

TRANSPORTATION POLICY ALTERNATIVES COMMITTEE

Minutes

June 1, 2007 – Meeting

Metro Regional Center – Council Chambers

MEMBERS PRESENT

Elissa Gertler
Karen Schilling
Nancy Kraushaar
Mike McKillip
Paul Smith
Frank Angelo
Scott Bricker
Sorin Garber
John Reinhold
Phil Selinger
Rian Windsheimer
Satvinder Sandu

AFFLIATION

Clackamas County
Multnomah County
City of Oregon City, representing the Cities of Clackamas County
City of Tualatin, representing the Cities of Washington County
City of Portland
Citizen
Citizen
Citizen
Citizen
TriMet
ODOT
FHWA

MEMBERS ABSENT

Brent Curtis
Ron Papsdorf
Greg DiLoreto
Sreya Sarkar
Dave Nordberg
Susie Lahsene
Dean Lookingbill
Jack Burkman
John Hoefs

AFFLIATION

Washington County
City of Gresham
Citizen
Citizen
DEQ
Port of Portland
SW Washington RTC
Washington DOT
C-TRAN

ALTERNATES PRESENT

Andy Back
Danielle Cowan
Margaret Middleton
Marianne Fitzgerald
Robin McCaffrey

AFFLIATION

Washington County
City of Wilsonville
City of Beaverton
DEQ
Port of Portland

GUESTS PRESENT

Lawrence Odell
Derek Robbins

AFFILIATION

Washington County
Forest Grove

STAFF

Andy Cotugno, Kim Ellis, Ted Leybold, Josh Naramore, John Mermin, Jon Makler, Joyce Felton, Richard Brandman, Jamie Snook, Pat Emmerson

1. CALL TO ORDER, DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

Chair Andy Cotugno declared a quorum and called the meeting to order at 9:36 a.m.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO TPAC ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were none.

3. APPROVAL OF TPAC MINUTES FOR APRIL 27, 2007

MOTION:

Phil Selinger moved, seconded by Karen Schilling, to approve the April 27th, 2007 meeting minutes.

VOTE:

The motion passed.

4. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- Willamette River Bridges
- Regional Rail System
- I-5/ 99W Connector Update
- RTO 05-06 Evaluation Report & Eval Procedure
- LO Transit AA Evaluation Results & LPA Process RTP Performance Measures/ Implementation Strategies

There was no discussion regarding the future agenda items.

5. STREETCAR AND DEVELOPMENT IMPACTS

Mr. Richard Brandman appeared before TPAC and gave a PowerPoint presentation on the streetcar and its relationship to and impact on development. He also identified a variety of techniques used to produce streetcar projects and briefly explained the short and long term planning benefits these projects provide urban planning and development.

Key points of presentation:

1. Increasing national interest in streetcar projects; (e.g. 40 cities in the United States are pursuing streetcar projects)
2. Small Starts, a federal program similar to New Starts, was created to help provide funding for such projects.
3. General disconnect with how the program is being administered in relationship to its original purpose; federal transit administration (FTA) is making it harder to fund streetcar programs.
4. Streetcars play a role in urban renewal by increasing development within the close proximity to such infrastructures.
5. 38 % of streetcar project funding (Portland streetcar project) is coming from development money.
6. Streetcars do not save travel time, which is a federal funding factor; however they attract more development and put more trips on transit.
7. Streetcar projects receive a higher level of support from the development community than bus service, and help promote alternative modes of transportation (e.g. walking, biking, etc.)
8. TriMet's annual rides per resident compared to similar sized transit districts across the nation shows that Portland is number one.

Mr. Sorin Garber, Citizen, questioned what those opposed to the streetcar project would propose as alternative modes of transit. Mr. Brandman responded by explaining that BRT, bus rapid transit systems, are alternatives to light rail and fine in certain applications for a lower cost project, lower capacity and

lower volume. However, BRTs cannot carry the volume of people needed in the future, and there is no indication that developers want to be located near or associated with bus-lines.

Mr. John Reinhold, Citizen, mentioned that streetcars should be a better alternative mode of transit than BRT because it is not exclusively tied to fossil fuels. Mr. Brandman elaborated on Mr. Reinhold's comment by explaining that although a positive for the environment, these factors have been eliminated from the federal review process when considering funding streetcar projects.

Ms. Elissa Gertler, Clackamas County, wanted to know how TPAC can take the streetcar project to the next step and get a wider regional application. More specifically she was inquiring about the proposed streetcar project for Lake Oswego and light rail for Clackamas County and what are some of the conclusions that can be drawn out of streetcar development to development in centers. Mr. Brandman responded by saying that there is a combination of factors to be taken into consideration. First, the local community will have to approve the project, second the market conditions and feasibility analyses will have to prove it economically feasible, and finally the demand must be present. Mr. Brandman also noted that this process for the LO streetcar proposal should be complete in the next couple of weeks. More specifically the analysis will focus on the LO alignments and Johns Landing, which could be applied to any project in any center, but with a varying formula for various conditions.

Mr. Frank Angelo, Citizen, asked whether it was feasible to increase the contribution costs the development community pays in taxes and fees. Mr. Brandman answered Mr. Angelo by explaining that in the short-term developers and the development community benefit from streetcar programs; however the bigger picture is that streetcar projects change how communities are built, in terms of controlling and predicting density in addition to providing alternative modes of transportation to accommodate higher density.

Mr. Andy Cotugno, Metro, commented that with every new circumstance and market condition a new precedent is established. For example based on today's conditions and development an eastside streetcar will not be as successful as the Pearl district's and Clackamas less so.

Mr. Phil Selinger, TriMet, requested for there to be a placeholder in the RTP for streetcar projects at all of the regional centers. Even though the streetcar is development oriented, one challenge is to make sure that it works with the rest of the system. Building the streetcar is a one-time capital loss with on-going operating cost and it is a good circulator system for building centers.

Mr. Scott Bricker, Citizen, commented that he did not agree with the current rapid transit plans. He questioned whether enough analysis has been done on the BRT to negate it as a reasonable and feasible mode of transportation in the region. Mr. Bricker expressed that there is a lot of opportunity with BRT in regards to cost and asked why the FTA would support a more expensive project. Mr. Brandman responded by saying that it has been recognized that BRT is a lot less expensive than a light rail or streetcar to build; however one must analyze the long-term benefits of the money spent, including the on-going operating cost and the ridership in addition to the development potential. He also noted that the Right-of-Way for the proposed LO streetcar project is already owned, and clarified that the cost of the project is not \$200 million.

Mr. Cotugno redirected the conversation by stating that the broader challenge is to communicate the long-term benefits to the public. Streetcar projects have the potential to promote greater use in communities, schools, parking garages, help to put in parks and greenways. One has to ask what is the project's function within the community in the future and how will it help Metro reach its concept plan goals down the road.

Mr. Brandman concluded by saying that the point of his streetcar presentation was to not only inform the Metro community of the long term benefits for development and centers building; but more importantly to educate the federal government of the value of streetcar programs, and attempt to change the current management direction and review process of streetcar programs by federal funding programs.

5.1 TIP Amendment and Air Quality Consultation (Ted Leybold)

Mr. Ted Leybold, Metro, appeared before TPAC and presented a project amendment for the 2006-09 TIP. The amendment called for the addition of a right turn lane for the Marine drive extension project near 257th on I-84 in Troutdale. Mr. Leybold explained that this amendment project is necessary to address the short-term traffic needs; instead of performing the Marine drive project at this time a turn lane will be added. The amendment adds this project to the TIP for 2008 and takes money away from the existing earmarked project. Regional agency partners have agreed that this is an exempt air quality project and can be added without an air quality analysis. The project amendment was presented before TPAC prior to this date.

Mr. Rian Windsheimer, Region 1 ODOT, added that this project amendment is only a short-term fix. ODOT is still working on the long-term solution.

MOTION:

Mr. Frank Angelo, Citizen, moved, seconded by Ms. Karen Schilling, Multnomah County, to approve the 2006-019 TIP amendment to add the "I-84 right turn lane at 257th".

VOTE:

The motion passed without objection.

5.2 RTP STATUS REPORT

• Solicitation Issues and Process Next Steps

Ms. Kim Ellis, Metro, updated TPAC on the RTP solicitation process and next steps. She introduced a memo to TPAC to explain the solicitation process and how the project has progressed since the acceptance of the policy framework. Ms. Ellis' memo addressed the questions and concerns about the solicitation process; including the unknowns and ambiguity it may have generated.

Key points of memo:

1. May 10th JPACT recommended an extension of the RTP state timeline component. Federal component deadline: Dec. 2007. Second step built in to allow for more time to be spent on the state component: deadline June 2008.
2. Timeline of sequencing: details of meetings and staff work for federal RTP deadline, details and dates for meetings and hearings for federal RTP, air quality analysis deadline of March 2008, adoption deadline of June 2008.
3. Clarified components of RTP: described both state and federal requirements.
4. Clarified level of analysis and scope of staffs' work.
5. Discussed corridor refinement plans
6. Discussed determination of necessity of projects

The question was asked whether project placeholders would be in the federal or state components of the RTP. Mr. Cotugno responded by saying that given the limits of the financially constrained federal RTP, placeholder projects would be a function of the state RTP.

If projects in the state RTP are to change in the future, then the federal RTP will have to be amended. This process would not be exempt from air quality studies because the air emissions standards in the federal RTP are based on a model of the number and size of projects.

Metro staff plan to identify a range of years and projects then perform a conformity analysis to determine what projects will be completed, and in what sequence over time. A 200% percent list of projects is being compiled and will be used as a platform to model and evaluate what is feasible for the state and federal RTP. The RTP is not soliciting projects outside of the UGB. All rural roads and connections to areas inside the UGB are the responsibility of local jurisdictions. Metro staff plans to have urban reserve placeholders

included by the next RTP update. The current RTP does not account for Measure 37 claims. SDC fees are not accounted for in the financial portion of the RTP in most of the newly added areas of the UGB.

Mr. Windsheimer explained that ODOT plans to respond to the submittals from the mobility workshop by compiling the results and identifying potential projects and their associated costs. ODOT plans to have a draft by Monday, June 4th, 2007. Phil Selinger, TriMet, followed by saying that transit has listed a high capacity connection for Hwy 26 as a potential project; in addition to extensions to Clackamas and Tigard. TriMet plans to have something on the agenda next month.

Mr. Paul Smith, City of Portland, requested Metro staff to provide a base model or a table of the metro region's base year population and employment; subtotaled by each jurisdiction (1/3 living in current city limits of Multnomah County) from 2005-2035 of the Metro region. In addition the City would like to request an analysis of model's performance. Ms. Ellis agreed to provide materials for Mr. Smith's request.

Ms. Karen Schilling, Multnomah County, mentioned Commissioner Maria Rojo de Steffey's letter to JPACT on May 10th, 2007 regarding the bridges and mobility issues, to be forwarded to TPAC. She noted that the County has had this item on the table for quite some time and wanted to know how TPAC was going to proceed. Ms. Ellis responded by saying that Mr. Cotugno's finance work lists the bridge category as a separate issue and Mr. Steve Siegel would provide an updated financial forecast memo at a later time.

- **Finance Issues and Choices**

Mr. Andy Cotugno addressed the questions related to RTP finance and said that he would bring any further questions back to JPACT. Mr. Cotugno also explained that the state required RTP will need to meet the land-use plan and the projects included in the RTP will have to have a financial strategy. Mr. Cotugno referred to a PowerPoint presentation/ handout during his discussion (included for the record).

Mr. Cotugno expressed a need for locating and pursuing new sources of revenue to support the RTP. Vehicle registration fees, gas taxes and truck fees alone cannot fund the state required RTP. He suggested evaluating and analyzing resources available at the local level, and self-help components. Metro staff will present the RTP finance issues and choices to MPAC and then call for action at JPACT.

It was suggested that bond measures be used, since these types of financing have worked in the past at the local level. An increase in gas tax was also suggested, but discounted by the empirical evidence that proves they do not work; therefore the idea should be abandoned. Road tolls were also suggested as a way to generate new revenue and a consulting company is under contract with ODOT to research the development of such a system. The question was raised as to whether or not the region should pursue a regional ballot measure. Mr. Cotugno suggested this discussion to begin immediately. Ms. Gertler added that TPAC should identify financing models and build on the ones that are successful and abort the ones that have been ineffective.

Mr. Cotugno concluded the discussion by suggesting that the conversation continue with each districts' respective JPACT member.

6 ADJOURN

Chair Cotugno adjourned the meeting at 11:59 a.m.

Dawson Bodner

*Material available electronically.

**Due to technical difficulties there is no audio recording available for this meeting.

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR JUNE 1, 2007

The following have been included as part of the official public record:

ITEM	TOPIC	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENTNO.
	Agenda	06/01/07	Meeting Agenda	060107t-01
3.0	Minutes	04/27/07	TPAC Meeting Minutes	060107t-02
5.0	Presentation	06/01/07	Presentation on Portland Streetcar: What's Next? – Richard Brandman	060107t-03
5.1	Memo	05/23/07	From Ted Leybold to TPAC and interested parties: TIP Amendment to the Troutdale/Marine Drive Extension Project	060107t-04
5.1	Maps	N/A	ODOT Maps: ODOT Region 1 STIP Project Location & STIP Project Vicinity	060107t-05
5.2	Presentation	05/24/07	Financially Constrained RTP	060107t-06
5.2	Memo	05/31/07	2035 Regional Transportation Plan – Process Update	060107t-07
5.2	Handout	05/23/07	Transportation Finance Strategy Considerations and Choices	060107y-08
5.2	Handout	N/A	Oregon Business Plan Transportation Funding Campaign (DRAFT)	060107t-09