



METRO

TRANSPORTATION POLICY ALTERNATIVES COMMITTEE

Minutes - July 27, 2007

Metro Regional Center – 370 A/B

MEMBERS PRESENT

Karen Schilling
Ron Papsdorf
Frank Angelo
John Reinhold
Satvinder Sandu
Jack Burkman
Greg DiLoreto
Sorin Garber
Sreya Sarkar
Dave Nordberg

AFFILIATION

Multnomah County
City of Gresham, representing the Cities of Multnomah County
Citizen
Citizen
FHWA
Washington DOT
Citizen
Citizen
Citizen
DEQ

ALTERNATES PRESENT

Ron Weinman
Clark Berry
Margaret Middleton
Lainie Smith
Robin McCaffrey
Danielle Cowan
John Gillam
Lynda David
Alan Lehto

AFFILIATION

Clackamas County
Washington County
City of Beaverton, representing the Cities of Washington County
ODOT
Port of Portland
City of Wilsonville, representing Cities of Clackamas County
City of Portland
SW Washington RTC
TriMet

GUESTS PRESENT

Jennifer Dill
Mike Lynch
Terry Whisler
Aruna Reddi
Massard Saberian
Vicki Deide

AFFILIATION

PSU
Multnomah County LUT
Cornelius
Multnomah County
City of Lake Oswego
City of Portland

STAFF

Andy Cotugno, Robin McArthur, Tom Kloster, Kim Ellis, Ted Leybold, Mark Turpel, Josh Naramore, John Mermin, Pam Peck, Caleb Winter

CALL TO ORDER, DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

Chair Andy Cotugno declared a quorum and called the meeting to order at 9:31a.m.

1. CITIZEN AND MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS TO TPAC ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Chair Cotugno noted that copies of the report, *Promoting Vibrant Communities with System Development Charges*, are available for those who want them. Copies of *The Financial Incentives Toolkit* will be available soon. Once these items are on the website, the link will be forwarded to members.

2. **APPROVAL OF TPAC MINUTES FOR JUNE 29, 2007**

MOTION:

Ron Weinman moved, seconded by Karen Schilling, to approve the June 29 minutes.

VOTE:

The motion passed.

3. **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

- Willamette River Bridges
- Regional Rail System
- RTP Systems Analysis & Policy Framework Refinements

5. **ACTION ITEMS**

5.1 Resolution No. 07-3826, For The Purpose Of Amending The 2006-09 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) To Reallocate \$1 Million Of Regional Flexible Funds From The Construction Phase To The Preliminary Engineering Phase Of The Eastside Streetcar Loop Project

Ted Leybold introduced the proposed amendment, requested by the City of Portland. The City was awarded \$1 million in MTIP funds towards construction of the Eastside Streetcar Project. Initially, project development funds were to come from other sources.

Vicki Deide of the City of Portland explained that there is need for initial funds for the preliminary engineering phase due to some unanticipated issues. This project was submitted before the reauthorization of the transportation bill that began the Small Starts Program. Despite congressional intent that this would be a more streamlined and simple process, that has not been the case. The funds for construction will be covered from the local improvement district, tax increment financing, transportation system development charges and the Federal Transit Administration. She explained that these funds will not be released until a later date and thus cannot be used for the development phase. The City is asking Metro's to reallocate funds to the preliminary engineering phase. The total cost of this project is \$152 million.

Two members expressed concern that additional funds for this project would be requested in the future. Chair Cotugno explained that any future requests for MTIP funds would have to stand on their own merits. Vicki Deide indicated that the City of Portland did not anticipate returning for more MTIP funds at this time.

MOTION:

John Gillam moved, seconded by Dave Nordberg, to approve Resolution No. 07-3826, For The Purpose Of Amending The 2006-09 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) To Reallocate \$1 Million Of Regional Flexible Funds From The Construction Phase To The Preliminary Engineering Phase Of The Eastside Streetcar Loop Project.

VOTE:

The motion passed.

5.2 Resolution No. 07-3824, For The Purpose Of Approving An Air Quality Conformity Determination For The 2008-2011 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program.

Ted Leybold introduced the resolution, explaining that Metro is in the process of updating the MTIP. The first step is to show that the MTIP will meet federal and state air quality standards and to document anticipated air quality impacts. Regional flexible funds that were allocated to projects were approved in February 2007. The state, transit, cities and counties were surveyed on their selected projects. These were put into a travel demand model and then an air quality model. The impacts were documented at specific time points and compared to budgets. A comparison was done to check that emissions are not being exceeded. There was a 30-day public comment process and comments from DEQ. Transportation projects must be proactive and aimed at improving air quality. He said that Mark Turpel submitted a memo dated July 18, 2007 (part of the meeting packet).

Discussion included:

- Dave Nordberg of DEQ noted that if the VMT per capita increased more than 5% two years in a row, which it has, this group has to take action. He said as the trigger has been reached, he would feel more comfortable endorsing this resolution if the committee decided whether there is a problem that needs to be addressed or if the increase is due to the different data associated with expansion of the area.
- Chair Cotugno explained that added territory would have boosted the VMT in 2004 and that data and preliminary 2006 data (not yet published) indicate the VMT is dropping. Chair Cotugno indicated that considering how much air quality has improved, it is not worth the effort.
- Mark Turpel and others questioned the comparability of the data because of changes in census and geography.
- Ron Papsdorf asked if it is possible to go back to 2000 to recalibrate the geography so that an honest comparison can be made.
- At a past meeting, TPAC made the decision to state what the 5% would be so that there would be no question; the trigger is 19.5%.

Chair Cotugno asked that a motion be brought to the floor recommending approval of the resolution acknowledging that the exceeding of the threshold does not require further investigation.

MOTION:

Greg DiLoreto moved, seconded by Ron Weinman, to approve Resolution No. 07-3824, For The Purpose Of Approving An Air Quality Conformity Determination For The 2008-2011 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program, Acknowledging That The Exceeding Of The Threshold Does Not Require Further Investigation.

VOTE:

The motion passed.

5.3 Resolution No. 07-3825, For The Purpose Of Approving The 2008-2011 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program For The Portland Metropolitan Area

Ted Leybold presented a brief review of the document, *Adoption Draft, Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program, Portland Metro Area, Federal Fiscal Years, 2008-2011*. This document is part of the meeting record. He highlighted changes to the document: first, the assignment of specific funds in specific years and second, a change to administrative procedures.

Ted Leybold is setting up discussions with agencies to discuss how to start the process with ODOT, options for hiring consultants, and reviewing project development and design issues. These meetings will continue into the fall. If projects are not starting until 2010, he will schedule meetings next year.

He said that he has requests for projects requesting advanced funds on file. However, over-programming this year will limit the number of projects that can be granted advanced funds. The projects that will receive advanced funds are: diesel emissions projects (advanced to 2008), the PE phases of projects that have 3 phases over 3 years (advanced to 2009) and some TOD projects.

MOTION:

Dave Nordberg moved, seconded by Karen Schilling, to approve Resolution No. 07-3825 For The Purpose Of Approving The 2008-2011 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program For The Portland Metropolitan Area.

VOTE:

The motion passed.

6. INFORMATION ITEMS

6.1 RTO Evaluation Framework and July '05 – December '06 Report

Pam Peck reviewed the goals of the Regional Travel Options program. She then presented highlights of the last few months, including reaching over 98% of public, completing a public awareness survey, and starting to develop a 10-year strategy with ODOT and other partners. The Drive Less/Save More Challenge was a success and received coverage on KGW News (total earned media value \$160,000), blogs, in community papers and in *The Portland Tribune*. KGW wants to participate as a sponsor next year. In the VanPool

Program, five vanpools have been added, making a total of 20 vanpools. The *Bike There Map* is for sale in stores. Carefree Commuters Challenge has been going well.

Dr. Jennifer Dill from PSU Urban Studies presented a report, *Regional Travel Options 2005-06 Program Evaluation, July 19, 2007*. Her presentation is included in the meeting record; the final report is part of the meeting packet. In summary, the RTO programs have increased transit use significantly, in particular for commuting in the downtown and Lloyd district areas. Improvements for carpooling, vanpooling, cycling and walking are not nearly as great. Most of the success was seen in core areas; suburban areas are more of a challenge. For future evaluations, she recommended developing a new strategic plan with specific output and outcome objectives. In addition, she recommended that a comprehensive evaluation be done every two years, with a comparison to other programs in other regions, and a minor update every year.

Discussion included:

- Did the survey capture a true picture? One week is very limited and perhaps it should be done over a one-month period.
- Responses to the survey would also change drastically depending on the time of year, the weather and the availability of bus shelters.
- Regarding re-routing bus routes with low rider ship, Pam Peck responded that the issue is TriMet's responsibility. The RTO program is doing an analysis of worksites around the region seeking the 50 top worksites with large numbers of employees with poor access to alternative transport.

Caleb Winter talked about the RTO Evaluation Framework, included as part of the meeting record. He highlighted the need to evaluate awareness and satisfaction and to complete a region-wide phone survey.

6.2 RTP Report

Kim Ellis passed out three memos; all are part of the meeting record.

Trail Project Submittals

Kim Ellis presented the memo on regional trail project submissions, asking that committee members take the information to their trails groups. She asked that additional projects, including all paperwork, be submitted by August 13.

Final Draft of Performance Measures

Kim Ellis reviewed the memo regarding the final draft of the performance measures.

Discussion included:

- There is concern with the reliability issue and the ability to measure it on arterial roads. If we can't come up with a good measure, should we change the goal, reword it or take reliability out? If all others are volume, capacity or delay we are not measuring the goal of reliability.
- Kim Ellis responded that it is a good goal; it has come up in all discussions and workshops. We should keep it and continue to work on it. Chair Cotugno added it is matter of distinguishing between historical measurements vs. forecasting conditions for a 20-year plan. Monitoring over time for reliability is useful even though it is not possible to forecast it.
- There should be something on improved safety and security.
- Appreciation was given that the obligation of local jurisdictions to participate in monitoring was recognized. Jurisdictions have their own performance measures. It would be helpful to combine performance measures rather than add more performance measures.

Financially Constraint – Revenue Assumptions

Kim Ellis summarized the memo regarding financial constraints and revenue assumptions. Each of the project coordinators will present a list at the August TPAC meeting. Final recommendations will go to TPAC in September. The comment period will take place October 15 to November 15.

Discussion included:

- Robin McCaffrey expressed concern that putting projects on paper will indicate a commitment. Is this much detail necessary, or could we look at a family of projects?
- Chair Cotugno responded that the purpose of finance constraint estimates is for sizing and does not indicate a financial commitment. Project plans will not be published.

- John Gillam reiterated that if local projects must be broken down into categories, it will be difficult. Presenting local projects as an aggregate would help. It would be difficult to forecast tax increment financed projects, for example.
 - Tom Kloster added that jurisdictions will have access to a database that will house information on MTIP and RTP projects. It will be accessible over the web to those with administrative access. We want to maintain it as an ongoing tool.
 - Ron Papsdorf noted that jurisdictions were asked to submit projects to the 200% list lacking any technical evaluation on faith that there would be a technical evaluation. Now they are being asked to go to the 100% list without the technical evaluation of need. How do we come up with other projects to throw in the mix without having that evaluation?
 - Clark Berry shares Ron's concern. He said that jurisdictions have been asked to self-rate the process; how will Metro Council and JPACT sift through this?
 - Kim Ellis responded that she will take the self-scores to JPACT and show them how the investments match up to the program areas.
 - Clark Berry said he thought that jurisdictions had different interpretations of what the scoring meant. The scoring may not be consistent.
 - Robin McArthur asked, in response to Ron Papsdorf's question, what the need is for this work to be done now rather than after we have the public comment and evaluation process?
 - Kim Ellis responded that it is because there would then be a draft of the federal piece before the current plan expires in March.
- Tom Kloster added that there will be two times to revisit it: after the comment period and with the state component. He asked jurisdictions to make their best case now.
- Karen Schilling asked if there was flexibility to submit the 100% list at the end of August as it does not go to JPACT for approval until October.
 - Kim Ellis said they would consider it and let everyone know about the specific schedule.

Chair Cotugno brought the committee's attention to the chart titled *RTP Financial Constrained Revenue Assumptions* (part of the meeting record). The categories on the chart are for State, County, and TriMet needs. All dollars are in 2007 dollars.

Steven Siegel clarified that in 2004, ODOT put together a common set of assumptions for regional money. The numbers produced last December are included but do not affect the modernization numbers. There is a statutory minimum amount for modernization that ODOT is required to use of its combined state and federal funds. There is an assumed vehicle registration fee increase for modernization purposes.

Discussion included:

- Greg DiLoreto pointed out that Connect Oregon is not on the chart. It should be on for multi-modal projects.
- John Reinhold asked if anything was built in to accommodate the assumption of additional demands for additional modernization?
- Chair Cotugno said that ODOT has done its revenue forecast and concluded that they need a one-cent per year gas tax increase in order to keep up with maintenance needs.

Chair Cotugno referred to City and County road and street needs, saying that most funds are earmarked for maintenance and preservation of streets, roads and bridges. Four jurisdictions have adopted street utility fees to cover maintenance.

Discussion included:

- Suggestions were made that the local gas tax should be added, that the term "local option revenues" be used instead of "street utility fees," and that private development be included in addition to systems development charges.
- Chair Cotugno emphasized that we focusing on project analysis, not maintenance analysis. One percent per year represents the rate to cover status quo spending. The first choice to be made is for maintenance and preservation.
- Steve Siegel explained that he divided the \$10 million based on the percent of growth. In response to his first memo, he got responses from Gresham and others, for example, that in their 20-year plan they assumed a certain amount of development money. Steven then adjusted his numbers. Almost all the numbers he used are from jurisdictions' twenty-year plans. He had taken the annual number and extrapolates from it.
- Frank Angelo encouraged Steve to talk to jurisdictions, especially Washington County.
- Chair Cotugno said that federal funds constitute 20-25% of the monies in the Federal RTP. However, all revenue sources are accounted for. The whole system has to demonstrate the air quality conformity. He

asked what the SDC assumption should be, and gave the examples of Bethany and Damascus. He continued, saying that Washington County has a substantial fund, the MSTIP. Do you assume that another round of MSTIP will happen and include it? He said he would like to hear from Washington County by the August 9 JPACT meeting. Lastly, state lottery funds can be used for light rail construction. With light rail bonds being paid off, we could assume there could be another \$250 million increment.

- Robin McCaffrey noted that Connect Oregon is tied to projects so would not be distributed equally in the region. She questioned how rail freight projects will be put in the RTP. Do we create a placeholder? It is unclear.

- Chair Cotugno said that he would include an assumption of a share of Connect Oregon funding for transit and a share for freight rail based upon round one.

- Robin McCaffrey said that if some of the assumed funding were to go to freight rail, there is no corresponding project in the list. This needs to be addressed.

- Chair Cotugno asked for a straw poll: To the question of whether to assume a penny a year gas tax, half agreed. To the question of more movement to straight utility fees, most were not in agreement. To the question of SDC charges in development areas, most agreed.

John Rienhold reiterated that it is important not to double up on SDC credits.

Ron Papsdorf brought up the question: can we continue to afford to amass money in regional rail projects without addressing transit operating issues?

4. **ADJOURN**

Chair Cotugno adjourned the meeting at 12:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by
 Laura Dawson Bodner
 Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR JULY 27, 2007

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

ITEM	TOPIC	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENTNO.
2. *	Brochure	July 2007	Promoting Vibrant Communities with System Development Charges	072707t01
2.	Publication	July 2007	Promoting Vibrant Communities with System Development Charges	072707t02
6.1 *	Presentation	07/27/07	Regional Travel Options RTO Update, PSU CUS Evaluation, Evaluation Framework	072707t03
6.1 *	Brochure	N/A	VanPool: Save Time, Money and Your Sanity	072707t04
6.2 *	Memo	07/27/07	2035 RTP Update: Financially Constrained Worksheet Instructions	072707t05
6.2 *	Memo	07/27/07	2035 RTP Performance Measures Work Group – Next Steps	072707t06
6.2 *	Memo	07/27/07	2035 RTP Update: Regional Transportation Trail Project Submittals	072707t07
6.2 *	Memo	07/24/07	From Steven M. Siegel: Revised Financially Constrained Revenue Estimates	072707t08
6.2 *	Chart	N/A	RTP Financial Constrained Revenue Assumptions	072707t09
	Letter	07/27/07	From Brent Curtis, Washington County, to Chair Cotugno re: Clark Berry, WA County rep to 07/27/07 meeting.	072707t10

* Material Available Electronically.