



TRANSPORTATION POLICY ALTERNATIVES COMMITTEE  
Special Meeting  
November 2, 2009  
Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

MEMBERS PRESENT

Elissa Gertler  
Nancy Kraushaar  
Alan Lehto  
Keith Liden  
Mike McKillip  
Ron Papsdorf  
John Reinhold  
Sharon Zimmerman

AFFILIATION

Clackamas County  
City of Oregon City, representing Cities of Clackamas Co.  
TriMet  
Citizen  
City of Tualatin, representing Cities of Washington Co.  
City of Gresham, representing Cities of Multnomah Co.  
Citizen  
Washington Department of Transportation

MEMBERS ABSENT

Brent Curtis  
Sorin Garber  
Mara Gross  
John Hoefs  
Susie Lahsene  
Dean Lookingbill  
Dave Nordberg  
Louis A. Ornelas  
Satvinder Sandhu  
Karen Schilling  
April Siebenaler  
Paul Smith  
Rian Windsheimer

AFFILIATION

Washington County  
Citizen  
Citizen  
C-TRAN  
Port of Portland  
SW Washington RTC  
Department of Environmental Quality  
Citizen  
FHWA  
Multnomah County  
Citizen  
City of Portland  
ODOT, Region 1

ALTERNATES PRESENT

Andy Back  
John Gillam  
Jane McFarland  
Lidwien Rahman

AFFILIATION

Washington County  
City of Portland  
Multnomah County  
ODOT, Region 1

STAFF: Robin McArthur, Ross Roberts, Deborah Redman, Kim Ellis, Kelsey Newell, Tom Matney, Tom Kloster, John Mermin, Dick Benner, Lake McTighe.

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

Chair Robin McArthur declared a quorum and called the meeting to order at 2:08 p.m.

**2. COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

There was none.

**3. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO TPAC ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

There was none.

**4. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

The future agenda items were not discussed.

**5. INFORMATION/ DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**5.1 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Amendments (Exhibit F)**

Ms. Kim Ellis of Metro introduced five topics for further discussion by JPACT at their November 12<sup>th</sup> meeting. TPAC members were asked to review Metro staff's recommendation for each item, provide revisions (if applicable) and provide a formal recommendation to JPACT. (All materials, including discussion items and attachments, are included as part of the meeting record.)

***5.1.1 Discussion Item 1: Greenhouse Gas Emissions and HB 2001 Land Use and Transportation Scenarios***

The committee discussed how the region should move forward to proactively meet state and regional greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction targets. House Bill 2001 requires Metro to “develop two or more alternative land use and transportation scenarios” designed to reduce GHG emissions from light-duty vehicles by January 2012, and it requires Metro to adopt one scenario that meets the state targets after public review and comment. Local governments are then required to adopt comprehensive plan and land use regulations consistent with the adopted scenario. This component of HB 2001 is intended to ensure statewide targets for GHG emissions are being addressed in metropolitan transportation plans and regional and local land use plans.

Preliminary results from the transportation model analysis show the draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) does not meet state and regional targets for GHG emissions - showing increases from today. The required scenario planning includes further development of tools and policies in Oregon than were anticipated in the draft RTP. Significant work program and scoping activities are continuing to be developed to respond to HB 2001 requirements.

Metro staff recommend moving forward to approve the development of RTP targets and land use targets by early 2010 to be used to guide development and evaluation of the performance of HB

2001 land use and transportation scenarios in 2011. Metro will facilitate coordination with local, regional, and state partners to execute this process. Finally, Metro will incorporate recommendations from this effort in the next RTP update in 2014.

MOTION: Mr. Andy Back moved, Ms. Elissa Gertler seconded, to move the Metro staff recommendation forward to JPACT for their review at the November 12<sup>th</sup> meeting with the clarification that an additional review takes place prior to 2014.

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

### ***5.1.2 Discussion Item 2: Regional Transportation Plan Performance Targets***

JPACT endorsed a set of transportation performance targets that supports the region's desired outcomes and the plan's goals and objectives. The targets provided policy direction for developing the investment strategy proposed in the draft RTP. Metro recommends adopting the RTP performance targets as amended in Attachment 1.

MOTION #1: Mr. Ron Papsdorf moved, Mr. Mike McKillip seconded, to approve Discussion Item 2, Attachment 1, Section II with the following edit, "Direct local governments to be consistent with ~~adopt~~ the new RTP policies and performance targets in local plans. And to evaluate local transportation system plan (TSP) performance relative to the performance targets."

ACTION TAKEN: With all in favor, the motion #1 passed.

MOTION #2: Mr. Back moved, Mr. Papsdorf seconded, to move Metro staff's recommendation on Discussion Item 2, including Attachment 1 with the above amended language, to JPACT for their review at the November 12<sup>th</sup> meeting.

ACTION TAKEN: With all in favor, the motion #2 passed.

MOTION #3: Mr. John Reinhold moved, Mr. John Gillam seconded, to remove the project list from the state RTP.

ACTION TAKEN: With 2 in favor (Reinhold and Gillam), 8 opposed (Kraushaar, McFarland, Papsdorf, McKillip, Gertler, Zimmerman, and Liden) and 2 abstained (Rahman and Lehto) the motion #3 failed.

### ***5.1.3 Discussion Item 3: Alternative Mobility Standards for State Facilities in the Metro Region***

The committee discussed how the region can jointly work with the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) to develop alternative mobility standards for state facilities in the Portland metropolitan region that support the region's desired outcomes.

MOTION: Mr. Back moved, Mr. Alan Lehto seconded, to move the Metro staff recommendation on Discussion Item 3 forward to JPACT for their review at the November 12<sup>th</sup> meeting.

ACTION TAKEN: With all in favor and one abstained (Reinhold), the motion passed.

**5.1.4 Discussion Item 4: RTP Corridor Refinement Plan Prioritization Process**

The public review draft 2035 RTP identifies five mobility corridors where more analysis is needed through a future corridor refinement plan. Metro recommends applying the factors to the five corridors as presented in Attachment 1 which provide sufficient coverage of the six desired regional outcomes to serve as a basis to prioritize the five proposed corridor refinement plans.

MOTION: Mr. Back moved, Ms. Lidwien Rahman seconded, to move the Metro staff recommendation on Discussion Item 4 and Attachments 1, "Prioritization Factors" and Attachment 2, "Prioritization Matrix and Raw Data + Sources" forward to JPACT for their review at the November 12<sup>th</sup> meeting.

ACTION TAKEN: With all in favor and one abstained (Zimmerman), the motion passed.

**5.1.5 Discussion Item 5: I-5/99W Connector Study Area – Issues, Options and Recommendations**

Mr. Andy Cotugno provided a brief overview of the I-5/99W Connector Study project background, issues identified, alternatives considered but not recommended, and the Metro staff recommendation.

MOTION: Mr. Back moved, Mr. Gillam seconded, to move the Metro staff recommendation on Discussion Item 5 forward to JPACT for their review at the November 12<sup>th</sup> meeting.

AMENDMENT #1: Ms. Elissa Gertler moved, Mr. John Reinhold seconded, to revise Recommendation 2.a to read, "Include the conditions as part of the project description for the Southern Arterial with language that implementation will not proceed unless and until all the conditions are met, including conducting of the I-5 South Corridor Refinement plan, including Mobility Corridors 2, 3, and 20;

ACTION TAKEN: With six in favor (Kraushaar, McFarland, Papsdorf, Lehto, Gertler, Reinhold), four opposed (Back, Rahman, Gillam, McKillip), and one abstained (Zimmerman) the amendment #1 passed.

AMENDMENT #2: Ms. Nancy Kraushaar moved, Mr. Reinhold seconded, to revise Recommendation 2.d to read, "Modify the description of the SW 124<sup>th</sup> extension to reflect a 2-3 land project (Project #10736) from Tualatin-Sherwood Road to the vicinity of the SW Tonquin Road, ~~then east to SW Boones Ferry Road, then south to the I-5/North Wilsonville interchange~~ then improvements east on Tonquin Road to Grahams Ferry Road, improvements on Grahams Ferry Road south to Day Road (Project #10588), improvements on Day Road east to Boones Ferry Road (Project #11243), and then improvements on Boones Ferry then south to the North Wilsonville/I-5 Interchange (Project #10852)."

ACTION TAKEN: With four in favor (Kraushaar, Papsdorf, Lehto, Gertler), five opposed (Back, McKillip, Rahman, Gillam, Reinhold), and two abstained (Zimmerman, McFarland) the amendment #2 failed.

AMENDMENT #3: Mr. McKillip moved, Mr. Back seconded, to remove Recommendation 2.b and 2.c from Metro staff's recommendation.

ACTION TAKEN: With two in favor (McKillip, Back) and seven opposed (Kraushaar, Papsdorf, Rahman, McFarland, Lehto, Gertler and Reinhold) and two abstained (Zimmerman, Gillam) the amendment #3 failed.

ACTION TAKEN: With seven in favor (Reinhold, Kraushaar, Papsdorf, Rahman, Gillam, Lehto, Gertler), two opposed (Back, McKillip) and two abstained (McFarland, Zimmerman), the motion passed.

## **5.2 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Amendments (Exhibit G)**

Committee members readdressed outstanding issues with *Consent Items for Consideration* (Exhibit G) at their October 30<sup>th</sup> meeting.

*(The proposed amendments are shown in double underscore and double strikethrough format to differentiate from the staff recommendation dated October 26<sup>th</sup> that was included in the October 30<sup>th</sup> TPAC packet.)*

MOTION #1: Mr. Gillam moved, Mr. Lehto seconded, to move the following proposed amendments to Metro staff's recommendation on Exhibit G forward to JPACT for their review at the November 12<sup>th</sup> meeting as part of the consent agenda:

- Amend Objective 4.4 Demand Management as follows: “Objective 4.4 Demand management – Implement services, incentives and supportive infrastructure to ~~dramatically~~ increase awareness of travel options ~~telecommuting, walking, biking, taking transit, and carpooling, and shift travel to off-peak periods.~~”
- Amend 2.3.1 Performance Targets section, Table 2.3 as follows: “Active Transportation – By 2035, triple walking, biking and transit ~~trips mode share~~ mode share compared to 2005.
- Consent Item #179: Amend as requested. No change recommended at this time. The target calls for tripling the number of walking, biking and transit trips by 2035.
- Consent Item #334: No change needed. The region intends to implement the Regional Freight Plan in such a way as to retrain companies like Sun Microsystems. Staff is working to develop a consolidated schedule and more detailed summary of tasks to be completed for consideration.

ACTION TAKEN: With all in favor, the motion #1 passed.

MOTION #2: Mr. Back moved, Mr. McKillip seconded, to approve the following amendments to Metro's staff recommendations forward to JPACT for review at the November 12<sup>th</sup> meeting as part of the consent agenda:

- Amend Objective 4.5 Value Pricing as follows: “Objective 4.5 Value Pricing - Consider and selectively Promote as appropriate a broader application of value pricing as a potential management tool.”
- Consent Item #107: In some cases the System Expansion Policy (SEP) and corridor refinement plan prioritization factors may overlap, however, application of the SEP and Corridor Refinement Plan prioritization factors will occur through separate processes. The system expansion policy framework is designed to provide a transparent process agreed to by Metro and local jurisdictions to advance high capacity transit projects through the tiers. The framework is based on a set of targets designed to measure corridor readiness to support a high capacity transit project. The system expansion policy framework: 1. Identifies which near-term regional priority corridor(s) should move into the federal project development process toward implementation; and 2. Delineates a process by which potential HCT corridors can move closer to implementation, advancing from one tier to the next through a set of coordinated Metro and local jurisdiction actions. Based on the tiered category, regional actions would be aligned with work in each corridor while local actions would focus on meeting MCT system expansion targets. In near-term corridors, formal **corridor working groups** would be established. Other corridors would coordinate work through existing processes.
- Consent Item #131: No change recommended. Amend page 7, Chapter 5 to add the following language, “Individual project and program solutions identified in the RTP may move forward to project development at the discretion of the facility owner/operator. The MOU or IGA from a corridor refinement plan is intended to provide more accountability and to formalize agreements across implementing jurisdictions on moving forward to implement the corridor refinement plan recommendations. This is particularly important in corridors with multiple jurisdictions.” In addition, revise the text box on page 6 as follows, “MOU or IGA to implement ~~mobility corridor strategy or~~ refinement plan recommendation or HCT system expansion targets...(in advance of project development).” The specifics behind the mobility corridor strategies and how they relate to both corridor refinements, the HCT system expansion policy, and state, regional and local levels in advance of project development will be further developed by the RTP Work Group, TPAC, MTAC, MPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council in Winter 2010 and prior to the adoption of the RTP by ordinance in 2010. It is not implied that mobility corridors not needing refinement plans would be precluded from beginning project development. ~~The MOU or IGA from a corridor refinement plan is intended to provide more accountability and to formalize agreements across implementing jurisdictions on moving forward to implement the corridor refinement plan recommendations. This is particularly important in corridors with multiple jurisdictions.~~
- Consent Item #258: Amend as requested. The language will be changed to reflect that ~~18%~~ 25% of the projects are focused solely on bicycle and/or pedestrian systems. ~~The regional trail system is a separate RTP system, different than the RTP bicycle and pedestrian systems.~~

ACTION TAKEN: With all in favor, the motion #2 passed.

MOTION #3: Mr. Back moved, Mr. McKillip seconded to amend *Consent Item #193* to read, “...at a minimum of least every 530 ft. – though an ideal spacing is in the range of 200 to 400 feet where possible-practicable-is preferred.”

ACTION TAKEN: With five in favor (Back, Rahman, McKillip, Kraushaar, Zimmerman), and five opposed (McFarland, Papsdorf, Gillam, Lehto, Gertler), the motion #3 failed.

MOTION #4: Mr. Back moved, Mr. Lehto seconded, to move *Consent Item #193* forward to JPACT for their review at the November 12<sup>th</sup> meeting as part of their consent agenda.

ACTION TAKEN: With all in favor, the motion #4 passed.

**6. ADJOURN**

Chair McArthur adjourned the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Tom Matney  
Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR NOVEMBER 2, 2009

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

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>DOCUMENT TYPE</b>	<b>DOC DATE</b>	<b>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>DOCUMENT No.</b>
5.2	Memo	11/2/09	To: TPAC and Interested Parties From: Kim Ellis RE: Regional Transportation Plan Amendments – Exhibit G (Consent Items)	110209t-01
5.2	Letter	10/5/09	To: Carlotta Collette, JPACT Chair From: Roy Rogers, Chair, Washington County Coordinating Committee RE: OR 217 Project	110209t-02