### 600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736 | FAX 503 797 1930 | FAX 503 797 1930



#### TRANSPORTATION POLICY ALTERNATIVES COMMITTEE

April 25, 2008 Metro Regional Center, 370A/B

MEMBERS PRESENT AFFILIATION

Jack Burkman WASDOT Sorin Garber Citizen

Elissa Gertler Clackamas County

Nancy Kraushaar City of Oregon City/Cities of Clackamas County

Alan Lehto TriMet Keith Liden Citizen

Mike McKillip City of Tualatin/Cities of Washington County

Dave Nordberg DEQ

Ron Papsdorf City of Gresham

John Reinhold Citizen

Karen Schilling Multnomah County

Satvinder Sandhu FHWA Sreya Sarkar Citizen

Paul Smith City of Portland

Rian Windsheimer ODOT

MEMBERS ABSENT AFFILIATION

Bret Curtis Washington County

John Hoefs C-TRAN

Susie Lahsene Port of Portland

Dean Lookingbill SW Washington RTC

Louis A. Ornelas Citizen April Siebenaler Citizen

ALTERNATES PRESENT AFFILIATION

Andy Back Washington County
Robin McCaffrey Port of Portland

### **STAFF**

Andy Cotugno, Kim Ellis, Ted Leybold, Caleb Winter, Ted Reid, Christina Deffebach, Kelsey Newell

### 1. CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

Chair Andy Cotugno declared a quorum and called the meeting to order at 9:38 a.m.

### 2. <u>CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO TPAC ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS</u>

Ms. Karen Schilling stated that Mr. Mike Lynch would replace Mr. Ed Abrahamson as Multnomah County's new TPAC Alternate. Mr. Ed Abrahamson has retired.

### 3. <u>APPROVAL OF TPAC MINUTES FOR MARCH 28, 2008</u>

<u>MOTION</u>: Mr. John Reinhold moved, Ms. Elissa Gertler seconded, to approve the March 28, 2008 meeting minutes.

<u>ACTION TAKEN</u>: With all in favor, the motion <u>passed</u>.

### 4. <u>FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS</u>

Future agenda items were not discussed.

### 5. <u>ACTION ITEMS</u>

## 5.1 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) – Step1: Recommendation

Chair Cotugno briefly overviewed Resolution No. 08-3942, which allocates Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) regional flexible funds to regionally administered programs.

<u>MOTION #1</u>: Mr. Paul Smith moved, Mr. Andy Back seconded, to approve the recommend base allocations as follows:

Revenue Source or Program	Revenues	Potential Allocation
Forecast of Funding Available	\$67.800	
Existing HCT Bond Payment		\$18.600
Additional HCT bonding; Milwaukie LRT and Commuter rail		\$7.400
Metro Planning - Base		\$2.116
RTO Base		\$4.407
TOD Base		\$5.000
TSMO Base		\$3.000
Regional travel behavior survey		\$0.350
Next Corridor		\$0.500
Local project funding reserve for Step 2 (previous allocation plus		\$25.650
inflation offset)		
Remaining balance	\$0.777	

<u>AMENDMENT #1</u>: Mr. Ron Papsdorf moved to remove the additional HCT bonding for \$7.4 million to the Milwaukie Light Rail and Commuter Rail from the recommended base allocation list.

ACTION TAKEN ON AMENDMENT #1: With no second, amendment #1 failed.

<u>AMENDMENT #2</u>: Ms. Schilling moved, Mr. Sorin Garber seconded, to remove the Next Corridor funding allocation for \$500,000 from the base allocation list.

*Discussion*: Chair Cotugno gave a brief historical overview of projects that have received funding through the Next Corridor allocation category. Ms. Nancy Kraushaar strongly supported the corridor studies and supported keeping the Next Corridor category on the base allocation list.

ACTION TAKEN ON AMENDMENT #2: With two in favor (Schilling and Garber) and 14 opposed, amendment #2 failed.

<u>ACTION TAKEN ON MOTION #1</u>: With all in favor to approve the base allocation, motion #1 <u>passed</u> unanimously.

MOTION #2: Mr. Papsdorf moved, Mr. Dave Nordberg seconded, to allocate the remaining \$777,000 balance to the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Supplemental.

*Discussion*: The committee discussed the two-step process and whether regional programs should be allowed to request additional funding beyond the base allocation. Many members expressed concern with the limited funds for local jurisdictions in step two.

ACTION TAKEN ON MOTION #2: With eight in favor and seven opposed, motion #2 passed.

MOTION #3: Mr. Rian Windsheimer moved, Mr. Papsdorf seconded, to allocate \$7.2 million from the Local Project Funding Reserve to a regional bike and pedestrian program to be administered through a cooperative intergovernmental process with the condition that funds be allocated for project implementation not administration and planning and called for review at a later date of the projects.

Discussion: The committee discussed whether allocating a regional program in the first step would protect or cap funding for worthy bike and pedestrian projects. Members were concerned with establishing an intergovernmental committee to review and allocate funding to programs without first defining project evaluation criteria. Additional discussion included concerns of local bike organizations, 2040 goals and performance measures and outcomes. Several members preferred selecting bike and pedestrian projects through local applications rather than by regional committees.

<u>ACTION TAKEN ON MOTION #3</u>: With three in favor (Windsheimer, Papsdorf, McCaffrey), twelve opposed (Reinhold, Schilling, Liden, Lehto, Smith, Nordberg, Gertler, Garber, Sarkar, McKillip, Back, Kraushaar) and one abstained (Burkman), motion #3 failed.

<u>MOTION #4:</u> Mr. Smith moved, Mr. Reinhold seconded, to allocate a minimum of \$7.2 million as part of the Local Project Funding Reserve to stand alone pedestrian and bike projects through the step two local application process.

*Discussion*: The committee needed clarification on eligible bike and pedestrian projects (e.g. minimum project size and project focus).

<u>ACTION TAKEN ON MOTION #4</u>: With eight in favor (Reinhold, Schilling, Liden Lehto, Smith, Papsdorf, Nordberg, Windsheimer), seven opposed (Gertler, Garber, Sarkar, Back, McCaffrey, Kraushaar, McKillip) and one abstained (Burkman), motion #4 <u>passed</u>.

<u>MOTION #5</u>: Ms. Gertler moved, Ms. Kraushaar seconded, to allocate \$4 million from the Local Project Funding Reserve to the Lake Oswego to Portland Environmental Impact Statement process.

*Discussion*: Mr. Dave Nordberg stated that the Lake Oswego to Portland streetcar project is one of the most effective air quality projects in regards to dollars spent per dollars saved. Mr. Papsdorf was concerned that allocating funds to this project prior to completing the HCT system plan may be premature. He emphasized that allocating additional funding for rail projects limits the available funding available for existing bus improvements, enhancement and expansion (e.g. operating and maintenance costs). Mr. Smith indicated that the City of Portland has agreed to match Metro funds for streetcar development through Johns Landing. Additional committee discussion included the Willamette Shore Line right of way, corridor congestion and ridership and project comparison.

<u>ACTION TAKEN ON MOTION #5</u>: With nine in favor (Kraushaar, Reinhold, Schilling, Nordberg, Burkman, Lehto, Windsheimer, Garber, Gertler) and seven opposed (McCaffrey, Back, Sarkar, McKillip, Liden, Smith, Papsdorf), motion #5 <u>passed</u>.

MOTION #6: Ms. Schilling moved, Ms. Gertler seconded, to allocate \$4 million per year to the Sellwood Bridge for 20 years with the deadline to finalize the overall funding commitment for the project of 2013 at which time it is subject to reallocation.

*Discussion*: Members were concerned that the commitment severely limited available funds for local projects in step two.

<u>ACTION TAKEN ON MOTION #6</u>: With five in favor (Schilling, Liden, Papsdorf, Windsheimer, Gertler), ten opposed (Garber, Reinhold, Lehto, Smith, Nordberg, Kraushaar, Sarkar, Back, McKillip, McCaffrey) and one abstained (Burkman), motion #6 <u>failed</u>.

<u>MOTION #7</u>: Mr. Mike McKillip moved, Mr. Andy Back seconded, allow bridges to compete in the local application step of the process.

<u>ACTION TAKEN ON MOTION #7</u>: With all in favor and one abstained (Burkman), motion #7 <u>passed</u>.

<u>MOTION #8</u>: Mr. Smith moved, Mr. Alan Lehto seconded, to allow on-street bus and diesel retrofit projects to apply in step two of the application process.

ACTION TAKEN ON MOTION #7: With all in favor, motion #8 passed.

<u>MOTION #9</u>: Mr. McKillip moved, Mr. Smith seconded, that TOD or RTO not be allowed supplemental applications during step two.

ACTION TAKEN ON MOTION #9: With all in favor and one abstained, motion #9 passed.

MOTION #10: Mr. Back moved that the TSMO program may apply for additional funding in the second step of the application process.

ACTION TAKEN ON MOTION #10: With no second, motion #10 failed.

MOTION #11: Mr. Smith moved, Mr. Nordberg seconded, to approve Resolution No. 08-3942 with all of the above amendments incorporated.

ACTION TAKEN ON MOTION #11: With all in favor and one opposed (Abrahamson), motion #11 passed.

# 5.2 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) – Step 2: Local Distribution Ranking Criteria

Mr. Ted Leybold briefly overviewed the updates to 2010-13 regional flexible fund solicitation and relative weighting of measurement categories.

Mr. Robin McCaffrey distributed a draft discussion version of the solicitation categories chart that attempted to tie the categories to the RTP land use framework and to be outcomes-based.

<u>MOTION</u>: Mr. Reinhold moved, Mr. Keith Liden seconded, to recommend the framework to JPACT.

<u>AMENDMENT #1</u>: Ms. McCaffrey moved, Ms. Gertler seconded, to incorporate the term "economic opportunity" with the measurement reliability category and to shift the following percentages in the industrial and employment area implementation category:

	Solicitation categories			
Measurement categories	Regional mobility corridors	Mixed-use area implementation	Industrial and employment area implementation	Environmental enhancement and mitigation
Compact urban form and economic opportunity	15%	55%	<del>35%</del> <u>10%</u>	N/A
System reliability and Economic opportunity	0	10%	<del>30%</del> _ <u>55%</u>	N/A

ACTION ON AMENDMENT #1: With seven in favor and four opposed, the motion passed.

The committee discussed removing the Green Streets program from the *Environmental and Enhancement and Mitigation* solicitation category; stating that with numerous jurisdictions requiring or voluntarily implementing Green Streets practices, there is no longer a need to recognize pilot projects, and the program should be a requirement.

<u>AMENDMENT #2</u>: Ms. Kraushaar moved, Ms. Gertler seconded, to drop Green Streets projects from the environmental enhancement and mitigation category, leaving the emissions reduction and culvert and wildlife crossing tracks.

<u>ACTION TAKEN ON AMENDMENT #2</u>: With eleven in favor, one opposed (Reinhold) and one abstained (Burkman), amendment #2 <u>passed</u>.

<u>AMENDMENT #3</u>: Mr. Reinhold moved, Mr. Papsdorf seconded, to shift the environmental enhancement and mitigation category to the following:

	Solicitation categories			
Measurement categories	Regional mobility corridors	Mixed-use area implementation	Industrial and employment area implementation	Environmental enhancement and mitigation
Environmental stewardship	5%	5%	5%	<del>100% <u>95%</u></del>
Support project/program types with limited funding sources	5%	5%	5%	<del>N/A</del> - <u>5%</u>

<u>ACTION TAKEN ON AMENDMENT #3</u>: With eleven in favor, one opposed (Nordberg) and one abstained (Burkman), amendment #3 <u>passed</u>.

<u>AMENDMENT #4</u>: Mr. Reinhold moved, Mr. Papsdorf seconded to shift the environmental enhancement and mitigation category to the following:

	Solicitation categories			
Measurement categories	Regional mobility corridors	Mixed-use area implementation	Industrial and employment area implementation	Environmental enhancement and mitigation
Compact urban form and economic opportunity	15%	55%	10%	N/A-5%
Environmental stewardship	5%	5%	5%	<del>95%</del> - <u>90%</u>

<u>ACTION TAKEN ON AMENDMENT #4</u>: With six in favor and five opposed, amendment #4 <u>passed</u>.

<u>AMENDMENT #5</u>: Mr. Papsdorf moved shift the mixed-use area implementation and industrial and employment area and implementation categories for the following:

	Solicitation categories			
Measurement categories	Regional mobility corridors	Mixed-use area implementation	Industrial and employment area implementation	Environmental enhancement and mitigation
Compact urban form and economic opportunity	15%	<del>55% <u>60%</u></del>	<del>10%</del> -15%	N/A
System reliability	50%	<del>10%</del> <u>15%</u>	<del>55% <u>60%</u></del>	N/A
Enhance Safety	20%	<del>20%</del> <u>10%</u>	<del>20%</del> <u>10%</u>	N/A

<u>ACTION TAKEN ON AMENDMENT #5</u>: With ten in favor, three opposed and one abstained, the amendment #5 <u>passed</u>.

ACTION TAKEN ON MOTION: With all in favor, the motion passed.

#### **5.3** Draft STIP Modernization Recommendation

Mr. Rian Windsheimer of ODOT provided a brief update on the 2010-13 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). In February, JPACT made a recommendation to ODOT where to cut the required \$26 million of modernization funding for the current 2010-13 STIP; among these projects was the US 26: 185<sup>th</sup> to Cornell project. ODOT Region 1 recommended that the 2010-13 modernization funds (\$15 million) be used restored to the 185<sup>th</sup> to Cornell project.

<u>MOTION</u>: Mr. Windsheimer moved, Ms. Kraushaar seconded, to restore funding to the US 26: 185<sup>th</sup> to Cornell project into the draft STIP modernization program.

*Discussion*: Washington County is very supportive of this motion. The County has agreed to make a \$3 million dollar commitment of local funds to the project if STIP funding is restored.

ACTION TAKEN: With all in favor, the motion passed.

### 6. <u>INFORMATION / DISCUSSION ITEMS</u>

### 6.1 SB 566 Recommendation: Information for Special TPAC meeting on May 22<sup>nd</sup>

Senate Bill 566 has directed the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) to conduct a study to evaluate Oregon's highway system, with input from highway users, local governments and the

Federal Highway Administration. The purpose of the study is to identify specific highway projects require to reduced traffic congestion, improve freight mobility and enhance safety.

ODOT Region 1 has been asked to provide a list of highway projects that the region would be able to deliver with an anticipated \$52 million annual allocation of modernization program funds for 2010-15.

Mr. Windsheimer indicated that a supplemental mailing with a draft list of projects would be emailed prior to the special TPAC meeting scheduled for May 2<sup>nd</sup>. Committee members were asked to submit projects to ODOT Region 1 as soon as possible.

### 6.2 Performance-based Growth Management Concept and Project Work Schedule

Chair Cotugno provided a brief introductions to the performance-based growth management; specifically highlighting the transportation and land use connections. Staff will provide a formal presentation at the next TPAC meeting.

### 7. ADJOURN

As there was no further business, Chair Cotugno adjourned the meeting at 12:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted.

Kelsey Newell

Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR APRIL 25, 2008 The following have been included as part of the official public record:

ITEM	TOPIC	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
5.2	Chart	N/A	Discussion draft of solicitation criteria handout distributed by Robin McCaffrey	042508t-01
5.3	Chart	N/A	Proposed ODOT Region 1 Preservation Projects for 2010-13 STIP Cycle	042508t-02
5.3	Мар	4/2008	Map of Proposed Region 1 Candidate Projects for the 2010-2013 STIP Cycle	042508t-03
5.3	Chart	N/A	Proposed ODOT Region 1 Safety Improvement Projects for 2010-13 STIP Cycle	042508t-04
5.3	Map	4/2008	Map of Proposed Region 1 Candidate Projects for the 2010-13 STIP Cycle	032808t-05
6.1	Handout	N/A	Senate Bill 566 Project List	042508t-06
6.2	Chart	4/25/08	Performance-based Growth Management Draft Guiding Principles	042508t-07