

JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION  
MEETING MINUTES  
SEPTEMBER 12, 2002

<u>MEMBERS PRESENT</u>	<u>AFFILIATION</u>
Rod Monroe	Metro
Rex Burkholder	Metro
Fred Hansen	Tri-Met
Rob Drake	City of Beaverton, representing Cities of Washington County
Bill Kennemer	Clackamas County
Maria Rojo de Steffey	Multnomah County
Larry Haverkamp	City of Gresham, representing Cities of Multnomah County
Kay Van Sickle	Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT – Region 1)
Karl Rohde	City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas County
Roy Rogers	Washington County
Jim Francesconi	City of Portland

<u>MEMBERS ABSENT</u>	<u>AFFILIATION</u>
Rod Park	Metro
Stephanie Hallock	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Royce E Pollard	City of Vancouver
Craig Pridemore	Clark County
Bill Wyatt	Port of Portland
Don Wagner	Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT)

<u>ALTERNATES PRESENT</u>	<u>AFFILIATION</u>
Dean Lookingbill	SW Washington RTC
Peter Capell	Clark County

<u>GUESTS PRESENT</u>	<u>AFFILIATION</u>
Bruce Harder	Tri-Met
Lynn Peterson	Consultant
Dick Feeney	Tri-Met
Olivia Clark	Tri-Met
Kathy Lehtola	Washington County
Dave Williams	Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT – Region 1)
John Gillam	City of Portland
John Wiebke	City of Hillsboro
Dave Nordberg	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Alice Rouyer	City of Milwaukie
Phil Selinger	Tri-Met

GUESTS PRESENT

AFFILIATION

Neil McFarlane	Tri-Met
Thayer Rorabaugh	City of Vancouver
Steve Kelley	Washington County
Jim Strathman	Portland State University
Deborah Murdock	Portland State University
Bob Duehmig	OHSU
Linda Floyd	City of Wilsonville/SMART
Susie Lahsene	Port of Portland
Karen Schilling	Multnomah County
John Rist	Clackamas County
Ron Papsdorf	City of Gresham

STAFF

Andy Cotugno	Richard Brandman	Renée Castilla
John Houser	Ted Leybold	

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

There were no citizen communications.

III. MEETING MINUTES OF AUGUST 8, 2002

ACTION TAKEN: Rex Burkholder moved and Fred Hansen seconded the motion to approve the meeting minutes of August 8, 2002. The motion passed.

IV. TEA-21 REAUTHORIZATION PROJECT PRIORITIES

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

Bill Kennemer stated that he would like another guideline added that would ensure that decisions to place projects as priority for TEA-21 reauthorization are consistent with land use plans. He further stated that the decisions that JPACT makes impacts the process of significant work. Therefore, there needs to be some prioritization done when evaluating transportation projects that would affect land use projects.

Rod Monroe stated that hopefully the Regional Transportation Plan complements local land use plans. However, it should be noted that the prioritization of transportation projects might change somewhat based upon land use decisions.

Karl Rohde stated that the timing for funding of transportation projects needs to be timed with the funding of land use projects. He further stated that land use projects are being built at a faster pace than the transportation projects.

Andy Cotugno stated that transportation and land use is consistent within the RTP. However, the RTP is a very long list. The MTIP criteria will have an emphasis on projects that support centers industrial areas, and will require all UGB areas to have concept plans to receive MTIP funds. He stated that the component of land use should be emphasized when evaluating MTIP projects.

Andy Cotugno asked when the delegation would want the list.

Dick Feeney replied that the delegation would want to see the list by early next spring (March).

Rob Drake stated that the JPACT committee has been effective in their lobbying efforts when they have prepared a regional priority list and have lobbied from that list. He stated it has been counter productive in the past when they go to Washington DC to lobby for the region only to find out an entity has been campaigning delegates for individual projects. If JPACT does create a regional priority list at JPACT then the should support that list.

Rod Monroe stated that Mike Burton's Transportation Investment Task Force should be completed with all of their work within the next two months.

Larry Haverkamp expressed concerns with the Transportation Investment Task Force prioritizing projects and competing against JPACT for state and federal funds. He feels that there might be some conflict with the project lists, how they prioritize and what they take before the public on the ballot.

Rod Monroe replied that he hopes it would not be in a competitive nature, but a process designed to provide JPACT with the state and local match needed to quality for federal money.

Larry Haverkamp replied that he hopes that is true because it would not benefit either group to be competing for the same money.

Fred Hansen stated he does not serve on the Transportation Investment Task Force, however, his Board Director, George Passadore, does. It is George's hope that what comes out of the Task Force's recommendation would be complementary to the RTP.

Rod Monroe asked if the committee felt they could support a new program; Small Starts or only continue to support the big programs.

Fred Hansen stated that recently there has been more competition nationally for New Starts money and if this new program (Small Starts) is created out of new money, then he could support it. However, if they take money out of the existing program (New Starts) and create this smaller program, then he could not support it because the level of funds available would be significantly decreased.

Dean Lookingbill advised the committee that they would be asking their Washington delegation to secure funding for a full funding grant agreement to begin the I-5 alternative analysis process.

Dick Feeney stated that they are assuming three things; 1) continuation of their agreements on into the authorization period; 2) S/N authority will get folded into the next bill; and 3) commuter rail will be carried onward. He said that hopefully there would be opportunities as well. He said there is talk nationwide of doubling the transit program. There is talk of the New Starts program doubling to \$2.2 billion per year, which of course is dependent on revenue strategies. However, the cold reality is that there are many projects competing, including 300 projects in various stages of preliminary engineering and construction. If the New Starts continue to be a compressed program then this region would need to think twice about which categories they want.

Rod Monroe asked if it would be appropriate to have a preliminary meeting with the Congressional delegation, before finalizing the Region's priority list to determine if JPACT is in agreement with the delegation and/or see if the delegation would like other projects added.

Fred Hansen asked what the conversation between the parties would be.

Rod Monroe reiterated his previous statement of the importance of JPACT understanding the delegation and what projects they would like to see funded.

Jim Francesconi asked if it would be staff to staff.

Fred Hansen stated that it would be good to have the conversations, however it would need to be done in such a way as not to give away the authority that JPACT has in prioritizing projects for the region.

Rod Monroe stated that if the conversation was done carefully then that would not be a problem.

Karl Rohde stated if the goal of this meeting were to gain their perspectives on the opportunities of growing the programs then he would want a meeting. However, he reiterated the importance of leaving the prioritization of projects to JPACT.

Bill Kennemer agreed that it was important for the delegation to agree with JPACT's priorities and help to achieve them. However, it is dangerous to allow the delegation to set priorities for JPACT. He also stated that it was important for JPACT to clearly know the priorities of Vancouver and Washington so that both the Washington and Oregon delegations are working together for this region.

Roy Rogers asked if JPACT has determined how they would accomplish the geographic balance at this table so that each member of the delegation has a project to take to Washington DC.

Rod Monroe stated that because Washington County is the fastest growing part of the region, its projects are important. However, it is good for everyone to remember that JPACT is trying to

build a regional transportation network, which at some point might be emphasizing on more parts of the region than others do.

Roy Rogers stated that each member of the delegation would be approaching the priorities separately. JPACT needs to think about this as it creates its strategy.

Karl Rohde stated that all districts need to be represented with some sort of project, but that the list should be created logistically to achieve the goals of the RTP.

Rex Burkholder stated that there needs to be a process for determining key issues and to try and get the most out of the funding that they can to protect the regions interest. There needs to be a discussion on whether the funding formulas can remain the same, whether there should be an allocation to MPOs for bridge repair.

Karl Rohde stated that Congress is out of control with earmarking and the flexibility that was once with this program is no longer there.

Andy Cotugno stated that there would be earmarking with New Starts and every other program; that is the reality. However, demonstration projects might also be earmarked as demonstration or bridge and/or ITS. If a list is prepared that has a high degree of support in the district, it would play an important role in having a balance in each program.

Dave Williams stated that historically what the OTC has done is created a series of unfunded projects and offered them up. However they have recently tried to prevent that by creating ACTs and forcing those ACTs to speak with their members and collectively create their priority lists. He further stated that ODOT is asking for earmarks on three projects in region 1; 1) I-5/Delta Park-Lombard, 2) Highway 217 – TV Highway to Sunset (Westside Corridor – Final Phase) and 3) Sunrise Corridor – Industrial Connector: I-205 to 135<sup>th</sup> Ave. He stated that ODOT has enough modernization funds to make the projects whole and asked JPACT to make these projects a priority if all members are willing.

Bill Kennemer reiterated the importance of adding a 9<sup>th</sup> criteria to create a better linkage between transportation and land use.

Andy Cotugno stated that there would be more focus on regional centers and town centers the connections between those and among them. He stated that there would be further discussion on the criteria to make that happen.

Rob Drake said there needs to be priorities set for each center, how they are going to transport people from one spot to another. He said the transportation and land use connection is of regional importance and pertains to more than just centers and/or industrial areas.

Karl Rohde stated that there is still the question of whether to reign in the individual lobbying efforts of local jurisdictions and to determine in what direction the lobbying efforts are going to go.

The consensus of the committee was to lobby the Oregon delegation as a region and the members stated they would inform their local jurisdictions to that affect.

V. TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES 04-07 MTIP SCHEDULE AND SOLICITATION PACKET

Ted Leybold presented the Transportation Priorities 04-07 MTIP Schedule and Solicitation Packet (included as part of this meeting record).

Andy Cotugno asked when the was deadline for applications.

Ted replied that the schedule is for applications due toward the end of December.

Roy Rogers asked for explanation of the 89% v 70% funding allocation for the transit start-up concept. He reiterated the importance of connectivity between regional centers and various town centers.

Ted Leybold stated that if a road or bicycle project were located within one mile of a center that it would be eligible for the 89% match, outside of that one mile they would receive the 70/30-match ratio. He further stated that they would be evaluating transit by two different methods. They would evaluate proposals by transit service and capital projects. He also stated that the start-up service would need to be self-supportive within a certain time period to qualify for MTIP funding.

Fred Hansen assured the committee that connections between centers is very important to Tri-Met and they would continue to provide that service as well as additional services for new centers.

Roy Rogers said he wanted Tri-Met to retain the flexibility to address new service areas.

Fred Hansen addressed concerns with the point system for Transit: Capital Technical Evaluation Criteria. He stated that for new areas where they would like to provide service, local jurisdiction commitment is sometimes more important than the number of new riders they would serve. He felt that points should be given if a jurisdiction is willing to coordinate improvements with Tri-Met and commit to implementing those improvements, i.e. new sidewalks, etc.

Andrew Cotugno stated that those point values that measure cost-effectiveness would be changed to allow a score based on local coordination and commitment.

VI. TRI-MET FINANCIAL UPDATE

Fred Hansen gave a brief description of the Tri-Met Financial Update and introduced Bruce Harder to the committee.

Bruce Harder presented the Tri-Met financial update (included as part of this meeting record).

Fred Hansen stated that the 0% in the bus category is for new operator hours. He said that they would continue to reallocate hours from poor performing routes to new routes to provide new service and increase productivity.

Rod Monroe asked if Tri-Met would be seeking a modest increase in the payroll tax.

Fred Hansen then introduced Lydia Clark to the JPACT committee and said that she would be handling state legislation activity. He further stated that Tri-Met may be seeking authority for a one tenth of one percent payroll tax increase and over the next ten years, increasing by .001 percent per year for ten years. The rate would increase from .006218 to .007218. He said it was important to note that the legislation would not be imposing this increase. The Tri-Met board would need to implement the increase in a separate board action. Therefore, state legislative action would require a simple majority rather than a super (2/3) majority required for new revenue measures at the state level.

VII. ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chair Monroe adjourned the meeting at 9:05 am.

Respectfully submitted,

Renee Castilla