



**METRO**

**Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation**

**MINUTES**

May 11, 2006

7:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.

Council Chambers

MEMBERS PRESENT

AFFILIATION

Rod Park, Vice Chair	Metro Council
Brian Newman	Metro Council
Sam Adams	City of Portland
Bill Kennemer	Clackamas County
Rob Drake	City of Beaverton, representing Cities of Washington County
Dick Pedersen	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Lynn Peterson	City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas County
Fred Hansen	TriMet
Jason Tell	Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT - Region 1)
Roy Rogers	Washington County
Paul Thalhofer	City of Troutdale, representing Cities of Multnomah County

ALTERNATES PRESENT

AFFILIATION

Chuck Becker	City of Gresham, representing Cities of Multnomah County
Susie Lahsene	Port of Portland
Dean Lookingbill	Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council

OTHER COUNCILORS PRESENT

Jef Dalin	City of Cornelius
John Hartsock	City of Damascus

GUESTS PRESENT

AFFILIATION

Kenny Asher	City of Milwaukie
Scott Bricker	Bicycle Transportation Alliance
Kathy Busse	Washington County
Danielle Cowan	City of Wilsonville
Marianne Fitzgerald	DEQ
Cam Gilmour	Clackamas County
Tom Markgraf	CRC
Tom Miller	City of Portland
Ron Papsdorf	City of Gresham
Deborah Redman	HDR

Karen Schilling  
Paul Smith  
David Zagel

Multnomah County  
City of Portland  
TriMet

## STAFF

Andy Cotugno, Kim Ellis, Tom Kloster, Ted Leybold, Jessica Martin, Robin McArthur, John Mermin, Kathryn Sofich, Randy Tucker

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Rod Park declared a quorum and called the meeting to order at 7:32 a.m.

### II. INTRODUCTIONS

There were none.

### III. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

### IV. CONSENT AGENDA

#### **Consideration of minutes for the April 13, 2006 JPACT meeting**

#### **Resolution No. 06-3694, For the Purpose of Amending the 2006-09 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program to Add New Projects Receiving Funding From SAFETEA-LU and From an Award of The State Transportation Enhancements Discretionary Funds**

ACTION: Councilor Lynn Peterson moved, seconded by Commissioner Bill Kennemer to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion passed.

### V. ACTION ITEMS

#### **Resolution No. 06-3695, For the Purpose of Recommending Approval of the Draft 2006 Portland-Vancouver Ozone Maintenance Plan**

Mr. Dick Pedersen appeared before the committee to present Resolution 06-3695, which would ensure that federal regulations are met and air quality standards maintained. The Portland area has exceeded federal clean air standards for ground level ozone (summertime smog) as recently as 1998. In 1996, the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and the Southwest Clean Air Agency (SWCAA) developed Ozone Maintenance Plans for the Portland-Vancouver Air Quality Maintenance Area (AQMA) that included several strategies to reduce air pollutants and ensure compliance with ozone standards. These strategies were successful in reducing smog-forming emissions and no violations of the ozone standard have occurred in the Portland-Vancouver area since 1998. The 2006 maintenance plan continues the same strategies adopted for the Portland-Vancouver AQMA in 1996 to reduce and manage Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) and Nitrogen Oxide (Nox) emissions. Mr. Pedersen presented a PowerPoint presentation (included as part of this meeting record), which included information on:

- Portland-Vancouver and Salem Ozone Maintenance Plan
- Ozone Formation
- Ozone Air Quality
- 2002 VOC and Nox Emissions
- Maintenance Strategies
- Proposed Rule Changes
- Proposed Contingency Plan
- Plan Adoption Schedule

With regard to the Ozone Plan, Mr. Andy Cotugno noted that TPAC members suggested that the vmt/capita measure remain substantially as proposed with triggers for reassessment should vmt per capita increase by the five percent trigger or more. However, they also suggested that the additional nominal numbers representing the absolute vmt per capita be deleted so that adjustments in the geography of the area where vmt per capita is measured is not tied to older data based on a smaller urban area.

Mr. Pedersen noted that TPAC's comments would be taken into consideration as the rules are developed.

ACTION: Mayor Rob Drake moved, seconded by Councilor Peterson, to approve Resolution No. 06-3695. The motion passed, with Mr. Pedersen abstaining.

## VI. INFORMATION / DISCUSSION ITEMS

### **2035 RTP Update: Draft Work Program**

Ms. Kim Ellis appeared before the committee to present an update on the 2035 RTP Update. She presented a PowerPoint presentation, which included information on the following:

- Federal and State Context of Metro's Regional Transportation Plan
- Regional Context of the 2040 Growth Concept
- New Look/RTP Connection
- Stakeholder Engagement
- Phase 1: Scoping
- Phase 2: Research and Policy Development
- Phase 3: System Development
- Phase 4: Adoption Process
- Post-Adoption: State and Federal Consultation
- Key Issues – Unfunded Gap
- Next Steps

Commissioner Kennemer noted that the committee has been talking for quite some time about the land use and transportation connection. However, he feels the conversation should be three fold to include a financial piece.

Mr. Fred Hansen stated that the committee should think of the RTP in a broader context and not get distracted by individual project discussions at this point.

Councilor Brian Newman agreed with Mr. Hansen and stated that policy objectives and measurable outcomes need to be identified prior to discussing the specific projects that support them.

Commissioner Sam Adams stated that the RTP update process should begin with a discussion of how the region is doing. He noted that the committee should be given quarterly progress reports on where we are at in the current RTP. He stated his feeling that the RTP doesn't look at decisions made within local

communities and that the RTP seems to be more about how the Federal and State monies are spent rather than the management of the regional transportation system.

Mr. Hansen noted that each jurisdiction must have a local TSP (Transportation System Plan) but questioned the level of review done to ensure that all the jurisdictions TSPs are in compliance / alignment with the RTP. Mr. Cotugno responded that Metro participates with each jurisdiction as they develop and adopt their plans. Ms. Susie Lahsene added that while Metro is involved, the local plan adoptions are not in sync with the RTP update and there could be 2-3 years lag time between plan adoptions.

In response to Commissioner Adams comments regarding the RTP, Mr. Cotugno stated that while the MTIP and STIP decisions are about carving up the money, the RTP is intended to cover the full system and all the resources that go into the system. He added that the larger debate of determining the best way to meet the needs for the entire system on a regional scale has to date, not occurred.

Mr. Hansen reiterated that the committee should be talking more about outcomes and what our communities and the region should look like before directing staff. He noted that it is too much to ask to have an RTP created by staff alone without discussing the desired outcomes. Ms. Ellis responded that on page 5 of the discussion draft distributed to the group, the next task of Phase II, is to develop an outcomes-based evaluation framework concurrently with identifying a set of performance measures.

Vice Chair Park asked committee members to review the discussion draft report and direct comments to Ms. Ellis so that they may be incorporated.

### **Region 1 Draft STIP: Public Comment Summary, Draft Schedule, Process and Evaluation Factors**

Mr. Ted Leybold and Ms. Ludwien Rahman appeared before the committee to present information on the Region 1 Draft STIP. As the next step in the process Ms. Rahman and Mr. Leybold will evaluate the projects on the 150% list as well as the additional projects requested during the public comment period against the criteria that the Oregon Transportation Commission has adopted.

Ms. Rahman explained ODOT got to the 150% list by looking at the following:

- Past commitments
- Consistence with acknowledged Transportation System Plan
- Project Need – 2004-09 projects as highest priority, 2016-25 as lowest
- Available Funds – staff eliminated projects or project phases over \$30-50million
- Leverage – staff identified projects with federal earmarks and/or alternative funding sources
- Freight – ODOT staff considered freight criteria including the Oregon Freight Advisory Committee (OFAC) list of priority projects
- Oregon Highway Plan support
- Project-readiness
- Geographic distribution – considered equity between Metro vs. non-Metro jurisdictions and between counties within Metro

In order to arrive at the 100% list, Mr. Leybold noted that ODOT and Metro staff would prepare a matrix applying the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) prioritization criteria to the projects on the 150% list and to other projects proposed in comments submitted to ODOT during the recent comment period. Staff proposes to apply the criteria to projects in the Metro area in a manner that addresses both OTC and local prioritization criteria with a qualitative technical evaluation by ODOT and Metro Staff.

On June 8<sup>th</sup>, JPACT will be presented with a 100% list recommendation from TPAC. Upon JPACTs approval, the project list will be presented to the Metro Council on June 29<sup>th</sup>.

He directed the committee's attention to page 3 of the handout (included as part of the meeting record), which listed a set of evaluation factors consistent with the OTC criteria as well as incorporating factors of regional and local concern.

MOTION: Commissioner Roy Rogers moved, seconded by Commissioner Kennemer that JPACT direct Metro Staff and TPAC to emphasize the following when developing a recommendation for the 100% Mod list:

- Concentrate projects on meeting the OTC's six-prioritization criteria
- Focus the Mod program on P.E., ROW and Construction, and
- Address mounting congestion problems in high growth areas of the region

Given the criteria listed on page 3 are structured around the OTC criteria, Mr. Cotugno suggested removing the first bullet, adding the second bullet point to the Project Readiness category and the third bullet point the Oregon Highway Plan support criteria.

MOTION TO AMEND MAIN MOTION: Commissioner Rogers moved to amend the motion to remove the first bullet point and add the second and third bullet points to the criteria as stated above.

The committee discussed the meaning of and how to interpret the third bullet point.

MOTION AS AMENDED BY FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: Commissioner Rogers moved, seconded by Commissioner Kennemer, to amend the third bullet point reflect the following:

- Address mounting ~~congestion~~ problems in high ~~growth~~ congestion areas of the region

Mr. Hansen noted that while satisfactory in the context of this discussion, the criteria suggested by Commissioner Rogers seem very highway/road oriented he wouldn't want them to become the criteria for future decisions.

CALL FOR THE QUESTION: Vice Chair Rod Park called for the question.

Without further discussion, the committee voted on the motion under consideration as amended.

VOTE: The motion passed.

### ***ConnectOregon* Status Report**

Ms. Bridget Wieghart appeared before the committee and presented a brief status report on *ConnectOregon*. She noted that the process is moving along well and there are a lot of projects in the region. Currently, the projects are being prioritized. Ms. Wieghart distributed a Region 1 project evaluation matrix and application scoring results (included as part of this meeting record) and asked that comments be directed to her.

### VII. ADJOURN

There being no further business, Vice Chair Rod Park adjourned the meeting at 9:11 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jessica Martin  
Recording Secretary