of Phase 1 into the funding allocation program at this time. Any questions that may arise can be directed to my attention as I have the longest history on this project and can best speak to its technical merits. An updated Priorities 2002 Project Solicitation Form will be completed and submitted to METRO tomorrow.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Donald P. Odermott, PE  
Senior Project Manager

Attachments

cc: Wink Brooks  
    Roy Gibson  
    Andy Back (Wash. Co.)  
    Clark Berry (Wash. Co.)  
    Jennifer Wells
August 21, 2001

Rod Monroe, Chairman
Joint Policy Committee on Transportation
Metro
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, Or. 97232

Dear Chairman Monroe:

As this region makes final decisions on the allocation of MTIP and HB2142 funds, we feel it is important to reiterate the reasons underlying Clackamas County’s requests.

If we step back for a moment and review the documents that guide this region’s decision making we look at the 2040 Growth Plan and the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The first speaks to the growth this region will see over the next twenty years and the regional plan to locate a majority of that growth in Clackamas County. Secondly, the RTP is the blueprint on where transportation investments need to be made to accommodate planned growth. The RTP identifies significant transportation investments, i.e. South Corridor Transit, Sunrise Corridor, Sunnyside Road and many others to build the necessary infrastructure in Clackamas County to manage the transportation needs of existing and new county residents.

Within the next couple of months JPACT and the Metro Council will concur on a set of transportation improvements necessary to make progress in implementing the RTP. The following are our priorities and requests of JPACT and Metro Council for funding with MTIP & HB2142 funds:

**MTIP**

- **$5.75 million**
  - Sunrise Corridor PE to be matched with County funds (need to seek matching funds from the State)
- **($1.0 million)**
  - Metro exception planning associated with Sunrise Corridor Unit 2
- **($2.5 million)**
  - Sunnyside Road PE & Final Design to be matched with County Funds for Phases 2, 3 & 4 (122nd to 172nd)
- **($0.5 million)**
  - County ITS program
- **($0.75 million)**
  - Harmony/Linwood final design
August 21, 2001

Rod Monroe, Chairman
Joint Policy Committee on Transportation
Metro
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, Or. 97232

Dear Chairman Monroe:

As this region makes final decisions on the allocation of MTIP and HB2142 funds, we feel it is important to reiterate the reasons underlying Clackamas County’s requests.

If we step back for a moment and review the documents that guide this region’s decision making we look at the 2040 Growth Plan and the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The first speaks to the growth this region will see over the next twenty years and the regional plan to locate a majority of that growth in Clackamas County. Secondly, the RTP is the blueprint on where transportation investments need to be made to accommodate planned growth. The RTP identifies significant transportation investments, i.e. South Corridor Transit, Sunrise Corridor, Sunnyside Road and many others to build the necessary infrastructure in Clackamas County to manage the transportation needs of existing and new county residents.

Within the next couple of months JPACT and the Metro Council will concur on a set of transportation improvements necessary to make progress in implementing the RTP. The following are our priorities and requests of JPACT and Metro Council for funding with MTIP & HB2142 funds:

**MTIP**

- **$5.75 million**
  - $1.0 million: Sunrise Corridor PE to be matched with County funds (need to seek matching funds from the State)
  - $1.0 million: Metro exception planning associated with Sunrise Corridor Unit 2
  - $2.5 million: Sunnyside Road PE & Final Design to be matched with County Funds for Phases 2, 3 & 4 (122nd to 172nd)
  - $0.5 million: County ITS program
  - $0.75 million: Harmony/Linwood final design
HB 2142

The Board of County Commissioners recognizes that if the timing and support for seeking funds for the Sunrise Corridor Unit 1 in HB2142 funds is not appropriate now, the County requests that JPACT & Metro Council in October or November 2001 (as apart of the HB2142 decisions) give a priority designation to the Sunrise Corridor Unit 1 for construction funding in the next STIP(s) pending the outcome of the EIS and land use exception processes. By taking this action the region will be able to continue planning for growth areas in the County. Without this commitment by the region and State to construction funding for Unit 1, the County will not be in a position to support urban densities in any new areas in East County brought into the UGB.

The County is pursuing options to match regional & State funds to Unit 1.

Project Requests:
Modernization category:

1. $22.0 million, to be overmatched with $23.0 million of local funds, for the construction of Sunnyside Road from 122nd to 172nd. This project fits the criteria adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC), it leverages local funds, it will be constructed prior to the OTC deadline of October 2008 and has an approved environmental document to 172nd. HB2142 funds and a 51% local match will enable the County to complete all phases of this project.

2. $3.0 million for added capacity, i.e. turn lanes, intersection realignments and signalization to 4-5 intersections on Highway 213 between Oregon City and Molalla.

3. $2.5 million for added capacity, i.e. turn lanes, intersection realignments and signalization to 2-3 intersections on Highway 99E between Oregon City and Canby.

Preservation category:

1. $3.0 million for realignment of dangerous curves and elimination of load length restrictions on Wilsonville Road from I-5 to the County line. This improvement will enhance safety and freight mobility.

2. $861,000 for road resurfacing, sidewalks and drainage improvements on Government Camp Loop Road. County has committed $228,000 as match to this project.
Bridge category:
1. $2.0 million for replacement of the Lolo Pass Road Bridge (#6401).
   This improvement will not add capacity to this facility.
2. $1.3 million for replacement of the Graves Road Bridge (#6562).
   This improvement will not add capacity to this facility.

All of these cost estimates will be further defined as the County completes applications for each proposed project.

Clackamas County looks forward to working with JPACT and Metro Council in allocating funds to our priorities. We believe we have advanced a reasonable package of requests including a longer-range view for the Sunrise Corridor that formalize the region’s and ODOT’s commitment to this project.

Sincerely,

Michael Jordan
Chairman

Bill Kennemer
Commissioner

Larry Sowa
Commissioner

Cc: JPACT members
   : Metro Council
   : Andy Cotugno
   : Cam Gilmour
August 30, 2001

Councilor David Bragdon, Presiding Officer
Councilor Rod Monroe, JPACT Chair
METRO
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232

Re: North Lombard Overcrossing Project

Dear Councilors:

The Columbia Corridor Association strongly endorses the recommendation of Metro staff and TPAC for allocation of $2 million in MTIP funding to the North Lombard overcrossing project. As the deliberations on project funding progress to JPACT, we urge your support for strategic transportation investments in the Columbia Corridor. The North Lombard overcrossing project is a strategic investment consistent with long-range planning that has occurred in the Columbia Corridor for the last several years.

The Columbia Corridor is home to over 2,900 businesses that employ over 98,000 people with a payroll of $3.2 billion. Most of these businesses have a critical role in providing market access for industries in the rest of the region. This role makes these businesses heavily reliant on the transportation system for their operations. Efficiencies in the transportation system mean increased productivity which translates to cost savings to the industries they serve. Strategic transportation investments in the Columbia Corridor are a key to the economic health for the businesses of the Portland metropolitan region.

The North Lombard overcrossing is an important project and a transportation priority of the Columbia Corridor Association. It will eliminate two at-grade rail crossings in Rivergate, complete a missing bike and pedestrian connection, and improve safety in an environmentally sensitive area. Movement of freight makes up to 58 percent of the traffic during some times of the day. MTIP funds will help fill the funding gap for this essential improvement. This is an investment for the region that directly impacts and supports business operations.

We recognize the difficulty in allocating scarce resources to meet the broad transportation needs of the region. We fully concur with Metro staff and TPAC to address one of the more pressing needs for the business community.

Sincerely,

Michal A. Wert, Co-chair
Transportation Committee

Patti McCoy
Executive Director

cc: Ed Galligan, Port of Portland
Charlie Hales, City of Portland
Bruce Warner, ODOT
August 30, 2001

COLUMBIA CORRIDOR
ASSOCIATION

Councilor David Bragdon, Presiding Officer
Councilor Rod Monroe, JPACT Chair
METRO
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232

Re: Columbia/Killingsworth East End Connector

Dear Councilors:

In April 1999, the Columbia/Killingsworth East End Connector was designated by JPACT during the MTIP fund allocation process as the next regional priority following completion of the Westside projects. This project continues to be a high priority for the Columbia Corridor.

As you allocate limited Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program funds to the region’s transportation priorities, the Columbia Corridor Association would like to express strong support for the approach of forwarding designated regional priority road improvement projects for construction with funds from the 2001 Legislature’s Transportation Investment Act program. The Region needs to look at bonding for projects as a way to promote JPACT priorities. The Transportation Investment Act passed by the 2001 Legislature offers another needed source of funds to address the region’s critical transportation needs.

The Columbia/Killingsworth Connector has been identified repeatedly as a transportation bottleneck that must be solved to keep goods moving on the system. The Port of Portland, City of Portland and ODOT have completed studies of the problem to identify the best alternative for construction. A new connection at 87th Avenue best meets freight and multi-modal objectives. Today, traffic accessing I-205 from Columbia Boulevard backs up over a mile during the PM peak. As a result, traffic from businesses on Columbia Boulevard face delays or seek time consuming alternatives to access the freeway. Columbia Boulevard is a two-lane facility that connects with I-205 through a signalized intersection at a railroad underpass. The intersection is very close to the I-205 interchange, limiting turning movements and constraining traffic flow.

The businesses in the Columbia Corridor have distinct transportation needs. Many of the businesses provide an important link in the supply chain for access to national and international markets. These uses rely on transportation efficiency for successful business operation. Columbia Boulevard is an important corridor for freight movement in this region.

Addressing the needs of the Columbia Corridor through strategic investments in transportation infrastructure is critical to maintaining the “economic engine” of the region, a role the Columbia Corridor serves for the City, the metropolitan region and the state. We anticipate your support of this important project for funding through from the 2001 Transportation Investment Act.

Sincerely

Michal A. Wert, Co-chair
Transportation Committee

Patti McCoy
Executive Director

Cc: Ed Galligan, Port of Portland
    Charlie Hales, City of Portland
    Bruce Warner, ODOT
Please share this email with Deputy Presiding Officer, Susan McLain and Commissioner Roy Rogers.

Members of our Department's Advisory Council and myself were involved this past year in an extensive planning process for elderly and disabled transportation. One of the priority issues that surfaced in that plan was lack of sidewalks from the homes of elders and those with disabilities to transit stops (plus the lack of shelters at those stops).

I understand that JPACT, TPAC and the Metro Council are making final decisions on MTIP funding soon. I urge you to restore at least $600,000 for the Pedestrian Access to Transit Program requested by Tri-Met.

These funds would make transit more accessible to many including elders and people with disabilities by coordinating sidewalk improvements and transit improvements.

Again, please fund this important program.
From: "ROSS MATHEWS" <Rmat@worldnet.att.net>
To: <trans@metro.dst.or.us>
Date: Fri, Aug 31, 2001 4:27 PM
Subject: Transportation

Metro Council

This last year I had the privilege of serving on the Tri County Elderly and Disabled Transportation Task force. During the study it became apparent that one of the largest barriers for seniors is the lack of public transportation. While some areas are served with fixed route public transportation, the distance from the seniors place of residence to the transit stop is further than many of the seniors can walk. Then to add insult to injury, many of the seniors would have to walk in the street in order to get to the transit stop. Not only is this dangerous for the senior, it can be very scary for them.

In conjunction with that problem is the fact that once the senior get to the transit stop, many of them have no shelter. The elderly and many time frail senior has to wait out in what can be terrible weather. Seniors are facing enough problems just to get to the transit stop much less exposing them to the raw elements for an extended length of time. Exposing them to bad weather only adds insult to injury. While I do not know an exact amount, I can’t help but think this extra exposure to the elements will only cause increases in the cost of medical care for our seniors.

Without question I would ask you to do all possible to provide funding to the pedestrian access funding.

Yours truly

Ross Mathews
1932 NE Harewood Place
Hillsboro, Oregon 97124

I would memo be directed to Susan McClain

CC: "Jennifer Wells" <jenniferw@ci.hillsboro.or.us>, "Mary Lou Ritter"
<marylou.ritter@state.or.us>
Hello, I have not seen Metro's recommendations for MTIP yet but want to be sure that the Springwater Corridor trail is the highest on the list for funding. This trail will effect incredible change and possibility for alternative transportation from the Southeast to downtown. Thanks for taking my comments into consideration.

Pedro Ferbel 8512 SE 8th AV PDX 97202

=====

"If there is no struggle there is no progress. Those who profess to favor freedom, and yet depreciate agitation, want crops without plowing the ground. They want rain without thunder and lightning. They want the ocean without the awful roar of its many waters. This struggle may be a moral one; or it may be a physical one; or it may be both moral and physical; but it must be a struggle. Power concedes nothing without a demand. It never did and it never will." — Frederick Douglass
HAZELWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
VIA Facsimile
(503) 797-1793

September 4, 2001

MTIP Comments, Metro Planning Department
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232

RE: PM1 – SE Foster Road at SE 162nd Ave.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The Hazelwood Neighborhood Association asks for your support on this project. We believe this project has significant merit and will be of benefit for all the area residents. These benefits include:

1. Multi-model access for the residents in an area whose use has been mostly vehicular.

   As with many areas of East Portland, that particular intersection was built when vehicle traffic was the only travel mode considered. With increased emphasis on alternatives to the automobile, that intersection needs a signal, sidewalks for better pedestrian access and a bike path to accommodate other modes of travel.

2. Safer commuting for new residential units already approved, but not yet built, and planned for Pleasant Valley into the current transportation mode.

   That intersection is critical to getting residents in and out of the developments on Clatsop Butte and above Kelley Creek. As more new development occurs, without an improved intersection, the likelihood of a serious and/or fatal collision between motorists, pedestrians and cyclists increases.

3. Fulfillment of the financial commitment made to residents in the area to realign that intersection.

   The residents of Hawthorne Ridge, along with others, have already paid for their portion of improvements to that intersection. This funding allows that commitment to be implemented.

4. Furthers the efforts to enhance steelhead habitat in Kelley Creek.

   By replacing the culvert over Kelley Creek, this project will create a more fish-friendly habitat for the steelhead listed as "Threatened" by the federal government.

Thank your consideration and we again urge that you give this project funding.

Sincerely,

Arlene M. Kimura
Chair and Co-Land Use Chair
Hazelwood Neighborhood Association
112 NE 133rd Avenue
Portland, OR 97230

cc: HNA Board
L. Bauer, Pleasant Valley NA
East Portland Chairs Advisory Council
September 4, 2001

VIA FACSIMILE

The Honorable Rod Park, Chair
Metro Community Planning Committee
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Dear Rod:

The Westside Economic Alliance has reviewed the recommended 100% Project List for the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). We support the recommendations that have been forwarded to JPACT and the Metro Council for consideration. Specifically, we are in support of the recommendation that STP funding be allocated to critical road and highway projects throughout the region.

As we stated in our earlier testimony, because of the limited amount of dollars available in the state for modernization we support using all the STP dollars for road/highway related projects. Our members have clearly stated that solving transportation problems is the top priority need to support their economic plans. The transportation problems most frequently expressed are related to moving goods and services, getting employees to work and general transportation mobility on the Westside. All these issues relate to traffic congestion and the lack of an adequate road system to serve residents and businesses.

Even with HB 2142 funding, the region will continue to experience a major short fall in available dollars for road modernization improvements.

We specifically endorse the Greenburg Road project and the I-5/Nyberg Interchange widening in addition to the funding for the PE element of the Hwy 26 widening. Also, the N. Lombard RR o-xing is a critical product-to-market freight project.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. We appreciate having a chance to work with Metro and others to develop a safe and efficient transportation system.

Sincerely,

WESTSIDE ECONOMIC ALLIANCE

Frank Angelo, Chair
Transportation Committee

cc: Metro Councilors
September 4, 2001

MTIP Comments , Metro Planning Committee
600 N.E. Grand Ave.
Portland, Oregon   97232

RE:   PM 1 - S.E. Foster Road   at S.E. 162nd Ave.

Ladies and Gentlemen :

I very much support this project because the Health and Welfare of my Neighbors is at stake. I could not be with you tonight because I have to work, but Paul Grosjean will be with you tonight to represent the Neighborhood Association.

Sincerely,

Linda Bauer
September 4, 2001

Metro Council and Community Planning Committee:

The Oregon City Transportation Advisory Committee appreciates the opportunity to provide public comments on the recommended project list for 2004-2005 federal funding.

We support the list of projects because they strike a balance between moving forward with long range goals of providing our region with a multi-modal transportation system that will make the most of our existing roads while carefully planning roadway expansion projects that ensure mobility for drivers and trucks who cannot possible use transit, bikes, and sidewalks.

First, we want to voice our strong support for the Molalla Avenue sidewalk project. Oregon City has taken a very methodical approach at planning and trying to fund this high-need project. The current situation on this arterial is dismal, especially considering that it is a transit corridor lined with mixed use development. Our community has formally recognized the need to construct pedestrian amenities in order for this corridor to increase in bus use. Access to the frequent Tri-Met service is essential and will help those that use this corridor, which runs from the downtown regional center area all the way to the Clackamas Community College.

This project not only provides wider, ADA compliant sidewalks, but also provides bike lanes and functional enhancements (such as access management and signal timing) – all within the existing right-of-way. Four travel lanes will go to two through lanes with center turn lanes and landscaped medians. Not only are we hoping for a better transit, pedestrian corridor, we also believe that the project will invigorate a tired, ugly commercial district with the landscaping and people places.

Now, for the McLoughlin Boulevard Improvements. Again, the community worked very hard to create a plan for the Oregon City regional center – our Downtown Community Plan. This project is being methodically advanced by the Oregon City staff. The City recently successfully applied for an ODOT TGM grant to complete the land use plan process for McLoughlin Boulevard in Oregon City. This planning will directly proceed the preliminary engineering that the project on the proposed list will provide. The timing has been carefully reviewed to maintain momentum for McLoughlin Boulevard improvements – which are seen as critical in the development of the downtown plan and achieving the regional center goals that will in the long run benefit Oregon City as well as the region. We do ask that if you will be referring to the original Council MTIP Project Ranking Matrix, please review the responses to the criteria for Oregon City’s McLoughlin Boulevard project. The TAC is concerned that the original responses to not accurately reflect the characteristics of our project.

Thank you again.

Oregon City Transportation Advisory Committee
Ginger Taylor and Melanie Paulo, Co-Chairs
Metro Councilors  
600 N.E. Grand Avenue  
Portland, OR  97232

Dear Metro Councilors,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Metropolitan Improvement Program for FY 2004-2005 as presented in the Staff Report (August 31, 2001, from Andrew Cotugno).

As we are all aware, the ranking scheme used to develop the projects does not make comparisons across project types (Road Modernization, Boulevard, etc.). Consequently, there is no way to assess which projects contribute best towards meeting regional and state goals. These goals include the State Transportation Planning Rule of reducing average vehicle miles traveled by 10% by 2020 and the regional mode split goals for the various centers. My concern is that the Program may actually be working against those goals. In particular, the Program directly supports $11 million in Road Modernization (almost all of which is for highways or in support of freeways), and leverages many tens of millions for Mainline Freeway projects (through HB 2142). At the same time, the Program provides a scant $2 million for Transportation Demand Management.

I believe the following changes would lead to better transportation solutions for the region:
1. Changing the U.S. 26 Widening Preliminary Engineering and the Sunrise Corridor EIS/PE to corridor studies that tie land use and transportation planning together, as is being done by the I-5 Partnership.
2. Increasing the allocation for Transportation Demand Management. The potential for TDM to provide effective access per dollar spent appears to be much greater than for projects that support primarily single occupancy vehicle use.

Frank M. Orem  
Conservation Committee
September 5, 2001

JPACT and Metro Council
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

Dear JPACT Members and Metro Councilors,

I encourage the region to find additional money for the 2040 initiatives in the TDM package with the MTIP proposal. The TDM Sub-committee’s original request for $500,000 over two years was a very lean and reasonable request, but has been cut by Metro staff to $285,000.

2040 initiatives included two important programs and provided funds for TDM opportunities in employment areas.

- The regional web-based rideshare program asked for $150,000 over two years for technology improvements, coordination, and outreach. This new program makes it easy for people to use the internet to find carpool and vanpool partners from Southwest Washington down to Salem. It leverages private and public funds and is the ideal regional project to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled.

- The Tualatin TMA shuttle was asking for its minimum $60,000 per year to run the shuttle;

- In addition to these two programs, the TDM Sub-Committee allocated $220,000 to fund projects to reduce commuter trips. The money would be distributed and managed by the TDM sub-committee.

The cut to the 2040 initiatives leaves the TDM sub-committee with three bad choices –

1) Jeopardize the future of the regional rideshare program and the Tualatin shuttle;

2) Eliminate the opportunity to be flexible and creative in funding commuter trip reduction programs;

3) Underfund everything.

TDM is a very small portion of this entire MTIP request. The TDM Sub-Committee’s original proposal was the result of negotiations during the committee process. This cut further reduces the amount available for 2040 initiatives and compromises the effectiveness of the region’s TDM programs.

I urge the region to find the funds to fully fund the 2040 initiatives so that the region supports the web-based ridesharing program and the Tualatin shuttle, and provides a way for TMAAs and other organizations to pro-actively respond to future opportunities.

Sincerely,

Rick Williams
Executive Director
Dear Chair Monroe,

It is my pleasure to convey to you, the City of Milwaukie's recommendations for the next phase of the South Corridor Transportation Study, the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Study. The following recommendations come to you from the City Council, and myself after concluding a thorough public process to consider the options for solving transportation problems in this part of the region. We appreciate the Policy Group's deference to our local decision making process.

Our community review of the options included extensive work by our neighborhood leadership over the course of the last year to learn, compare and discuss the alternatives within our community, with project staff and with neighbors from other jurisdictions. The process also included continuous updates to the community via our city newsletter, web page and Council meetings, a citywide Town Hall meeting in July, a follow-up Open House in August, and a review by our Planning Commission.

Our recommendations concerning the choices you will be making at your September 17th Policy Group meeting are detailed below:

**Light Rail to Milwaukie**

We prefer the Southgate Crossover Alignment (AB-1). This option affords Milwaukie the greatest amount of service in our North Industrial redevelopment area and our downtown, while having the least impact on our neighborhoods. The option uses existing rail right of way, includes adequate parking at various points along the alignment, does not add another barrier to our riverfront, and preserves a future opportunity to connect with commuter rail from the west.

We have some concerns about the size of the Tacoma park and ride, associated traffic on Johnson Creek Blvd. and wonder whether the additional park and rides along this line, would enable a reduction at that location. We also have concerns about "renegade" parking around the terminus at 21st and Lake Rd., as well as traffic that would be generated on Lake Rd. We ask that special consideration be paid to these concerns through the course of the study.

We are also interested in the B2A and B2B options, though have some concerns about bus volumes at the Junior High, with both; and security and access at the Hanna transit center, in B2B.
Busway through Milwaukie, onto the Clackamas Town Center:

Respectfully, we do not recommend any of the busway alternatives as they detract from the livability of our community. While we can appreciate the value of a seamless ride from Clackamas Town Center to downtown Portland as a regional objective, initial designs of the busway alternatives simply do not equate to a net gain for Milwaukie. The C-2 alternative which envisions a transfer center at Main & Scott Streets, lacks adequate parking, leaves a good degree of bus traffic on our downtown streets, creates displacements, and portends a future extension to the south, that would create an additional barrier to our riverfront. The C-3 alternative that locates the transfer center in the Southgate area, while less disruptive to our downtown, also leaves us with no transit service in the downtown.

Continuing on down 224, busway options appear to further disappoint Milwaukians. A below grade option (D1) includes several displacements and creates geological and environmental problems, because of the soil base along that area and the existing wetlands. The at-grade option (D2) also creates several displacements and adds multiple crossing gates. With both alternatives, we question the adequacy of transit service to our community. We also heard from our citizens that these options were too expensive and disruptive.

Bus Rapid Transit through Milwaukie, onto the Clackamas Town Center:

We prefer the Bus Rapid Transit option (D3) from the Harrison/224 area and continuing on to the Clackamas Town Center, via 224 and Harmony, with no park and ride in the vicinity of Lake Rd., Linwood and Harmony. Bus Rapid Transit provides much needed signal improvements, local service and added capacity, at a more reasonable cost. However, we have received several questions from citizens about the need to use Harmony at all. This is related to neighborhood objection to the planned expansion of Harmony Rd. Neighbors in that area feel that it will create a bottleneck condition, while displacing residences to the north and park land to the south.

In closing, we would also like to note that the South Corridor project staff at both Metro and Trimet, have been very helpful and professional throughout this process. They have dedicated extra time and energy to work with the neighborhood leaders in Milwaukie, toward broadening and deepening our understanding of the choices we have before us at a local and regional level. They have listened to our community's ideas, in the form of their 14 points and associated details, and applied serious consideration to all of them. We commend their demonstrated commitment to a community-based solution in the South Corridor and we look forward to continuing this collaboration with all of the participants in this project.

Sincerely,

Mayor James Bernard
City of Milwaukie

CC: Milwaukie Neighborhood Leadership
Milwaukie City Council
South Corridor Policy Group
Mike Swanson, City Manager
Michelle Gregory, Neighborhood Services Manager
Ross Roberts, South Corridor Project Manager, Metro
Michael Fischer, South Corridor Project Designer, Trimet
Members of Metro Council  
Metro Regional Government  
600 NE Grand  
Portland, OR 97232  

September 6, 2001  

Dear Members of the Metro Council,  

I am writing to request full funding of the 2040 initiatives and the TDM programs at last year’s levels.  

It has been proven nationally, that TMA's and related programs such as shuttle services need ongoing public funding in addition to the private funding already committed. Past TDM funding has supported several successful metro area TMA Shuttles and Carpooling programs.  

With limited Tri-Met service to the Tualatin City core area, it is the Tualatin TMA shuttle that gets employees that last mile to work in our western industrial area. With 30 or more boarding’s a day (and sometimes as many as 45), it is very successful program. Our carpooling program has over 100 riders and is also successful a getting people to work. Without on going TDM funding the shuttle and carpool programs will cease too exist.  

The need for continued shuttle and carpool funding becomes even more important when Novellus, one of Tualatin’s newest employers, brings over 1,000 new employees to our area. I urge you, please do not reduce 2040 initiative and TDM funding levels.  

Sincerely,  

John R. Bendit  
President, Upscale Automotive, Inc.  
Past President, Tualatin Chamber of Commerce
From: "vandown" <vandown@teleport.com>
To: <trans@metro.dst.or.us>
Date: Thu, Sep 6, 2001 9:36 PM
Subject: Commnets on MTIP project funding

Please fully fund the construction of the three bridges and the completion of the Springwater Corridor trail connection as originally proposed.

You certainly face difficult choices in balancing the demands of regionally significant projects against a limited amount of funds. The residents of the Sellwood-Moreland also faced some hard choices when considering which projects to support towards completion. Over the course of at least three general neighborhood meetings in the spring and now late summer of this year residents have come out again and again in favor of completing the Springwater Corridor Trail by making the connection between the current trail’s end in Ardenwald and the soon-to-be-constructed East Bank Trail ending at the foot of the Sellwood Bridge. When this issue first came up, neighbors faced a strategic choice whether to support, through MTIP, this project or a proposal that would have built SE Spokane and SE Umatilla as bicycle boulevards. The Spokane/Umatilla bicycle boulevard project is very near and dear to residents in the neighborhood but particularly those living on these streets. The bicycle improvements envisioned could also be expected to have traffic calming benefits, a much needed side benefit for these two local streets that are so abused by regional commuters. The Springwater Corridor project, on the other hand, while constructed adjoining and through the neighborhood is really a project of regional significance providing tremendous value for people throughout the metropolitan area. Nonetheless, at each meetings neighbors have reaffirmed their support for completion of the Springwater project. We urge you to acknowledge the hard choices in tradeoffs that we have made and fully fund the Springwater completion. Thank you.

Kevin Downing
President
Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League

6202 SE 21st Ave
Portland, Oregon 97202
503 238-4665
September 6, 2001

Members of Metro Council
Metro Regional Government
600 NE Grand
Portland, OR 97232

Dear Members of the Metro Council,

As a member of the Tualatin business community I am concerned with the issues that affect my ability to do business. Transportation and traffic issues have a severe impact on business in Tualatin. From freight movement issues to getting employees to work on time.

My business, Durametal Corporation, is a member of the Tualatin TMA and pays annual dues to support the services the TMA provides in the community. One of the most valuable services provided by the TMA is the Tualatin TMA shuttle service. It is with this shuttle that my employees are able to make the last connection in their commute to work. Without the shuttle my employees would have to walk more than a mile to work one way.

The Tualatin TMA along with many other TMA shuttles is funded from the 2040 Initiatives money from the regional TDM program. I ask as a business person that is concerned about lack of transit service in our city, that you, Metro Council consider full funding of the regional 2040 initiatives program from the MTIP 2002.

It has been recommended that the 2040 Initiatives program receive almost a 50% cut of funding from the last MTIP, and from the amount that was requested. If this cut occurs, these small community shuttles that are often the last connection for employees will cease to exist. This will be devastating to our business community. I hope you will consider our request for full funding of the 2040 Initiatives program and the Regional TDM program.

Best Regards

Lisa Searle
HR Manager
Dear Members of the Metro Council,

As a member of the Tualatin business community I am concerned with the issues that affect my ability to do business. Transportation and traffic issues have a severe impact on business in Tualatin. From freight movement issues to getting employees to work on time.

Durametal Corp is a member of the Tualatin TMA and pays annual dues to support the services the TMA provides in the community. One of the most valuable services provided by the TMA is the Tualatin TMA shuttle service. It is with this shuttle that my employees are able to make the last connection in their commute to work. Without the shuttle my employees would have to walk more than a mile to work one-way. Novellus Corp is opening up a facility about two miles to the west of Durametal’s facility. It is reported there will be 2,500 employees at this location. It is imperative that public transportation be extended to this location.

The Tualatin TMA along with many other TMA shuttles is funded from the 2040 initiatives money from the regional TDM program. As a business resident of Tualatin for almost 40 years that is concerned about the lack of transit service in our city I respectfully request that the Metro Council continue full funding of the regional 2040 initiatives program from the MTIP 2002.

It has been recommended that the 2040 initiatives program receive almost a 50% cut of funding from the last MTIP, and from the amount that was requested. If this cut occurs, these small community shuttles that are often the last connection for our employees will cease to exist. This will be devastating to Tualatin’s business community. Please consider and approve our request for full funding of the 2040 initiatives program and the Regional TDM program.

Respectfully submitted,

Donald W. Dauterman
President
September 6, 2001

MTIP Comments
Metro Planning Department
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

Gentlemen:

We strongly support the project submitted by the City of Tigard for improvements to SW Greenburg Road from Washington Square Drive to Tiedeman Avenue. Although we are disappointed that the amount originally proposed for both rights-of-way acquisition and partial construction was reduced to rights-of-way acquisition only, we are pleased that the project made the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) recommended 100% list.

This project is extremely important to Tigard. The widening of Greenburg Road would add capacity to an already heavily congested street and provide much more efficient movement of traffic into and out of the Washington Square Regional Center. It would facilitate the development of the Regional Center Plan and enhance safe pedestrian and bicycle travel to and from that area. The improved roadway would also provide for smoother bus service into the Regional Center and assist in the transition of that area from a typical suburban shopping mall to a true Regional Center that serves the cities of Beaverton, Tigard and other surrounding jurisdictions.

We request that the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council retain the Greenburg Road project in the final 100% list at the funding level recommended by TPAC. The Greenburg Road project was funded for preliminary engineering in the Priorities 2000 process. Additional funding at a level sufficient for rights-of-way acquisition through the Priorities 2002 process would allow us to move closer towards construction of this much-needed improvement.

Sincerely,

JAMES E. GRIFFITH
Mayor

c: Tigard City Councilors
William A. Monahan, City Manager
Agustin P. Duenas, P.E., City Engineer
September 7, 2001

Members of Metro Council
Metro Regional Government
600 NE Grand
Portland, OR 97232

Dear Members of the Metro Council,

As a member of the Tualatin business community I am concerned with the issues that affect my ability to do business. Transportation and traffic issues have a severe impact on business in Tualatin from freight movement issues to getting employees to work on time.

My business, Key Knife, Inc. is a member of the Tualatin TMA and pays annual dues to support the services the TMA provides in the community. One of the most valuable services provided by the TMA is the Tualatin TMA shuttle service. It is with this shuttle that my employees are able to make the last connection in their commute to work. Without the shuttle my employees would have to walk more than a mile to work one way.

The Tualatin TMA along with many other TMA shuttles is funded from the 2040 initiatives money from the regional TDM program. I ask as a businessperson that is concerned about lack of transit service in our city, that you, Metro Council consider full funding of the regional 2040 initiatives program from the MTIP 2002.

It has been recommended that the 2040 initiatives program receive almost a 50% cut of funding from the last MTIP, and from the amount that was requested. If this cut occurs, these small community shuttles that are often the last connection for employees will cease to exist. This will be devastating to our business community. I hope you will consider our request for full funding of the 2040 initiatives program and the Regional TDM program.

Best Regards

Pamela K. Anderson
Director of Employee Services
September 7, 2001

Metro Council
Metro Regional Government
600 NE Grand
Portland, OR 97232

Dear Chairman Park and Members of the Council,

I am writing to you as a member of the Tualatin business community and Tualatin Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors, to ask that you please fully fund the I-5/Nyberg interchange and widening project.

It has come to my attention that the City of Tualatin may not be granted MTIP 2002 funds for this project and this concerns me greatly. I live and work in Tualatin and therefore deal with the city’s traffic congestion every day. There are constant back-ups along many of our arterial roads due to the congestion created by the current interchange. This congestion severely impacts our downtown. Tualatin has worked very hard as a city to implement the types of 2040 development that our region has encouraged. This congestion adversely affects our ability as a city to create a multi-modal city, it is almost impossible to cross a street or ride a bicycle along many of our roads.

Furthermore, congestion is adding to the costs of doing business in Tualatin. Our city has three major highways converging within it, 99W, I-5 and I-205. Speedy freight movement is critical to our business community and movement in and out of the industrial area is hampered due to traffic congestion created by the current I-5/Nyberg intersection. This congestion is not just affecting Tualatin but also regional freight movement needs. When traffic is backed up along I-5 it is also backed-up in Tualatin and along I-205. Business trying to move freight from south of Tualatin to the Metro area and back are delayed while trying to move through the Tualatin area.

The I-5 intersection is also an important access to a large hospital in our city; congestion at this intersection can create severe delays for emergency vehicles moving in and out of the area.

A recent city survey indicated the traffic congestion was the highest rated problem to our residents and businesses. This is because traffic congestion is becoming unbearable within our city.

Please seriously consider the adverse affects that traffic has on our city and fully fund the I-5/Nyberg road interchange project.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Neta George
To: matoesonm@MetCen.MRC-PO
From: "am" <mcinamon@jps.net>
Subject: resend of MTIP comments
CC:
Date Sent: Tuesday, September 11, 2001 4:37 PM

Marilyn,

I didn't check email yesterday so I hope you'll still accept these comments today.

I've decided to convert them to txt format and imbed them in the email message. Please excuse any formatting problems that may be caused during the conversion.

Thanks in advance for accepting these comments

Ann

-----------------------------comments below-------------------------------
September 9, 2001

MTIP Comments
Metro Planning Department,
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

To whom it may concern,

As Chair of the Transportation Committee for the Sellwood-Moreland neighborhood association
I would like to submit our response to the staff recommendations for the MTIP process. We whole-heartedly support the staff recommendation for full funding for the East Bank Trail/Springwater Trail Connector. We believe this project takes another critical step in completing the regional bicycle corridor from Portland CBD to Boring. We are alarmed to discover that the Technical Advisory committee has recommended removing full funding from this project in order to fund a highway project. We believe that the Springwater Corridor project has received widespread support from the region and that the timing of implementing this project is crucial.

With the advent of the construction of the OMSI to Umatilla portion of the corridor to begin this
fall, it will make commuting by bike to downtown that much more of a reality to folks in the inner southeast neighborhoods and those south of us. Until the portion that crosses McLoughlin Blvd, the Union Pacific and Johnson Creek is also completed, it remains a commuting challenge for those neighborhoods to our east. A partial implementation of only the bridge over the railroad will cause cyclists to have to cross at grade on McLoughlin. This will require stopping traffic numerous times at the light at Ochoco. This degradation of travel time on McLoughlin will very likely directly impact this neighborhood as even more commuters turn onto 17th Avenue and cut through this neighborhood to avoid slow downs on McLoughlin. It is exactly this type of behavior this neighborhood has struggled with for decades.

It also keeps our neighborhood from any easy access for eastward commutes or bicycle trips. Providing these types of connections yields access to a number of attractive origins and destinations, a key element in developing a vital bicycle transportation network. It is projects like this that will help move bicycling from an alternative to a primary mode of travel. Unlike many other bicycle projects that are built, this one interconnects the region.

Respectfully yours,

Ann McManamon
Chair, SMILE Transportation Committee
I have recently learned that, although priorities are still high, funds for Springwater Trail pedestrian/bicycle bridges over McLoughlin have been further cut. Although the amount remaining may be sufficient to build one (of three needed) I STRONGLY URGE YOU TO RESTORE FUNDING FOR ALL THREE BRIDGES. CONSTRUCTION OF THESE BRIDGES IS ABSOLUTELY CRUCIAL IN COMPLETING THE FINAL LINK IN THE TRAIL. As you probably know, at present bicyclists must walk, and often carry, their bicycles to reach the Trail Terminus on the east side of McLoughlin.

PLEASE GIVE URGENT CONSIDERATION TO ADVANCING THIS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT REGIONAL PROJECT.

Thank You.

Austin Pritchard
Board Member, S.M.I.L.E Neighborhood Association
503-231-6048
austinpritchard@earthlink.net
Hello,

I understand that all the necessary Springwater Corridor Trail bike bridges may not be built.

Please do fund construction for the bike bridges in SE Portland. The completion of the bridges will make travel on the Springwater Corridor Trail much easier and by funding these alternative forms of transportation the neighborhood and metro area will be more vibrant and healthy.

The Springwater Trail is a great bike path. Help to make it an easy path to get to and utilize.

Thank you,

Sincerely,

Cathy Mahle
1325 SE Sherrett
Portland, OR 97202
503 731-0171
September 10, 2001

David Bragdon
Presiding Officer, Metro Council
600 N. E. Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Dear Mr. Bragdon,

I am writing to urge you to support funding for the five existing TMAs, particularly the Westside Transportation Alliance (WTA).

- The WTA connects us with the latest information on transportation and auto trip reduction strategies. In addition, they are an excellent advocate and broker between area business and Tri-Met.

- The Westside Transportation Alliance provides valuable services to employers to help them create and promote auto trip reduction programs, such as: an Internet based survey of commute behaviors that complies with both ECO and Tri-Met PASSport requirements and a new brochure on alternate transportation options in Washington County with a customized insert of members’ alternate transportation resources offered to their employees.

- Our company also greatly values the WTA Nimbus Shuttle, which connects employees between the Beaverton Transit Center and the Nimbus Business Park.

- Employers commit significant dollars for auto trip reduction, such as: Tri-Met payroll tax dollars, transit subsidies and free passes, carpool matching and preferred parking, teleworking programs, compressed work week schedules, guaranteed ride home programs,
alternate commuting promotional programs with incentives such as prizes and bonuses, dues and support for TMAs, and subsidizing the WTA Nimbus Shuttle.

- However, member dues cannot fund 100% of the organization's budget. Therefore, the WTA needs to be able to receive and count on regional transportation funds each year to provide the quality services and programs that fulfill the region's mode split goals.

- Other regions provide ongoing funding of TMAs for the promotion of alternate forms of commuting. Florida provides $25,000 per year for each TMA; Massachusetts $50,000 per year per TMA; and Houston $40,000. As a leader in the area of metropolitan commute options, it is important you continue to support organizations like the WTA.

Thank you for considering our request,

Chad Madron
Associate Transportation Coordinator
FCNB
503-520-8548
September 10, 2001

Metro Planning Department
600NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

Subject: MTIP Comments

Dear JPACT Committee and Metro Council Members:

At JPACT's August 9, 2001 meeting, I spoke about the importance of the Boeckman Road Extension project in achieving Metro's 2040 Goals. Also, Danielle Cowan, City of Wilsonville Public Affairs Director, spoke on my behalf concerning this project, as well as to another MTIP project—the SMART Park and Ride facility at your Metro Community Planning Committee Public Hearing held September 4, 2001 which I was unable to attend. I am submitting the essential points of my comments and Ms. Cowan's to be considered in the written record.

I appreciate the opportunity to express the critical nature of the Boeckman Road Extension Project and the SMART Park and Ride facility. However, we are very disappointed in the staff recommendation of August 31, 2001 to only provide half of the requested funding. It also appears that this funding was achieved at the expense of the SMART Park and Ride facility. I fear that by funding half of the amount requested for both of these projects, the viability of each is compromised. I urge JPACT and the Metro Council to fully fund both projects. Here's why:

The Boeckman Road Extension Project is vital to the entire region. It is a Metro designated Regional Street that will provide a multi-modal link to the proposed Dammasch Mixed-Use Urban Village to industrial and employment areas, the Wilsonville Commuter Rail Station and Transit Center, Interstate 5 and Wilsonville Town Center. It allows Metro to use a small portion of its funds and resources strategically for a project that will help maintain the Urban Growth Boundary. The Dammasch Urban Village will provide at least 2,300 housing units within the current UGB, but without the extension of Boeckman Road, it cannot be developed.

Please consider these points:

- This project provides Metro the opportunity to demonstrate that it can meet its 2040 Goals. A linchpin in meeting those goals is development of the Dammasch Urban Village, which will assist the region in maintaining the Urban Growth Boundary.

- Much has been made of public-private partnerships and this project is an excellent example. We have recently interviewed potential developers of the Dammasch property. The City and the developers are willing to move forward on their commitment and make substantial investments to make this project happen. The
region must demonstrate its commitment to the partnership by stepping up to the plate with the requested $1 million. It is a small but important investment. The staff recommendation of only $500,000 does not demonstrate a strong commitment to this regional priority project.

- Westside Commuter Rail is an extremely high priority for the region and the state as well. It is considered a cost-effective key to resolving some of the area’s transportation deficiencies. Completion of the Boeckman Road Extension is an essential component to making commuter rail work. The project will provide necessary off-site access to the commuter rail station. Without these improvements, commuter rail will have a limited ability to serve commuters outside Wilsonville when it should be serving the whole south metro region.

- This project must happen now, not four or five years from now. The state property that will make the Dammasch Urban Village possible will most likely not be available if the Boeckman Road Extension is not completed until after 2006.

The South Metro Area Rapid Transit (SMART) Park and Ride Project
The requested $1.172 million of MTIP funding is for purchasing land for a 250-space park-and-ride area and transit center. Staff recommended that just $586,000 of this amount be funded, even though earlier it was targeted to receive the full amount requested. Last year, the SMART Park and Ride project was identified on the 2000-2003 MTIP Priorities 150% list. It is our understanding that first consideration for the 2002-2005 MTIP process was to go to those projects that were highly ranked and unfunded in the prior MTIP process. This year, the project received a favorable ranking and is included on JPACT’s Approved 150% list, but then was not included in Metro Council’s priority list. We urge you to support this most important local and regional multi-modal project.

The SMART Park and Ride facility will be co-located with the commuter rail terminus on Wilsonville’s Westside to provide a single transfer site for bus, rail and carpool passengers. This project provides an important and necessary regional link for commuters traveling to points north and south along the I-5 corridor through Wilsonville. As the proposed terminus for Commuter Rail and given Wilsonville’s close proximity to I-5, a Park-and-Ride center in our city has the potential to serve I-5 commuters from the entire south metro area including Canby, Donald, Aurora, and Woodburn. While these communities are outside Metro’s jurisdiction, their commuters seriously impact the metro area transportation capacity. The more of these vehicles that remain in Wilsonville with their drivers taking transit, the more capacity is preserved in the critical I-5, I-205, and Highway 217 corridors.

There is limited land available near the commuter rail terminus. It is imperative that we acquire the most appropriate land as soon as possible to build a park and ride facility. Any further delay in acquiring land for this purpose will risk losing the optimal site and will result in higher costs. As you know, the Wilsonville business community fully funds SMART’s fareless transit system whose ridership continues to expand. SMART presently leases 55 parking spaces from several retailers for park and ride users. These spaces are and have been at capacity for some time with demand steadily increasing. Wilsonville lacks parking and transfer facilities for drivers who want to use public transportation or rideshare options.
This Park-and-Ride and Transit Center will provide a centralized point of access for pedestrians, bicyclists, car and vanpools, and motorists traveling north and south through Wilsonville. In addition, co-locating this facility adjacent to the commuter rail terminus will further enhance multi-modal and regional connectivity.

The City of Wilsonville feels a great sense of urgency that both of these projects receive the funding and the support of JPACT and the Metro Council. It should be a top priority given its significance in enabling the region to meet its 2040 vision. If however, you opt to follow staff’s recommendations, we ask that you commit the funds currently allocated to both to just the SMART Park and Ride facility. We must purchase this property as soon as possible. We have a willing seller, but we don’t know for how long. We do not have other fund sources to acquire the property. Even though the Boeckman Road Extension is equally important, we believe that the viability of either project is jeopardized if they receive only half of the funds requested. These projects deserve separate consideration and full support. It does not serve the region well to split funds between them.

Although the Sunrise and Sunset Corridors get a lot of attention and seem to be the focal points of the MTIP funds, the Interstate-5 Corridor is the main west coast arterial stretching from southern California to Canada, not to mention that it connects Oregon’s most populous cities. It is the primary freight route moving goods in and out of the whole Portland region and maintaining its capacity is critical to Oregon commerce. Certainly it deserves more consideration in this funding process. The Boeckman Road Extension project and the SMART Park and Ride facility encourage the use of transit and alternative modes of transportation. The Boeckman Road Extension in particular allows Metro to use these funds in a forward-thinking, strategic way that will have a lasting, positive impact on the region far into the future.

Sincerely,

Charlotte Lehan
Mayor

Charlotte Lehan
September 10, 2001

David Bragdon
Metro Council, Presiding Officer
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

Dear Mr. Bragdon:

It has come to my attention that Metro is taking public comment on funding allocations for transportation programs and projects. The City of Tigard strongly supports funding of Transportation Management Associations (TMA’s), particularly the Westside Transportation Alliance (WTA). The WTA has been invaluable in helping Tigard with many transportation issues including working with Tri-met and assisting with our Washington Square Regional Center plan. Continued financial support of this TMA would allow for continued support of the implementation of our regional center plan which calls for multi-modal development, implementation of TDM measures, and a potential TMA for the Washington Square Regional Center area. In addition, the WTA will continue to assist Tigard in addressing all of its transportation needs. Please consider the TMA’s and their invaluable contribution to the Metro area when making your funding allocation decisions.

Sincerely,

James N.P. Hendryx
Community Development Director
Metro Council
Metro Regional Government
600 NE Grand
Portland, OR 97232

Dear Chairman Park and Members of the Council,

I am writing to you as a member of the Tualatin business community and Tualatin Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors, to ask that you please fully fund the I-5/Nyberg interchange and widening project.

It has come to my attention that the City of Tualatin may not be granted MTIP 2002 funds for this project and this concerns me greatly.

I live and work in Tualatin and therefore deal with the city’s traffic congestion every day. There are constant back-ups along many of our arterial roads due to the congestion created by the current interchange. This congestion severely impacts our downtown. Tualatin has worked very hard as a city to implement the types of 2040 development that our region has encouraged. This congestion adversely affects our ability as a city to create a multi-modal city, it is almost impossible to cross a street or ride a bicycle along many of our roads.

Furthermore, congestion is adding to the costs of doing business in Tualatin. Our city has three major highways convening within it, 99W, I-5 and I-205. Speedy freight movement is critical to our business community and movement in and out of the industrial area is hampered due to traffic congestion created by the current I-5/Nyberg intersection. This congestion is not just affecting Tualatin but also regional freight movement needs. When traffic is backed up along I-5 it is also backed-up in Tualatin and along I-205. Business trying to move freight from south of Tualatin to the Metro area and back are delayed while trying to move through the Tualatin area.

The I-5 intersection is also an important access to a large hospital in our city, congestion at this intersection can create severe delays for emergency vehicles moving in and out of the area.

A recent city survey indicated the traffic congestion was the highest rated problem to our residents and businesses. This is because traffic congestion is becoming unbearable within our city.

Please seriously consider the adverse affects that traffic has on our city and fully fund the I-5/Nyberg road interchange project.

Yours sincerely,

Barbara McCarthy
Owner
Finance Springwater's missing link

For bicyclists hardy enough to commute from Boring or Gresham into downtown Portland, the Springwater Corridor Trail is a big tease.

Look on a map, and you can see that the 17-mile former rail line comes tantalizingly close to doing the job. It peterers out at the railroad tracks just east of McLoughlin Boulevard in Milwaukie.

Only a dedicated commuter bicyclist like Eugene Grant grits his teeth and keeps pedaling through the ensuing bicycle-hostile territory, including the slender sidewalk over the Sellwood Bridge. "If you fall off that sidewalk, the cars are right next to you," Grant says. "There's no room for error."

Grant, who works as a real estate attorney in downtown Portland, is mayor of Happy Valley, one of the eastside communities eager to see the Springwater Corridor Trail completed. Milwaukie residents feel so strongly that they're willing to put up a $26,000 local match, which is a lot in a town of 20,000. It amounts to $1.30 per capita.

You can see why they think the trail is so important, though: It has such potential to attract commuters. An estimated 100,000 people live within a half-mile of it; an estimated 600,000 people already use it for recreation.

This month, Metro will decide how to spend $38 million in federal transportation dollars, about half of which has to be earmarked for alternative modes of transportation. Completion of the Springwater Corridor Trail should be high on Metro's list.

It won't come cheap. The $4.2 million cost for a final McLoughlin to Sellwood section includes construction of bicycle/pedestrian bridges over Johnson Creek, McLoughlin and the Union Pacific Railroad line. But it's worth it.

This final segment of the trail will connect to another 3-mile stretch that the city of Portland has planned from the Sellwood Bridge to OMSI. From there, commuters like Grant could hop on the Hawthorne Bridge.

They'll still have to watch where they're going. But they might actually be able to enjoy the view.
Agenda Item No.: #4

Yes: Robert Drake, Dave Lohman, Lonnie Roberts, Roy Rogers, Kay VanSickel.
No: Peter Capell, Charlie Hales, Stephanie Hallock, Fred Hansen, Larry Haverkamp, Bill Kennemer, Dean Lookingbill, Rod Park, Craig Pridemore, Karl Rohde, Don Wagner.

The vote is: 5/yes and 11/no. The vote failed.
METRO JPACT ROLL CALL AND VOTE RECORD

Meeting Date: September 13, 2001

Agenda Item No.: #4
2

nd

motion: Resolution to amend with option 2. Vote: 11/yes, 5/no. Vote passed.

Yes: Rex Burkholder, Charlie Hales, Stephanie Hallock, Fred Hansen, Larry Haverkamp, Bill Kennemer, Dave Lohman, Rod Park, Craig Pridemore, Lonnie Roberts, Karl Rohde.

No: Robert Drake, Dean Lookingbill, Roy Rogers, Kay VanSickel, Don Wagner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member/Alternate</th>
<th>Present/Absent</th>
<th>Moved</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>Aye</th>
<th>Nay</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian, Tom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkholder, Rex</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capell, Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruz, Serena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drake, Robert</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galligan, Ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginsburg, Andy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hales, Charlie</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallock, Stephanie</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen, Fred</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haverkamp, Larry</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosticka, Carl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan, Michael</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katz, Vera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennemer, Bill</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kight, James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legry, Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liebe, Annette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lohman, Dave</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lookingbill, Dean</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McFarlane, Neil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe, Rod</td>
<td>(P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newman, Brian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odgen, Lou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park, Rod</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollard, Royce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pridemore, Craig</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, Lonnie</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers, Roy</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohde, Karl</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Sickel, Kay</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner, Don</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner, Bruce</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Charlie Hales motioned and seconded by Karl Rohde. The vote was: 11/yes, 5/no. The motion passed.
Third motion: The motion was to amend the resolution to remove $540,000 of past allocations to the Cornell Road Blvd. Right-of-Way and shift dollars to "SMART Park & Ride."

The motion was moved by Karl Rohde and seconded by Charlie Hales. The motion was withdrawn by Karl Rohde; and agreed upon by Charlie Hales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member/Alternate</th>
<th>Present/Absent</th>
<th>Moved</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>Aye</th>
<th>Nay</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian, Tom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkholder, Rex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capell, Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruz, Serena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drake, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galligan, Ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginsburg, Andy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hales, Charlie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallock, Stephanie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen, Fred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haverkamp, Larry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosticka, Carl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan, Michael</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katz, Vera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennemer, Bill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kight, James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legry, Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liebe, Annette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lohman, Dave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lookingbill, Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McFarlane, Neil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe, Rod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newman, Brian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odgen, Lou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park, Rod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollard, Royce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pridemore, Craig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, Lonnie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers, Roy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohde, Karl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Sickel, Kay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner, Don</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner, Bruce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vote was withdrawn.
Fourth motion: The final motion to amend to remove $540,000 and shift dollars to I-5/Nyberg Project and to shift $500,000 of Boeckman Road Project to SMART Park & Ride.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member/Alternate</th>
<th>Present/Absent</th>
<th>Moved</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>Aye</th>
<th>Nay</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian, Tom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkholder, Rex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capell, Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruz, Serena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drake, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galligan, Ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginsburg, Andy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hales, Charlie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallock, Stephanie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen, Fred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haverkamp, Larry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosticka, Carl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan, Michael</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katz, Vera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennemer, Bill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kight, James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legry, Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liebe, Annette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lohman, Dave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lookingbill, Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McFarlane, Neil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe, Rod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newman, Brian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odgen, Lou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park, Rod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollard, Royce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pridemore, Craig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, Lonnie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers, Roy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohde, Karl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Sickel, Kay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner, Don</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner, Bruce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vote unanimously passed.
METRO JPACT ROLL CALL AND VOTE RECORD

Meeting Date: September 13, 2001

Agenda Item No.: #4

The main motion: to approve amending the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program to Allocate FY 2004-2005 Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) and Surface Transportation Program (STP) Funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member/Alternate</th>
<th>Present/Absent</th>
<th>Moved</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>Aye</th>
<th>Nay</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian, Tom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkholder, Rex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capell, Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruz, Serena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drake, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galligan, Ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginsburg, Andy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hales, Charlie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallock, Stephanie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen, Fred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haverkamp, Larry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosticka, Carl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan, Michael</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katz, Vera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennemer, Bill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kight, James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legry, Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liebe, Annette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lohman, Dave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lookingbill, Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McFarlane, Neil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe, Rod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newman, Brian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odgen, Lou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park, Rod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollard, Royce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pridemore, Craig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, Lonnie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers, Roy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohde, Karl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Sickel, Kay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner, Don</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner, Bruce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vote unanimously passed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST NAME LAST_NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>REPRESENTING</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>STE TYPE</th>
<th>SUITE</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>ZIPCODE</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>FAX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roy Y</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>12700 SW 72ND Ave.</td>
<td>155 N. 1st Ave.</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>22 OR</td>
<td>97223-8335 503-620-2632</td>
<td>503-693-4545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Y</td>
<td>Hales</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>1221 SW 4th Ave.</td>
<td>1221 SW 4th Ave.</td>
<td>Room 210</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97204-1906 503-823-4682</td>
<td>503-823-4040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Y</td>
<td>Hosticka</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>600 NE Grand Ave.</td>
<td>600 NE Grand Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97232-2736 503-797-1549</td>
<td>503-797-1793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonnie Y</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
<td>501 SE Hawthorne Blvd.</td>
<td>501 SE Hawthorne Blvd.</td>
<td>Room 600</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97214-3585 503-988-5213</td>
<td>503-988-5262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Y</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>12700 SW 72ND Ave.</td>
<td>155 N. 1st Ave.</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>22 OR</td>
<td>97223-8335 503-620-2632</td>
<td>503-693-4545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Y</td>
<td>Hales</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>1221 SW 4th Ave.</td>
<td>1221 SW 4th Ave.</td>
<td>Room 210</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97204-1906 503-823-4682</td>
<td>503-823-4040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Y</td>
<td>Hosticka</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>600 NE Grand Ave.</td>
<td>600 NE Grand Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97232-2736 503-797-1549</td>
<td>503-797-1793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>AFFILIATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Choquin</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Monroe</td>
<td>Metro Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Park</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Halet</td>
<td>Wash County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Rogers</td>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Holman</td>
<td>DEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Hellock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Wagner</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Leckningbill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Van Sickel</td>
<td>RTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Hansen</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Haverkamp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Rouse</td>
<td>TRIMET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rex Burkholder</td>
<td>Cities of Mult County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorrie Roberts</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Drake</td>
<td>Metro Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Knowlton</td>
<td>MultCo. Comm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Benny</td>
<td>Cities of Washington Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clermont Bliss Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wash. Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>AFFILIATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Ballew</td>
<td>Wash. County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Lehtola</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Newman</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Williams</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Werneman</td>
<td>Clackamas Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Hodgland</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Ocker</td>
<td>Gresham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim White</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Bragdon</td>
<td>Portland Office Metro Coroll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Kuster</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernie Bottonly</td>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Putman</td>
<td>THPAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Kreushaar</td>
<td>Oregon City (THPAC Cities &amp; Black Co.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Bisco</td>
<td>LUSDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deb Wallace</td>
<td>City of Milwaukee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Barnett</td>
<td>Portland Parks &amp; Rec'n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Si Everts</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Schouten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Linda Floyd
Gary Katsion
Jack Freeman
Danville Cowan
Jen Holan
Suzie Lohse
(Kamila Ryszkawa)
Kamila Shpenev
Harold Lasley
Rabia Rashid
Bobo Katz
Paul Crossman
Steve Datsyn
Mike McMillan
Katie Mangle
Mike Nachle
Neil McFarlane
L.A. Ornelas
Kelly Seannell

City of Wilsonville
Kittelston & Assoc
City of Wilsonville
City of Forest Grove
Port of Portland
Port of Portland
Multnomah County
Westside Economic Alliance
Part of Portland
Pleasant Valley Neighborhood
City of Portland Staff
City of Tualatin
TriMet
OHsu
Congressman David Wu
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ross Williams</td>
<td>CST/CLF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh Alpert</td>
<td>Comm. Hales office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Sharp</td>
<td>Tualatin Hills Park &amp; Rec. Dist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey Weit</td>
<td>MTAC Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wiebke</td>
<td>City of Hillsboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Morgan</td>
<td>City of Wilsonville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Maller</td>
<td>C-TRAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick E.</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Pridemore</td>
<td>Clark County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Lou O'Gden</td>
<td>City of Tualatin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>