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MEETING: JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION
DATE: January 10, 2002
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 December 13, 2001 meeting – APPROVAL REQUESTED
4. Re-authorization of TEA-21 – Comments – Congressman Blumenauer
*5. Resolution 02-3151 - For the Purpose of Approving Funds for the Sunnyside Road and Boeckman Road Projects – APPROVAL REQUESTED – Andy Cotugno, Metro
*6. I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership, Preliminary Recommendations – Informational and Comments Requested – Kate Deane, ODOT
7. Clackamas County Transportation Funding Initiative – Informational – Cam Gilmour, Clackamas County
8. Update on the Status of the Sauvie Island Bridge – Informational – Maria Rojo de Steffey, Multnomah County
9. 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.
Joint Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)
December 13, 2001
Meeting Notes

**MEMBERS PRESENT**
- Rod Monroe, Chair
- Rod Park
- Rob Drake
- Fred Hansen
- Roy Rogers
- Dean Lookingbill, alternate
- Larry Haverkamp
- Dave Lohman, alternate
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- Kay Van Sickel
- Karl Rohde
- Charlie Hales
- Maria Rojo De Steffey
- Rex Burkholder
- Bill Kennemer

**AFFILIATION**
- Metro
- Metro
- Beaverton, representing Cities of Washington County
- Tri-Met
- Washington County
- SW Washington RTC
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- Washington State Department of Transportation
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12/13/01 JPACT Meeting Notes

STAFF
Andy Cotugno
Richard Brandman
Mike Hoglund
Chris Deffebach
Renée Castilla

SUMMARY
The meeting was called to order and quorum declared by Chair Rod Monroe at 7:38am.

CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS
There were no citizen communication items.

MEETING REPORT

Action Taken: Rex Burkholder moved and seconded by Roy Rogers to approve the November 1, 2001 JPACT meeting notes. The motion passed unanimously.

I-5 TRANSPORTATION AND TRADE PARTNERSHIP

Andy Cotugno stated that Kate Deane has been managing the I-5 Task Force process. They are currently undergoing a public review period and are asking for feedback. He indicated that the Task Force has not formally adopted this draft as their position but would be reconvening January 29, 2002 to adopt a recommendation.

Kate Deane stated that the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership is a bi-state planning project, sponsored by ODOT, WSDOT and FHWA. A 28-member bi-state task force leads it and the purpose of the project is to develop a strategic plan for I-5 corridor between Portland and Vancouver. Their project overview and purpose is to look at a multi-faceted plan, not only looking at the freeway, but also at transit service in the corridor, managing demand, freight and passenger rail.

Kate stated that the status of the project is as follows:

- In January 2000, a 28-member bi-state task force began its work.
- Members of the committee include elected, business, neighborhood and community representatives.
- The Task Force spent January – June working with the public and one another to determine what improvements should be studied.
- Those draft results are now available.

She said that the option packages evaluated included:

- Baseline (2020)
Kate said that the next steps would be: January 2002 – Public review of draft recommendations, Bi-State Committee review and comment on draft recommendations, Task Force adopts draft recommendations; February 2002 – Plan refinements including additional technical review and developing finance plan; June 2002 – Public review of draft recommendations, Task Force adopts final recommendations and strategic plan; Post 2002 – Review by JPACT and RTC, Adoption into Regional Transportation Plans, EIS if major improvements are recommended.

Fred Hansen stated that Kate Deane has done a terrific job on the process. He also stated that the base line is not current conditions and includes levels of improvements not yet financed. He also had two comments: 1) the improvements on the I-5 Corridor did not make things much better because the I-5 corridor is the preferred area of movement; and 2) they determined that the traffic was not all “through” traffic. About 60% of the traffic in the corridor (SR 500/Columbia Corridor) serves a sub-regional transportation shed and stays in that corridor.

Roy Rogers asked the Committee how competitive the process would become in the next six months for 5309 New Starts money.

Rod Monroe replied that the JPACT committee needs to consider the fact that it has been very successful in receiving federal money and it owes that in part to both the Oregon and Washington delegations. He stated that the Washington delegation is in an instrumental position to assist JPACT with funding projects in a mutual way. If only Oregon projects get funded, this might cause more difficulty receiving federal funds. He stated that everyone must work together to amass political clout and continue to have the Oregon and Washington delegation be supportive of JPACT transportation priorities.

Rod Monroe emphasized that the appropriation for the commuter rail project for Washington County might get reduced. He said that JPACT and Metro would provide support for Washington County if it were determined that they would like the assistance.

Karl Rohde asked Kate Deane why the west arterial road does not appear on the map, but in the draft paper, appears as a significant heading.
Kate Deane replied that the west arterial did get looked at very strongly and was taken off the table. While it solves problems for Oregon neighborhoods, it creates problems for Washington neighborhoods. Because there is no resources at this time to determine how someone gets from point A to point B, it would result in increased transportation along the downtown roads of Fourth Plain and Mill Plain Roads, through neighborhoods, which would cause widening of those roads and potential displacements.

Dave Lohman stated that overall; this has been an interesting process. He also stated the he appreciates the group’s willingness to solve problems for transportation. He understands how complex this analytical process has been and now with the public comment period, the group can start to address the problems and look at solutions. However, realistically, solutions are 20 years out for some projects. Others might begin sooner if local and federal funding is there.

Rod Park noticed that the land used portion was listed as item number 6 on the draft recommendations. He asked if this was listed by importance.

Charlie Hales stated that he didn’t feel the Land Use Committee had successfully grappled with the difficulty in getting land use policy to avoid eroding transportation investments. He stated that it was not a new problem and that they did not solve it either.

Fred Hansen stated that the debate was if the things that came out of the Land Use Committee should be strengthened, and/or if it should it play a bigger role.

Charlie Hales stated that he felt that the JPACT committee could help solve the problem if they were to condition investments based on performance of land use decisions by the local jurisdictions.

OREGON TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT ACT – HB 2142

Chair Monroe stated that he presented the JPACT position to the OTC and was told that there would not be enough funding to pay for Boeckman Road and Sunnyside both. The OTC voted unanimously to request that JPACT prioritize the two projects and tell them which one they would prefer to be funded. He said that he explained to the OTC board that he felt that JPACT should not be forced to make that decision, that both projects are equal. However, it was implied to him that the OTC may decide to spend the funding dollars else where within the state and fund neither project if JPACT could not make the decision. So, it was with some urgency that he brings this action to JPACT.

Dave Williams stated that he would go through the full list of things that the OTC did:

1) Adopted a district highway rule that would consistently implement preservation on district highways.
2) Reconciled the $20 million discretionary funds by splitting equally, $10 million to bridge and $10 million to preservation. They used the same formula as they did on the original split, 73/27. They placed $2.8 million on local bridges, inflating all of the original figures; all of the bridges on the cut list remain and are going to be funded.
On the State side, they are fully funding Shady Bridge on I-5, funded an I-5 bridge in Josephine County which currently impacts the trucking industry. From the $10 million preservation funds they added $2.7 million to fully fund the Farmington Road Project. The remaining $7 million funded four projects in Region 4 and one truncated project in Region 5.

3) Three legislators gave testimony. Dick Backland and Lane Shetterly spoke in support of the way the process ran and how the ACT’s performed around the state. Donna Nelson said that more money should have been given the Newburg bypass.

4) Twenty different groups testified on behalf of different projects.

Rod Monroe stated that he tried to express to the OTC the position of the JPACT committee to the best of his ability.

Fred Hansen asked whether the OTC discussed why Region 1 was under funded.

Dave Williams stated that it’s difficult to determine what constitutes a fair share because the bridge and preservation money follows the roads and pays for fixing the worst conditions.

Kay Van Sickel stated that ODOT did make their recommendation on use of the HB 2142 money and the $10.4 million Sunnyside project was recommended. She said that it was recommended based on several factors. The project readiness; the environmental work was completed; it had a 51% local match; the immediate need on Sunnyside; and, the County is committed to phase one already. She stated that once phase one was completed, phase two would extend to 142nd. The Boeckman Road project’s readiness was a factor; they also have a local match; but need the environmental work to be done. They are also waiting on the ongoing Community Solutions team process and that discussion to get finalized. Therefore, ODOT recommended Sunnyside.

Charlotte Lehan explained to the committee that the OTC Board stated to her that they had not made a decision and that both projects were still in play. The reasons for eliminating the Boeckman project are the same reasons JPACT has already addressed and resolved; the readiness, in terms of the environmental work. They are not required to do a full EIS and there are minimal environmental impacts. They have full support from the local environmental groups and 1000 Friends of Oregon. They have always said that they are committed to finishing the project in the timeline outlined, which is why JPACT had discussions concerning readiness before, with regards to the project. The interchange is a separate project; Boeckman is and always has been a stand-alone project. The Boeckman project is needed regardless whether there’s an interchange or not. She stated that they are in an awkward spot with Clackamas County because Boeckman Road is part of Clackamas County and so is Sunnyside. It is hard for her to advocate for her project over Sunnyside. She stated that if she was to try and look at the two projects objectively, she feels Boeckman does all of the right things in term of transportation. They are very aggressive on transit and Boeckman Road is a key connection to commuter rail. Part of the reason that they’re as aggressive as they are in their community regarding transit, is because trucking is their business in Wilsonville. Preserving truck capacity on I-5 is critical to the Wilsonville Chamber and the business community. Wilsonville fully funds a fareless transit service and full busses on I-5. They are also aggressive on land use with the Damasch development meeting 2040. There isn’t a better project in terms of meeting
regional goals. On the other hand, Sunnyside is a huge congestion problem. She stated that the question is how does the region decide. Is a project chosen that meets all goals or is a project chosen that will continue to put their “finger in the dike”. She stated that Clackamas County is the 3rd largest county in the state slated to accept the largest share of population growth under 2040 both in both sections of the county. Out of the whole $400 million of these funds, less than $15 million is coming to Clackamas County. Both projects have 50% match. Many of other projects have either no match or very little match. There is an equity issue for Clackamas County. She stated that JPACT needs to find a solution that will work for both projects. One suggestion would be to fund Boeckman Road since it is not a phaseable project and give the balance to the Sunnyside project or find more money to be able to fund both projects so that both can move forward. This will need the cooperation of JPACT, Region 1 and the OTC.

Bill Kennemer stated that he also attended the OTC hearing and was disappointed to hear that more money would not be added. He said that OTC’s decision to send these two projects back to JPACT puts him in an awkward position because it essentially puts two Clackamas County projects against each other. There are strong merits for both projects and strong feelings run on all sides. He stated that the charge the commissioners gave him, as the message bearer is that they would not choose between the two. They will not advocate against either project and he will abstain from the vote. But he also doesn’t know how to resolve this. He stated that fundamentally there are a couple of issues that concern him. His calculations show that if you add bridge, preservation and modernization, all three categories, Clackamas County ends up with the OTC recommendation, which would be the Sunnyside project, which is the more expensive of the two projects, receiving $14.346 million or in another perspective, it represents 3.5% of $400 million. It is also the view of the Clackamas County Board of Commissioners (BOC) that this is represents a most unfortunate allocation of statewide resources. The second issue that Mayor Lehan addressed was that both projects in Clackamas County have 50% or better match. Mayor Lehan is proposing a 50% match for Boeckman Road and the BOC is proposing a 53% match for the full length of Sunnyside. He suggested that matches might be a way to help make up difference and establish more regional equity.

Rob Drake he stated that he was hoping to get some kind of direction from Bill and Clackamas County Commissioners because if this were happening in Washington County, he would look to his own people to assist with the decision. He stated that the Boeckman Road project includes an enhancement to the Damasch project and that Damasch is a poster child of what everyone is trying to do with 2040. Wilsonville is an industrial center but it is a city and he sees the Boeckman Road project helping Wilsonville become more of a city rather than a transportation hub. He would ask which project was going to enhance more community and which is not. He stated that the Boeckman project is offering more of where they are heading and that is why it is a better project of the two.

Larry Haverkamp stated that he has a slight problem with the timing. He understands that Wilsonville is a model of what everyone wants the 2040 plan to look like. He understands wanting to move ahead with the project quickly. But he sees the Urban Growth Boundary extending towards the area where the Sunnyside project is and if that project is held up any longer, than there will be more massive problems to deal with. He sees this as more of a timing issue then choosing one project over the other. He emphasized that there has to be something
done with that Sunnyside area before it is brought into the UGB and it is likely to be brought in soon.

Charlotte Lehan stated that Damasch is in now and she is afraid that if they are forced to wait, they will lose their shot at the best developer for the project.

Charlie Hales said to look at the whole list of what is being done; it appears to be unbalanced. How much money is being spent to chase past patterns and how much is being spent to influence patterns for the future? Things are very disproportionate, most of the money is being spent to fix things and not for new projects.

Rod Monroe stated that Metro is going to have to expand UGB late next year, state law requires that exception land be used first before higher quality resource land is used. Most of the exception land is in NE Clackamas County and Sunnyside Road is already over capacity.

Roy Rogers stated that there is $10 million dollars left for one of these projects. Boeckman Road is $7.8 million. Would the remaining $2.2 million have to be returned to the OTC or would it remain in this region?

Rod Monroe stated that the $10 million if given to Sunnyside Road would pay for the expansion from 122\textsuperscript{nd} to 142\textsuperscript{nd}, approximately one mile of expansion. The Boeckman project is $7.8 million.

Roy Rogers stated that his preference is Boeckman Road but he doesn’t want to leave $2.2 million on the table for OTC.

Kay Van Sickel stated that yes, if Boeckman Road is chosen then the $2.2 million remaining would be left for the OTC to use elsewhere in the region. JPACT could recommend a different project to use the difference, for example the full remainder to go to Sunnyside.

Rob Drake stated that there are two projects of varying successes or Sunnyside has segments. He would suggest that the Metro staff go back to see if they can possibly shift any dollars to get some phase of the Sunnyside project done.

Rod Monroe stated that although this needs to be brought to a resolution he would suggest sending it back to Clackamas County for a resolution. He asked Kay Van Sickel how soon the OTC needed JPACT’s recommendation.

Kay Van Sickel stated that the OTC would make their final decision at their January 16, 2002 meeting. Therefore the recommendation needs to be there before then.

Rob Drake stated that there needs to be some kind of negotiation because the OTC has other places this money could go.

Rod Monroe stated that in order to meet the timing deadline on January 16, 2002 for the OTC, the JPACT meeting would need to be moved to January 10, 2002.
Fred Hansen said that if Clackamas County could give a recommendation or a set of options, as to their decision, then he is willing to wait for the 10th of January, otherwise the decision needs to be made at this meeting.

Rod Monroe stated that the next MTIP process is scheduled for 2002 with the final decision by 2003. There is no other pile of money unless there can be more of a match forced out of somewhere.

Kay Van Sickel stated with all of the reasoning placed on the table, Sunnyside could be chosen because they are ready to go to construction on phase one and are committed to phase 2. She would prefer a decision soon.

Kay Van Sickel moved and Larry Haverkamp seconded to recommend the Sunnyside Road project to the OTC for funding.

Rob Drake stated that he feels that there hasn’t been enough discussion and he would currently vote no. He stated that he has not heard whether or not Andy could shift any money and would prefer to wait and come back January 10, 2002.

Andy Cotugno stated that although they have just finished the MTIP allocation they could certainly look at whether or not a project could be bumped and is picked up at the next MTIP process. He would recommend holding off on the motion and meet again January 10, 2002 to discuss a recommendation to the OTC.

Rod Park stated that he would also vote no on the motion because he would still like to see what JPACT could still push the state on. He would like to hear the recommendations out of Clackamas County. He doesn’t feel that JPACT should make the recommendation just because Clackamas County won’t do it.

Karl Rohde suggested withholding the motion until January 10, 2002 to give the Clackamas County Commission a chance to discuss.

Action taken: Rob Drake moved and Karl Rohde seconded to table Motion #2. The motion passed. The vote was as follows:

Yes: Rob Drake
Karl Rohde
Rod Monroe
Annette Liebe
Don Wagner
Larry Haverkamp
Dean Lookingbill
Roy Rogers
Charlie Hales
Maria Rojo de Steffey
Action taken: Rob Drake moved and Karl Rohde seconded to move the JPACT meeting from January 17, 2002 to January 10, 2002; instruct Metro staff to work with Clackamas County to discuss financial options; assist with their internal issues; and come back with a recommendation so that a coordinated message can be sent to the OTC for their meeting on January 16, 2002. The motion passed unanimously.

Rex Burkholder emphasized to Kay Van Sickel regarding the Jackson School Road project, which received HB 2142 funding to remember the RTP rural connector rules. There will need to be discussion about protecting capacity and working together.

Rod Monroe stated that it is also important to protect the surrounding farmland.

CLACKAMAS COUNTY TRANSPORTATION FUNDING INITIATIVE

The presentation will be rescheduled for a future JPACT meeting.

FEDERAL PRIORITIES PAPER

Andy Cotugno stated that he has handed out last year's Federal Priorities Paper and stated that this is something that will be beginning again. He said that the next six months would become much more policy oriented.

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, January 10, 2002.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Renée Castilla
WHEREAS, the 2001 Oregon Legislature passed HB 2142 Establishing the Oregon Transportation Investment Act (OTIA); and

WHEREAS, the OTIA included $200 million for Lane Capacity and Interchange projects statewide; and

WHEREAS, the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) identified a $70 million ODOT Region 1 target for Lane Capacity and Interchange projects; and

WHEREAS, the OTC requested input from JPACT on project recommendations for the $70 million Region 1 Target for Lane Capacity and Interchange projects; and

WHEREAS, JPACT provided project funding recommendations for Lane Capacity and Interchange projects on November 2, 2001 that totaled $78,462 million; and

WHEREAS, JPACT requested $8,462 million more than the Region 1 target amount in order to achieve statewide equity for the region; and

WHEREAS, the $8,462 million would be used to complete funding for two Clackamas County projects: Boeckman Road in Wilsonville; and Sunnyside Road in Clackamas County; and

WHEREAS, the Boeckman Road project will serve a significant compact, mixed-use development project at the Dammasch Hospital site that will provide needed housing in Wilsonville and is consistent with region’s 2040 Growth Concept and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), as well as state objectives for compact development; and

WHEREAS, the Sunnyside Road project provides needed access to an area urbanizing consistent with ORS 197.298 and state Goal 14 for urban expansion on “exception lands,” and is consistent with region’s 2040 Growth Concept and the RTP; and

WHEREAS, at their December 12, 2001 meeting, the OTC retained the $70 million Region 1 target for Lane Capacity and Interchange projects and requested that JPACT develop a program within that target; and

WHEREAS, at their December 13, 2001 meeting JPACT requested that representatives of Clackamas County, Wilsonville, ODOT, and Metro work with the JPACT representative for
the Cities of Clackamas County to develop a strategy for balancing the Region 1 OTIA project list at $70 million with consideration given to recommending either in whole or in part the Boeckman and Sunnyside projects; and

WHEREAS, the Clackamas County, Wilsonville, ODOT, and Metro representatives met in Lake Oswego on December 18, 2001 and recommended a strategy that results in a combination of OTIA, Metro MTIP, ODOT STIP, and local funds to complete both the Boeckman and Sunnyside projects by FY 2006; and;

WHEREAS, now therefore be it resolved that the Metro Council and JPACT find that:

1. A funding and implementation strategy for Boeckman Road and Sunnyside Road (122\textsuperscript{nd} to 142\textsuperscript{nd}) should be pursued as shown in Exhibit A.
2. The strategy shown in Exhibit A represents a Metro Council and JPACT commitment of $1,956,625 from the FY 04-07 MTIP to the Boeckman project.
3. The Metro Council and JPACT will request an additional $1,956,625 from ODOT as a Region 1 priority for the 2004-2007 STIP.
4. That these commitments are conditioned on an additional local commitment of $1,956,625 to both the Sunnyside and Boeckman Road projects.
5. This strategy, together with previously recommended projects identified in the letter from JPACT to the OTC dated November 2, results in a $70 million Region 1 Metro area recommendation for OTIA Lane Capacity and Interchange projects and is consistent with the OTC Region 1 target.
6. The strategy be forwarded to the OTC for their consideration at their January 16, 2001 meeting.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this ______ day of ___________,

David Bragdon, Presiding Officer

Approved as to form:

Dan Cooper, General Counsel
## Sunnyside Road/Boeckman Rd. Funding Proposal

**Exhibit A**
to Resolution #02-3151

### Sunnyside Rd. - 122nd to 142nd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>start</th>
<th>finish</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>OTIA</th>
<th>STIP/MTIP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Apr-02</td>
<td>Oct-03</td>
<td>$916,357</td>
<td>$583,643</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Apr-02</td>
<td>Oct-03</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Construction</td>
<td>Jun-02</td>
<td>Dec-03</td>
<td>$5,101,052</td>
<td>$3,248,948</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$8,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Apr-04</td>
<td>Nov-06</td>
<td>$7,239,217</td>
<td>$4,610,783</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$11,850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,256,625</td>
<td>$8,443,375</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$21,700,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Local: $13,256,625 (61.09%)
- State/Region: $8,443,375 (38.91%)
- Total: $21,700,000 (100.00%)

### Boeckman Rd. - Tooze Rd. Connection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>start</th>
<th>finish</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>OTIA</th>
<th>STIP/MTIP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>May-02</td>
<td>May-03</td>
<td>$758,988</td>
<td>$456,012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1,215,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>May-02</td>
<td>May-03</td>
<td>$171,787</td>
<td>$103,213</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Construction</td>
<td>May-03</td>
<td>May-04</td>
<td>$1,355,808</td>
<td>$814,592</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$2,170,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Apr-04</td>
<td>Dec-05</td>
<td>$7,516,541</td>
<td>$602,809</td>
<td>$3,913,250</td>
<td>$12,032,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,803,125</td>
<td>$1,976,625</td>
<td>$3,913,250</td>
<td>$15,693,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Local: $9,803,125 (62.47%)
- State/Region: $5,889,875 (37.53%)
- Total: $15,693,000 (100.00%)

### Grand Total

- $23,059,750
- $10,420,000
- $3,913,250
- $37,393,000

### Target

- $23,059,750
- $10,420,000
- $3,913,250
- $37,393,000

---

Note: funding schedule between project phases could change to increase or decrease local share within the overall allocated amount.
STAFF REPORT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING FUNDS FOR THE SUNNYSIDE ROAD AND BOECKMAN ROAD PROJECTS

Date: December 21, 2001
Prepared by: Andrew Cotugno

DESCRIPTION

This resolution would commit future Metro Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) funding toward the construction of projects on Sunnyside Road in Clackamas County and Boeckman Road in Wilsonville; it would also recommend that ODOT commit $10.4 million of Bond funds from the Oregon Transportation Investment Act (OTIA) toward these projects and commit $2 million of future funds from the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). These commitments are recommended conditioned on Clackamas County and Wilsonville each committing another $2 million toward the projects.

Existing Law

These actions are proposed under the authority of the Metro Council, in concert with JPACT, operating as the Metropolitan Planning Organization under federal law, to allocate federal transportation funds.

Background

At their October 4 meeting, JPACT recommended projects for funding through the Oregon Transportation Investment Act (OTIA). Included in that recommendation was a request to fund $13.0 million toward a Sunnyside Road project from 122nd to 152nd Avenue as well as $7.8 million toward an extension of Boeckman Road to Tooze Road in Wilsonville. At their December 12 meeting, JPACT was informed that the Oregon Transportation Commission was prepared to fund $10.4 million from the OTIA Bond funds toward these projects and directed JPACT to recommend how to split these funds between the two projects. At the meeting there was discussion of committing the full amount toward a Sunnyside Road project from 122nd to 142nd (with $11.3 million of matching funds from Clackamas County) -or- to commit the requested $7.8 million toward the Boeckman Road project, leaving $2.6 million to go toward the Sunnyside Road project. JPACT concluded they preferred not to chose between the two projects and asked staff to return at the Jan. 10 JPACT meeting with a recommendation on how to fund both projects. Karl Rhode agreed to convene the parties to develop a recommendation. Staff suggested that additional funding contributions from all four parties (MTIP, STIP, Clackamas County and Wilsonville) should be considered.
Budget Impact

There is no impact on the Metro budget. However, this does represent a commitment of $2 million against FFY '05/06 MTIP funding toward these projects and a request to commit $2 million of FFY '05/06 STIP funding by ODOT.

Outstanding Questions

This recommendation is subject to concurrence by the other parties, particularly the Oregon Transportation Commission, Clackamas County and Wilsonville. In addition, cash-flow and project phasing requirements could result in the precise schedule of funding being altered within the total amounts approved.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the funding for the two projects be revised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Current Proposal</th>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>Recommended Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyside Road - 122&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; to 142&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$11,300,000</td>
<td>+1,956,625</td>
<td>$13,256,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTIA</td>
<td>10,400,000</td>
<td>-1,956,625</td>
<td>8,443,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$21,700,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$21,700,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Current Proposal</th>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>Recommended Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boeckman Road Extension to Tooze Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$7,846,500</td>
<td>+1,956,625</td>
<td>$9,803,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTIA</td>
<td>7,846,500</td>
<td>-5,869,875</td>
<td>1,976,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTIP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1,956,625</td>
<td>1,956,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1,956,625</td>
<td>1,956,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$15,693,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$15,693,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See (Exhibit A to Resolution 02-3151) for a more detailed breakdown of funding by project phase and schedule.

The change in funding described above results in a recommendation to the Oregon Transportation Commission that the OTIA Bond Funds be split $8,443,375 toward the Sunnyside Road project and $1,976,625 toward the Boeckman Road project. This is predicated on a future commitment of FFY '05/06 MTIP funding and a request that ODOT commit future FFY '05/06 STIP funding in the amount of $1,956,625 each. Further, it is conditioned on Clackamas County and Wilsonville each committing another $1,956,625 toward each of their projects.

In addition, because of the increased local share, it is recommended that ODOT consider a loan to Wilsonville and/or Clackamas County from the State Infrastructure Bank. This would help alleviate local cash-flow problems. Since both local shares are planned to be paid for through various development fees, this could be an important financing tool.
Approval of this recommendation would complete the funding for the Boeckman Road project. However, it would only complete the funding for the Sunnyside Road project from 122\textsuperscript{nd} to 142\textsuperscript{nd}. It is anticipated that future applications for MTIP funding will be considered for the remaining sections to 152\textsuperscript{nd} and 172\textsuperscript{nd}.
BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING FUNDS FOR THE SUNNYSIDE ROAD AND BOECKMAN ROAD PROJECTS. RESOLUTION NO. 02-3151

Introduced by Executive Officer Mike Burton

WHEREAS, the 2001 Oregon Legislature passed HB 2142 Establishing the Oregon Transportation Investment Act (OTIA); and

WHEREAS, the OTIA included $200 million for Lane Capacity and Interchange projects statewide; and

WHEREAS, the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) identified a $70 million Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Region 1 target for Lane Capacity and Interchange projects; and

WHEREAS, the OTC requested input from the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) on project recommendations for the $70 million Region 1 Target for Lane Capacity and Interchange projects; and

WHEREAS, JPACT provided project funding recommendations for Lane Capacity and Interchange projects on November 2, 2001, that totaled $78.462 million; and

WHEREAS, JPACT requested $8.462 million more than the Region 1 target amount in order to achieve statewide equity for the region; and

WHEREAS, the $8.462 million would be used to complete funding for two Clackamas County projects: Boeckman Road in Wilsonville; and Sunnyside Road in Clackamas County; and

WHEREAS, the Boeckman Road project will serve a significant compact, mixed-use development project at the Dammasch Hospital site that will provide needed housing in Wilsonville and is consistent with region’s 2040 Growth Concept and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), as well as state objectives for compact development; and

WHEREAS, the Sunnyside Road project provides needed access to an area urbanizing consistent with ORS 197.298 and state Goal 14 for urban expansion on “exception lands,” and is consistent with region’s 2040 Growth Concept and the RTP; and

WHEREAS, at their December 12, 2001, meeting, the OTC retained the $70 million Region 1 target for Lane Capacity and Interchange projects and requested that JPACT develop a program within that target; and

WHEREAS, at their December 13, 2001, meeting JPACT requested that representatives of Clackamas County, Wilsonville, ODOT, and Metro work with the JPACT representative for the Cities of Clackamas County to develop a strategy for balancing the Region 1 OTIA project list at $70 million with consideration given to recommending either in whole or in part the Boeckman and Sunnyside projects; and
WHEREAS, the Clackamas County, Wilsonville, ODOT, and Metro representatives met in Lake Oswego on December 18, 2001, and recommended a strategy that results in a combination of OTIA, Metro MTIP, ODOT STIP, and local funds to complete both the Boeckman and Sunnyside projects by Fiscal Year (FY) 2006; and;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council and JPACT find that:

1. A funding and implementation strategy for Boeckman Road and Sunnyside Road (122nd to 142nd) should be pursued as shown in Exhibit A to this resolution.
2. The strategy shown in Exhibit A represents a Metro Council and JPACT commitment of $1,956,625 from the FY 04-07 MTIP to the Boeckman project.
3. The Metro Council and JPACT will request an additional $1,956,625 from ODOT as a Region 1 priority for the 2004-2007 STIP.
4. That these MTIP commitments are conditioned on an additional local commitments of $1,956,625 each from ODOT, the City of Wilsonville and Clackamas County to both the Sunnyside and Boeckman Road projects.
5. Efforts will be made to avoid or minimize the above funding commitments by seeking other sources such as federal discretionary funds.
6. This strategy, together with previously recommended projects identified in the letter from JPACT to the OTC dated November 2, 2001, results in a $70 million Region 1 Metro area recommendation for OTIA Lane Capacity and Interchange projects and is consistent with the OTC Region 1 target.
7. The strategy be forwarded to the OTC for their consideration at their January 16, 2001, meeting.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this ______ day of ____________, 2002.

__________________________
Carl Hosticka, Presiding Officer

Approved as to form:

__________________________
Dan Cooper, General Counsel
### Sunnyside Road - 122nd to 142nd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>OTIA</th>
<th>STIP/MTIP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Apr-02</td>
<td>Oct-03</td>
<td>$916,357</td>
<td>$583,643</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Apr-02</td>
<td>Oct-03</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Jun-02</td>
<td>Dec-03</td>
<td>$5,101,052</td>
<td>$3,248,948</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Apr-04</td>
<td>Nov-06</td>
<td>$7,239,217</td>
<td>$4,610,783</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$11,850,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Local       | $13,256,625 |
| State/Region | $8,443,375  |
| Total       | $21,700,000 |

Local share: 61.09%
State/Region share: 38.91%
Total share: 100.00%

### Boeckman Rd. - Tooze Rd. Connection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>OTIA</th>
<th>STIP/MTIP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>May-02</td>
<td>May-03</td>
<td>$758,988</td>
<td>$456,012</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,215,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>May-02</td>
<td>May-03</td>
<td>$171,787</td>
<td>$103,213</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>May-03</td>
<td>May-04</td>
<td>$1,355,808</td>
<td>$814,592</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,170,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Apr-04</td>
<td>Dec-05</td>
<td>$7,516,541</td>
<td>$602,809</td>
<td>$3,913,250</td>
<td>$12,032,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Local       | $9,803,125  |
| State/Region | $5,889,875  |
| Total       | $15,693,000 |

Local share: 62.47%
State/Region share: 37.53%
Total share: 100.00%

Grand Total: $23,059,750
Target: $23,059,750

Note: funding schedule between project phases could change to increase or decrease local share within the overall allocated amounts.
DESCRIPTION

This resolution would commit future Metro Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) funding toward the construction of projects on Sunnyside Road in Clackamas County and Boeckman Road in Wilsonville; it would also recommend that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) commit $10.4 million of Bond funds from the Oregon Transportation Investment Act (OTIA) toward both the Sunnyside Road and Boeckman Road projects and commit $2 million of future funds from the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) toward the Boeckman Road project. These commitments are recommended conditioned on Clackamas County and Wilsonville each committing another $2 million toward the projects.

Existing Law

These actions are proposed under the authority of the Metro Council, in concert with the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), operating as the Metropolitan Planning Organization under federal law, to allocate federal transportation funds.

Background

At their October 4, 2001, meeting, JPACT recommended projects for funding through the OTIA. Included in that recommendation was a request to fund $13.0 million toward a Sunnyside Road project from 122nd to 142nd Avenues as well as $7.8 million toward an extension of Boeckman Road to Tooze Road in Wilsonville. At their December 12, 2001, meeting, JPACT was informed that the Oregon Transportation Commission was prepared to fund $10.4 million from the OTIA Bond funds toward these projects and directed JPACT to recommend how to split these funds between the two projects. At the meeting there was discussion of committing the full amount toward a Sunnyside Road project from 122nd to 142nd (with $11.3 million of matching funds from Clackamas County) -or- to commit the requested $7.8 million toward the Boeckman Road project, leaving $2.6 million to go toward the Sunnyside Road project. JPACT concluded they preferred not to chose between the two projects and asked staff to return at the January 10, 2002, JPACT meeting with a recommendation on how to fund both projects. Staff suggested that additional funding contributions from all four parties (MTIP, STIP, Clackamas County and Wilsonville) should be considered.

Budget Impact

There is no impact on the Metro budget. However, this does represent a commitment of $2 million against Fiscal Year 2005-06 MTIP funding toward these projects and a request to commit $2 million of Fiscal Year 2005-06 STIP funding by ODOT.
Outstanding Questions

This recommendation is subject to concurrence by the other parties, particularly the Oregon Transportation Commission, Clackamas County, and Wilsonville. In addition, cash-flow and project phasing requirements could result in the precise schedule of funding being altered within the total amounts approved. Future commitments of MTIP and STIP funding is proposed from currently unallocated FY 2006/07 funds. However, at that time, consideration can be given to advance these funds if other MTIP and STIP cash flow requirements allow.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the funding for the two projects be revised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Current Proposal</th>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>Recommended Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyside Road – 122&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; to 142&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$11,300,000</td>
<td>+1,956,625</td>
<td>$13,256,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTIA</td>
<td>10,400,000</td>
<td>-1,956,625</td>
<td>8,443,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$21,700,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$21,700,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Boeckman Road Extension to Tooze Rd. |                  |              |                      |
| Local                                | $7,846,500       | +1,956,625   | $9,803,125           |
| OTIA                                 | 7,846,500        | -5,869,875   | 1,976,625            |
| MTIP                                 | 0                | +1,956,625   | 1,956,625            |
| STIP                                 | 0                | +1,956,625   | 1,956,625            |
| Total                                | $15,693,000      | 0            | $15,693,000          |

(Note: See Exhibit A to Resolution 02-3151 for a more detailed breakdown of funding by project phase and schedule.)

The change in funding described above results in a recommendation to the OTC that the OTIA Bond Funds be split $8,443,375 toward the Sunnyside Road project and $1,976,625 toward the Boeckman Road project. This is predicated on a future commitment of FFY 05/06 MTIP funding and a request that ODOT commit future FFY '05/06 STIP funding in the amount of $1,956,625 each. Further, it is conditioned on Clackamas County and Wilsonville each committing another $1,956,625 toward each of their projects.

In addition, because of the increased local share, it is recommended that ODOT consider a loan to Wilsonville and/or Clackamas County from the State Infrastructure Bank. This would help alleviate local cash-flow problems. Since both local shares are planned to be paid for through various development fees, this could be an important financing tool.

Approval of this recommendation would complete the funding for the Boeckman Road project. However, it would only complete the funding for the Sunnyside Road project from 122<sup>nd</sup> to 142<sup>nd</sup>. It is anticipated that future applications for MTIP funding will be considered for the remaining sections to 152<sup>nd</sup> and 172<sup>nd</sup>.

On January 4, 2002, the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) recommended an amendment to Resolution 02-3151 to read:

WHEREAS, now therefore be it resolved that the Metro Council and JPACT find that:

5. Efforts will be made to avoid or minimize the above funding commitments by seeking other sources such as federal discretionary funds.
To: JPACT

From: Andy Cotugno

Subject: I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership

Date: January 3, 2002

At the January 10th JPACT meeting we are seeking comments on the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership’s Working Draft Strategic Plan Recommendations for Public Review to the I-5 Task Force. Attached is a copy of the working draft recommendations. The I-5 Task Force is scheduled to approve (or modify) the Draft Strategic Plan Recommendations at their meeting on January 29, 2002. In reviewing the working draft recommendations, please pay attention to the recommendations and to the additional work that the Task Force has requested. These areas of additional work reflect outstanding issues for which the Task Force is seeking additional information.

After January 29, 2002, when the Task Force approves the Draft recommendations, JPACT will have additional opportunity to comment on the draft recommendations prior to the approval of the final recommendations. After the I-5 Task Force approval of the final recommendations (anticipated in July 2002), adoption of the recommendation will be considered as an amendment to the Regional Transportation Plan.
About this Document
This document is a work-in-progress. It does not contain final recommendations. This document does contain working draft recommendations in the following areas: Corridor-Wide Freeway Capacity, Transit, River Crossing Capacity, Bridge Influence Area, Spot Improvements, West Arterial and Land Use. Following public input on these working draft recommendations, the Task Force is expected to discuss and adopt "Draft Strategic Plan Recommendations for the I-5 Corridor" on January 29, 2001.

This document also highlights areas needing additional work before the Task Force adopts a “Final Strategic Plan Recommendations for the I-5 Corridor” in June 2002. Areas for additional work and recommendations include: the bridge and its influence area, land use agreements, transportation demand management (TDM) actions, environmental justice and community enhancements, rail improvements, and a financing and implementation strategy. The Task Force is continuing to work on these areas and will seek public input as they develop additional recommendations.

The “Final Strategic Plan Recommendations for the I-5 Corridor” is expected to be adopted by the Task Force in June 2002, following further public input and discussion. The recommendations are expected to be a “package deal.” They will be inter-related and contingent upon each other. The Task Force’s “Final Strategic Plan Recommendations for the I-5 Corridor” will be sent to the Oregon and Washington Transportation Commissions and to the metropolitan planning organizations in Portland and SW Washington for review and potential adoption into their transportation plans. After adoption, the environmental review and project development phase may begin.

Introduction: Working Draft Strategic Plan
The I-5 Partnership brought together Washington and Oregon citizens and leaders to respond to concerns about growing congestion on I-5. Governors Gary Locke and John Kitzhaber have appointed a bi-state Task Force of community, business and elected representatives to develop a Recommended Strategic Plan for the I-5 Corridor between I-84 in Oregon and I-205 in Washington. In developing the strategic plan, the Task Force has been guided by the following Problem, Vision and Values Statement.

Problem
The Interstate 5 Corridor is the most critical segment of the regional transportation system in the Portland/Vancouver metropolitan area. The Corridor provides access to many of the Region’s most important industrial sites and port facilities, and is a link to jobs throughout the
Portland/Vancouver Region. Due to infrastructure deficiencies, lack of multi-modal options, land use patterns, and increasing congestion, businesses and individuals experience more frequent and longer delays in the Corridor. Without attention, the Corridor’s problems are likely to increase significantly, further impacting the mobility, accessibility, livability and economic promise of the entire Region.

**Vision and Values**
This plan is a multi-faceted, integrated plan of transportation policies, capital expenditures, personal and business actions, and incentives to address the future needs of the I-5 Corridor.

The final plan, when implemented, will improve our quality of life by:

- Providing travel mobility, safety, reliability, accessibility and choice of transportation modes for users whether public, private, or commercial and recognizing the varied requirements of local, intra-corridor, and interstate movement;
- Supporting a sound regional economy by addressing the need to move freight efficiently, reliably, and safely through the corridor;
- Supporting a healthy and vibrant land use mix of residential, commercial, industrial, recreational, cultural and historical areas;
- Respecting and protecting natural resources including air quality, wildlife habitat and water resources;
- Supporting balanced achievement of community, neighborhood, and regional goals for growth management, livability, the environment, and a healthy economy with promise for all;
- Distributing fairly the associated benefits and impacts for the region and the neighborhoods adjacent to or affected by the Corridor; and
- Protecting our future with an improved and equitable balance of: livability, mobility, access, public health, environmental stewardship, economic vitality and environmental justice.

**Overall Recommendation**
Physical improvements in the I-5 Corridor, beyond those already in the region’s transportation plans, are warranted and necessary to meet the transportation, economic, and livability needs of the Portland/Vancouver Region. These working draft recommendations are designed to address those needs. The specific plan elements follow.
Plan Elements

I. Corridor-Wide Freeway Capacity
   a. Working Draft Recommendation:
      1. The Task Force considered expanding the capacity of the Corridor to 4 through lanes in each direction, but does not recommend this option.
      2. The I-5 freeway between the Fremont Bridge in Portland and the I-205 interchange in Vancouver will be a maximum of 3 through lanes in each direction. This includes widening I-5 to 3 lanes between: a) Delta Park and Lombard (see Section V.a.1) and b) 99th St. to I-205 in Vancouver.
      3. One of the 3 through lanes may be designated for use as a high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane during the peak period, in the peak direction.
   b. Additional Work:
      1. The Task Force will develop and make recommendations on the potential use and extent of HOV through the I-5 Corridor (including the use of trucks in HOV lanes) in the Spring of 2002 after further public input and discussion.

II. Transit Capacity
   a. Working Draft Recommendations:
      1. A light rail loop system, including feeder buses, and new and expanded park and ride lots, should be established in Clark County. In the interim, bi-state transit needs will continue to be served by express bus.
      2. The light rail loop system should provide transit mobility, both within Clark County and between Washington and Oregon, in the I-5 and I-205 corridors.
      3. The light rail loop system may be constructed in phases.
      4. Peak-hour, premium express bus service in the I-5 and I-205 corridors to downtown Portland and to markets not well served by light rail should be provided as a supplemental service to light rail.
      5. Transit service in the Corridor should be increased over the next 20 years as planned in the Metro and RTC 20-year transportation plans.

III. River Crossing Capacity
   a. Working Draft Recommendations:
      1. New transit and vehicle capacity should be constructed across the Columbia River in the I-5 Corridor.
      2. For vehicles, there should be no more than 3 through lanes in each direction and up to two supplemental lanes (auxiliary or local access) in each direction across
the Columbia River (total 5 lanes in each direction). For transit, there should be two light rail tracks across the Columbia River in the I-5 Corridor.

3. In adding river-crossing capacity, every effort should be made to avoid displacements and encroachments.

4. The proposed design should include safety considerations.

b. Additional Work (January – June 2002):

1. The Task Force will discuss and formulate a recommendation on whether the joint-function, river crossing should be on one structure or two, as part of the Implementation and Finance Plan. (See Section X, below.)

2. Whether the new capacity is on a replacement bridge or supplemental bridge will be decided by the Task Force after further public input and discussion.

IV. Bridge Influence Area: SR 500 to Columbia Blvd.
(Including Vancouver Interchanges)

a. Working Draft Recommendation:

1. Between the SR 500 and Columbia Blvd. interchanges, the freeway needs to be designed to balance all of the on and off traffic, consistent with 3 through lane Corridor capacity and 5 lanes of bridge capacity, in each direction.

b. Notes

1. This 4-mile section has the highest concentration of interchanges and traffic entering and exiting the freeway. Over half the traffic crossing the I-5 bridge begins or ends the I-5 portion of its trip between the SR 500 interchange in Vancouver and the Columbia Blvd. interchange in Portland.

2. In adding river-crossing capacity, every effort should be made to avoid displacements and encroachments.

c. Additional Work (Jan-June 2002):

1. The Task Force directs staff to present a solution or solutions that balance the following: minimizing the disruption to neighborhoods and the environment while matching bridge and freeway lane configurations, addressing merging and weaving problems, and safely and efficiently moving traffic on and off the freeway. This includes the entire SR500/I-5 interchange. Staff shall work collaboratively with the community to identify and develop new conceptual designs for the interchanges. These will be prepared and reviewed by the Task Force in the Spring of 2002.

2. The Task Force will then develop and make recommendations for I-5 between SR 500 and Columbia Blvd., after further public input and discussion.
V. Spot Improvements
a. Working Draft Recommendations:
   1. I-5 should be widened to three through lanes in each direction between the Delta Park and Lombard interchanges in Oregon. This project should go to construction as quickly as possible.

   2. The Columbia Blvd. interchange in Oregon should be made into a full interchange (add ramps for southbound traffic to exit at Columbia Blvd. and for northbound traffic to enter the freeway from Columbia Blvd.).

   3. Both the Delta Park to Lombard project and the Columbia Blvd. interchange project should be considered for design at the same time. As part of this design effort, there needs to be a phasing and financing plan, with the recognition that the Delta Park project is the first priority.

   4. The transportation issues south of the I-5/Fremont Bridge junction must be addressed and solved. The Mayor of Portland, the Governor of the State of Oregon, and JPACT should join together to appoint a group of public and private sector stakeholders to study and make recommendations for long-term transportation solutions for the entire I-5/I-405 freeway loop.
VI. Land Use

a. Working Draft Recommendations:
   1. To protect existing capacity and support economic development, jurisdictions and agencies in the Corridor need to agree on a plan to manage land development to avoid adversely impacting I-5 or the Region’s growth management plans.
   
   2. Before construction of any additional cross-river transportation capacity is initiated in the Corridor, jurisdictions and agencies must have a documented, complementary understanding for a functionally integrated, regional transportation and land use system.

b. Notes:
   1. The Portland/Vancouver region’s transportation and land use systems are integrally related, each impacting and influencing the other.
   
   2. Each jurisdiction has the right and responsibility to control its own planning, development and enforcement processes.
   
   3. Effectively managing the transportation/land use relationship is critical to: a) efficiently and fairly using transportation capacity, b) supporting each government’s adopted growth management plans, and c) preserving and protecting the sizeable public investment in the Region’s transportation system.
   
   4. As land values in the Corridor increase, especially around interchanges and transit station areas, requests for zone changes are likely. Unless action is taken now, the Corridor’s transportation and economic development opportunities will erode, especially with the loss of industrial lands.

c. Additional Work (Jan-June 2002):
   1. Prior to June 30, 2002, the Task Force will develop a Model Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) to preserve the I-5 Corridor’s transportation system, especially for trade. The model IGA will focus on protecting the capacity and functionality of interchanges and transit station areas even if no cross-river transportation capacity is added now.
   
   2. Prior to June 30, 2002, the Task Force will outline the key elements of Comprehensive Regional Accord to achieve the fundamental goals for a functionally integrated, regional transportation and land use system. As the post-Task Force planning process proceeds, local jurisdictions whose land use decisions may impact the Corridor, will further develop and agree to a workable Accord before new cross-river transportation capacity is added to the Corridor.
VII. Transportation Demand Management/Transportation System Management (TDM/TSM)

a. Working Draft Recommendation:

1. Transportation demand management and transportation system management actions are important, need to be consistent, and will be made a part of the “Final Strategic Plan Recommendations for the I-5 Corridor.”

b. Additional Work (Jan-June 2002):

1. The Task Force will develop recommendations by the Spring of 2002 for bi-state TDM/TSM actions to be implemented in the Corridor before new cross-river transportation capacity is added.

2. The Task Force will further explore the use of congestion pricing as one of the tools for managing demand.

VIII. Freight and Passenger Rail

a. Additional Work (Jan-June 2002):

1. Work is currently underway to identify the capital and operating needs of the freight and passenger rail system. This work is expected to be complete in April 2002.

2. As part of the freight and passenger rail analysis, the estimated cost, ridership, and viability of a commuter rail system will be completed, and following public input, discussed by the Task Force.

3. The Task Force will develop and recommend a plan for improving Corridor heavy rail in the Spring of 2002 after further public input and discussion.

IX. Environmental Justice and Community Enhancements

a. Additional Work (Jan-June 2002):

1. The Task Force recognizes the need to address environmental justice and community concerns resulting from these working draft recommendations. The Task Force directs project staff to: a) continue conducting the environmental justice analysis, b) work with the affected communities to collaboratively explore potential community concerns regarding these working draft recommendations and c) develop measures to address those concern, such as neighborhood connectivity, a community foundation, air quality monitoring, etc. As a part of addressing environmental justice and community enhancements, a plan for addressing the needs of local streets will also be developed.

2. The Task Force will develop and recommend a plan based on the environmental justice analysis and community concerns in the Spring of 2002 after further public input and discussion.
X. Implementation and Financing Strategy

a. Additional Work (Jan-June 2002):
   1. An implementation strategy describing the phasing of improvements, TDM/TSM actions, and land use actions needs to be developed. The Task Force will develop and recommend an implementation strategy in the Spring of 2002 after further public input and discussion.

   2. Capital and operating costs of the working draft recommended improvements, even for improvements already in regional transportation plans, will likely exceed expected revenues. The Task Force will develop and recommend a financing strategy in the Spring of 2002 after further public input and discussion.

XI. West Arterial Road

a. Working Draft Recommendation:
   1. No further study of the option at this time, however, this alternative should be identified as a potential transportation solution for consideration in the future.

b. Notes:
   1. This option has several benefits to the regional transportation system including: relieving traffic on I-5, providing an additional connection between Oregon and Washington, relieving the St. Johns neighborhood of through truck traffic, and providing an efficient south-north arterial for a) freight movement between key industrial areas in the Portland/Vancouver area and b) other traffic in North Portland.

   2. However, the traffic impacts to Vancouver neighborhoods and the downtown Vancouver district are significant. It is very likely that arterial roads leading to this new connection would need to be widened to accommodate the traffic traveling between the West Arterial Road and the freeway. The widening of these arterial roads would be detrimental.

XII. Additional Elements and Strategies Considered

1. As part of the Task Force’s work it considered many potential elements and strategies that are not specifically commented upon in this draft document. They include: addressing the corridor’s problems with land use actions and/or transportation demand management alone, a new freeway with bridge outside the I-5 corridor (East of I-205, West of I-5) to connect Oregon and Washington, monorail, personal rapid transit, hovercraft buses, people-movers, water taxi, ferry, helicopters, gondola, etc. The Task Force also considered various combinations of the elements and strategies noted.

2. If you would like more information about those topic or have additional ideas, comments or concerns, please visit the project web site at: www.I-5partnership.com or call us at 1-866-STUDYI-5.
XIII. Next Steps:

- **Public Open Houses** – to give input on these Working Draft Strategic Plan Recommendations

  **January 14, 2002**
  4:30 - 8:00 p.m.
  Hudson's Bay High School Commons
  1206 E Reserve St.
  Vancouver

  **January 16, 2002**
  4:30 - 8:00 p.m.
  Kaiser Town Hall
  3704 N. Interstate Ave.
  Portland

- **Community Forum Meeting** – to give input on these Working Draft Strategic Plan Recommendations

  **January 12, 2002**
  9 a.m. - Noon
  Leupke Center
  1009 E. McLoughlin Blvd.
  Vancouver, WA

- **Task Force Meeting** – Adoption of Draft Strategic Plan Recommendations

  **January 29, 2002**
  3:30 – 7:30 p.m.
  Leupke Center
  1009 E. McLoughlin Blvd.
  Vancouver, WA

- **Further Public Input and Task Force Work:** February through June 2002

- **June 2002 - Task Force Adoption of Final Strategic Plan Recommendations**
To:        JPACT
From:     Andy Cotugno
Subject: I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership
Date:     January 8, 2002

On Friday, January 4, 2002, TPAC reviewed the working draft recommendations for public review for the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership. In the discussion that followed, TPAC identified several points for consideration, as the recommendations are refined. The TPAC discussion also recognized that the final recommendations for the I-5 Corridor will require JPACT and Metro Council action to amend the Regional Transportation Plan and possibly other actions.

To draw your attention to these issues, I have summarized the TPAC discussion:

• The data indicate a greater volume of Washington County trucks using I-5 than expected (the data show 16% of trucks at the bridge going to or from Washington County). This increases the importance of regional outreach efforts to involve those that may not realize how affected they are by conditions on I-5.

• Part of the additional work needed between January and June 2002 is to identify improvements needed on arterials in the I-5 corridor to facilitate freight movement. The recommendations call for additional work to identify a plan to discourage traffic from using some arterials (community enhancement/environmental justice). Work is also needed to plan for other arterials (i.e., Marine Drive, Columbia Blvd.) to accommodate more traffic, especially trucks.

• More information is needed to describe the key freight patterns, commute patterns, and general traffic patterns now and how they will be impacted in the future by the proposed improvements.

• How will congestion pricing be addressed? Will it address demand management and financing? How final can a decision about congestion pricing be in July?
• The working draft recommendations call for LRT across the Columbia at I-205 as part of a phased LRT Clark County loop. Can the I-205 Bridge accommodate LRT? Would LRT take a lane away from traffic on the I-205 Bridge and how would that impact truck traffic?

• The time line for the plan extends beyond 20 years. Shouldn’t the long-range plan for this corridor include more highway capacity (a fourth lane) recognizing the economic importance of this area? At least, shouldn’t we preserve the ability to expand I-5 to four lanes south of Columbia Blvd depending on the outcome of the Rose Quarter/Loop (I-405/East Bank Freeway/Rose Quarter) study. Or consider reducing access to I-5 if local traffic can be served elsewhere.

• The process takes too long. Traffic constraints for freight at the I-5 Delta Park area are already severe. The process leads to the solution in too long a time frame.

• When the RTP is amended to incorporate the I-5 Partnership recommendations, what do we want to say about the West Arterial? The working draft recommendations call for no further study of a west arterial option at this time however, they recommend that the alternative should be identified as a potential transportation solution for consideration in the future.
COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL DEEPENING UPDATE
January 2002

BIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT COMPLETED
On January 3, 2002, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers transmitted the Biological Assessment (BA) of the Columbia River channel deepening project to the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The BA thoroughly analyzes potential environmental effects of the project and incorporates additional ecosystem restoration and monitoring measures.

Despite some short-term effects on the river system — mostly through slightly increased suspended sediments and turbidity during construction, the Corps believes that the channel deepening project can be completed without long-term negative effects to salmonid populations. The Corps will monitor before, during and after construction to validate this assumption.

As part of the reconsultation process, the Corps, NMFS, and USFWS convened an independent panel of seven scientists to consider the technical issues, identify the best available science, and evaluate information on environmental issues connected with the channel deepening project.

This BA broadens the analysis to include all areas of the Columbia River, bank-to-bank, between the Bonneville Dam and 12 miles offshore. The BA includes actions associated with deepening the Columbia River channel, compliance measures to minimize incidental take of listed species, monitoring actions to ensure deepening and disposal have minimal effects on listed fish and their habitats, and adaptive management to respond to impacts discovered through the monitoring program. One of the most important changes was to incorporate a monitoring and research component to contribute to further information valuable to the recovery of endangered species in the Columbia River.

Because this project is a multi-purpose project that includes both navigation improvement and expanded restoration components, the BA adds six ecosystem restoration measures to improve the habitat and environmental quality of the Columbia River. The new restoration features include restoration of wetlands, native vegetation, and fish access to spawning streams in the estuary.

Under Section 7 of the federal Endangered Species Act, the BA must be completed by the federal agency proposing to conduct major construction activities.

NEXT STEPS
The next step is the Biological Opinion (BO) by NMFS and USFWS, which is anticipated in March 2002. A BO is the evaluation of whether a proposed action will jeopardize a listed endangered species or adversely modify or destroy critical habitat.

Following NMFS' issuance of a BO on the project, one more set of environmental approvals will be required - water quality and coastal zone management certifications from Oregon and Washington. In addition, the Corps will do a supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS) on the channel deepening project in 2002. Public involvement will be a key part of that process. The project's benefit to cost ratio of 1.9 to 1 will be reviewed and revised during the SEIS although it is not expected to change substantially.

Washington state funding for the project will be sought in 2002. Federal appropriations for ecosystem restoration, research and monitoring will be sought in 2002 as well assuming a positive BO is issued.

For more information on the Columbia River Channel Deepening Project, visit the Corps' website at www.nwp.usace.army.mil/issues/.
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