

JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

October 10, 2002

<u>MEMBERS PRESENT</u>	<u>AFFILIATION</u>
Rod Monroe	Metro
Rex Burkholder	Metro
Fred Hansen	TriMet
Bill Wyatt	Port of Portland
Karl Rohde	City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas County
Maria Rojo de Steffey	Multnomah County
Rob Drake	City of Beaverton, representing Cities of Washington County
Bill Kennemer	Clackamas County
Craig Pridemore	Clark County
Stephanie Hallock	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Larry Haverkamp	City of Gresham, representing Cities of Multnomah County
Rod Park	Metro Council
Jim Francesconi	City of Portland

<u>MEMBERS ABSENT</u>	<u>AFFILIATION</u>
Kay Van Sickle	Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT Region 1)
Don Wagner	Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
Royce Pollard	City of Vancouver
Roy Rogers	Washington County

<u>ALTERNATES PRESENT</u>	<u>AFFILIATION</u>
Dean Lookingbill	SW Washington RTC
Dave Williams	Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT – Region 1)

<u>GUESTS PRESENT</u>	<u>AFFILIATION</u>
Lynn Peterson	Citizen
Ron Papsdorf	City of Gresham
Jim Whitty	Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
Olivia Clark	TriMet
Laurel Wentworth	City of Portland
Kathy Lehtola	Washington County
Deborah Murdock	Portland State University
John Rist	Clackamas County
Phil Selinger	TriMet
Thayer Rorabaugh	City of Vancouver
Alice Rouyer	City of Milwaukie
Jim Strathman	Portland State University

GUESTS PRESENT (Cont.) AFFILIATION

Dick Feeney	TriMet
Thomas Briggs Markgraf	Third District
Dave Lohman	Port of Portland
Susie Lahsene	Port of Portland

STAFF

Andy Cotugno	Renée Castilla	Mike Hoglund
Bridget Wieghart		

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Monroe called the meeting to order and declared a quorum at 7:35 am.

II. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO JPACT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were no citizen communications.

III. MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 12, 2002 MEETING

ACTION TAKEN: Karl Rohde moved and Fred Hansen seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the September 12, 2002 meeting. The motion passed.

IV. ROAD USERS FEE TASK FORCE

Jim Whitty presented the Road Users Fee Task Force preliminary report (included as part of this meeting record).

Karl Rohde asked if the Road Users Fee Task Force has created a funding scenario for purchasing 3 million Global Positioning System (GPS) units at a \$125 per unit. He also asked what the committee is doing to examine other cities and states as well as the national level.

Jim Whitty replied that Oregon was the first state to pass the gas tax and is the first state looking at GPS and a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) fee.

Fred Hansen asked if there was any information coming that would assume other states are looking at placing GPS on new vehicles.

Jim Whitty replied that the committee has not heard that from other states yet.

Fred Hansen asked if there was an offset, would it be done from income tax or would it be more like a rebate?

Jim Whitty stated that it would depend on the form of the collection. As of September 6, 2002, the committee had chosen to use an income tax offset. It would be the driver's privilege and obligation to request the offset themselves by claiming it on their income tax. The view is that then the State highway fund would reimburse the state general fund.

Andy Cotugno stated that at the gas station level it could be a direct offset.

Jim Whitty replied yes that could happen; however, it raises a question. He said that if a flat rate was applied at the midpoint of the fuel efficiency of an automobile, what do you do with those that pay less in VMT fees than they would in gas tax. Under the proposal that the Task Force has put forward, those individuals would get a deal. He stated that he has informed the Task Force that this proposal is likely to become a political issue if it develops further.

Rod Monroe stated that the current system seems to give people the advantage if they purchase more fuel efficient vehicles.

Rex Burkholder stated that in the Road User Fee Task Force's recommendations it recommends funds would be allocated for modernization; however, nothing is mentioned for operation and maintenance. He asked is this was a decision made by the Task Force or was this an oversight.

Jim Whitty replied that it was definitely a decision that the Task Force made.

Rex Burkholder asked how operations and maintenance would be paid for if all of the funds are allocated to modernization.

Jim Whitty replied that this recommendation is just for congestion pricing. Only the congestion-pricing portion of the funds raised would go only for modernization.

Karl Rohde stated that currently the gas tax provides an incentive to purchase more fuel efficient cars, have they considered a class of car fee.

Jim Whitty stated there was discussion on adjusting the rate other than the congestion pricing, the Task Force decided not to. The issue of weight has come up for passenger vehicles, however weight is not so much the issue as is the capacity (or how many cars on the road).

Karl Rohde stated that this way loses the incentive-based program that the gas tax has on fuel-efficient automobiles.

Jim Whitty replied that the Task Force was well aware of that, however they still made their decision. He further stated that they justified their decision because they felt that this was too complex as it is, and to add numerous changes to the rate might make it too hard to carry. The Task Force also felt that each automobile acts like any other when using the road system regardless of fuel efficiency.

Rod Monroe asked if the Task Force had looked at an excise tax on the more expensive vehicles.

Jim Whitty replied that they did, however, it did not go further than discussion.

Bridget Weighart asked for clarification on GPS and the geographic changes regarding area pricing.

Jim Whitty explained that the way area pricing would work with is that a large circle would be drawn around each metropolitan area, as long as the vehicle was being driven outside of that circle, than it would be the lower fee. However, once the vehicle traveled inside of that circle, than an extra fee would be charged to the vehicle.

IV. TEA-21 REAUTHORIZATION PROJECT PRIORITIES

Andy Cotugno presented the TEA-21 Reauthorization Project Priorities (included as part of this meeting record).

Fred Hansen stated that the projects listed were not in any kind of priority ranking.

Rex Burkholder recommended the addition of Portland State University's request for support for their Research Center.

Karl Rohde stated that several of the planning organizations are advocating an increase in the Small Starts category, which would raise the funding ceiling to \$100 million. He would like to see a comment added that JPACT also advocates that the level of funding be raised.

Bill Kennemer stated that the Sunrise Corridor project will be an essential project for opening up the Urban Growth Boundary in the Damascus/Boring area and he feels it is important to create common language and descriptors that are clear. He feels that Industrial Connector is a misnomer. He stated that Clackamas County has been calling it Phase one instead of Industrial Connector. He further stated that the Urban Growth Boundary goes out to 172nd rather than a 135th.

Rob Drake wanted to echo Rex's comments regarding Portland State University. He further stated that having a Research Board in Portland provides for great opportunities.

Bill Wyatt stated that the Port of Portland is appreciative of the Columbia Intermodal Corridor project listed. There are a series of projects referenced that demonstrate the role of freight mobility. He stated that this is one in a series of projects that will demonstrate the need for and assist increased freight mobility in the region.

Fred Hansen stated that all of the members around the table want to make sure to maximize the amount of funding this region gets in all categories. He stated that the members would want to look at the reauthorization over the entire 6-year period as to maximize the possible funding opportunities, (i.e. what projects are entering P.E., EIS, construction, etc.) with projects coming on line.

Rod Monroe stated that it is important to make the trip back to Washington D.C. worthwhile and make sure the message is strong, unified and effective.

V. PERIODIC REVIEW/URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY

Mike Hogle presented the Periodic Review/Urban Growth Boundary – Recommendation to MPAC and Metro Council (included as part of this meeting record).

Andy Cotugno presented a TPAC recommended draft memo to Metro Council and MPAC from JPACT regarding “Periodic Review of the Urban Growth Boundary” (included as part of this meeting record).

He further stated that at MPAC last night, Mike Burton presented to MPAC, his supplemental Urban Growth Recommendation that identifies additional land areas needed for industrial land that he would then ask Metro Council to consider. He further stated that MPAC has also looked at other areas that were not included in Mike Burton’s supplemental recommendation to Council and may act on those areas at a later date.

Larry Haverkamp presented a memo to JPACT regarding the proposed amendment to JPACT’s memo on Periodic Review of the Urban Growth Boundary (included in this meeting record). It supported supplemental recommendation on specific parcels, throughout the region that were identified by Mike Burton.

Rob Drake stated that he could not disagree with Larry’s recommendation but stated that it was important to look at the whole package.

Rod Monroe reiterated to the JPACT Committee that deciding “where the Urban Growth Boundary is expanded” is ultimately the call of the Council, however they appreciate any input from JPACT. He further stated that the review of all recommendations is an ongoing process and the Metro Councilors that do sit on JPACT would probably abstain from a vote.

Mike Hogle stated that although TPAC discussed in general the shortfall of industrial land, they did not state specific pieces.

Fred Hansen stated that he was strongly on record regarding the need for industrial land, in particular, large industrial land lot availability.

Rob Drake stated that he favors a broad generic statement regarding the need for industrial land.

Fred Hansen would like to see a specific mention of large tracts and the need to protect them.

Andy Cotugno stated that it was possible to expand in the memo the importance of industrial land expansion.

Rob Drake stated that everyone needs to work to protect current industrial lands.

Fred Hansen moved and Rob Drake seconded the motion to adopt the TPAC recommendation and add language that states that as of this date; October 10, 2002, JPACT recognizes that the Urban Growth Boundary discussion is still in a state of development, however JPACT would recommend the continued discussion of adding additional land for industrial needs.

Dave Williams stated that when TPAC adopted this language they were speaking to the base case recommendation. However, TPAC did express concern regarding the transportation capacity needed for serving new industrial lands and the burden that would be placed on the existing infrastructure if all 5700 acres of industrial lands were to be added to the urban growth boundary.

ACTION TAKEN: *With Councilors Rod Monroe, Rod Park and Rex Burkholder abstaining from the vote. The motion passed.*

VII. TRI-MET PRODUCTIVITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

This item was carried over until the November 14, 2002 JPACT meeting.

VIII. ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chair Monroe adjourned the meeting at 9:07 am.