## JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

April 11, 2002 Meeting Notes

## MEMBERS PRESENT AFFILIATION

Rod Monroe Metro
Rex Burkholder Metro
Rod Park 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

Kay Van Sickel Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT – Region 1)

Larry Haverkamp City of Gresham, Representing Cities of Multnomah County

Don Wagner Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT)

Karl Rohde City of Lake Oswego, Representing Cities of Clackamas County
Roy Rogers Washington County

Charlie Hales City of Portland
Craig Pridemore Clark County

#### MEMBERS ABSENT AFFILIATION

Bill Wyatt Port of Portland

Stephanie Hallock Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)

Royce Pollard City of Vancouver

#### ALTERNATES PRESENT AFFILIATION

Dave Lohman Port of Portland

Dean Lookingbill SW Washington RTC

#### GUESTS PRESENT AFFILIATION

Tom Mills Tri-Met

Ron Papsdorf City of Gresham Karen Schilling Multnomah County

Dave Williams Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT – Region 1)

Linda Floyd City of Wilsonville

Deb Wallace Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT)

Louis A. Ornelas OHSU

John Gillam City of Portland John Rist Clackamas County

Lynn Peterson Tri-Met

JPACT - April 11, 2002 Page 2 of 7

#### **STAFF**

Andy Cotugno Renée Castilla Tom Kloster Ted Leybold Richard Brandman Jeff Stone

Michael Morrissey

## I. CALL TO ORDER

Vice-Chair Burkholder called the meeting to order at 7:35 a.m. and stated that Councilor Monroe was delayed.

#### II. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO JPACT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were no citizen communications.

#### III. MINUTES OF MARCH 14, 2002 MEETING

ACTION TAKEN: Karl Rohde moved and Fred Hansen seconded the motion to approve the minutes of March 14, 2002. The motion passed.

#### I-5 TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

Vice-Chair Burkholder presented to the committee a draft letter prepared by the Presiding Officer of the Metro Council, Carl Hosticka to the I-5 Partnership Task Force. The letter requests the task force adopts as final recommendations the draft report, with considerations. (Included as part of this meeting record.)

Andy Cotugno presented a memo written by Councilor Monroe to JPACT regarding the Bi-State Transportation Committee's comments on I-5 Task Force recommendations. (Included as part of this meeting record.)

Karl Rohde asked why JPACT was not co-signing this letter with the Metro Council to the I-5 Transportation Partnership Task Force.

Andy Cotugno asked if the JPACT committee would be acting on the recommendations from the I-5 Task Force.

Christine Deffebach responded that both TPAC and JPACT have already seen the draft recommendations and was given the opportunity to make comments back to staff. JPACT can certainly act at this meeting or the next on the draft recommendations. There will then be a review period for the draft recommendations. She had assumed that JPACT would want to comment and indicate whether the I-5 Task Force was moving in the right direction and/or any other comments JPACT may have.

Karl Rohde asked if Christine Deffebach meant that it would be a citizen comment before action by the Transportation Authority.

Andy Cotugno explained that the public comment period started in January once the I-5 Partnership Task Force released the preliminary draft recommendations and would continue through June, when draft recommendations are formally adopted. He stated that JPACT could become a co-signer to this letter or staff could prepare an additional letter for signature.

Fred Hansen stated on behalf of the Bi-State Committee, any comments received from JPACT would be valuable.

Karl Rohde stated that it was more of a process question. When is it an appropriate time to give comments?

Fred Hansen stated that there are many significant issues along the I-5 Trade Corridor that need to be thought about.

Dave Lohman asked if JPACT should wait on the rail analysis and its outcome first before JPACT comments.

Dave Williams stated that the rail analysis is in the works and would be coming soon.

## OREGON TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT ACT II (OTIA II) PROJECT SELECTION

Vice-Chair Rex Burkholder presented a letter written to the OTC by Bruce Warner, Director, ODOT. (Included as part of this meeting record.)

Kay Van Sickel explained that the OTC was meeting to discuss policy implications of the bond measure and to give direction to staff as to the general policy direction for OTIA II money. She stated that at the next meeting they would be discussing the scenarios given to them from ODOT staff. She further discussed the memo to the OTC, with the different scenarios for modernization, preservation and bridge. She stated that \$50 million would be going to bridge/preservation and \$50 million to modernization.

Fred Hansen asked if the OTC would be releasing funding to this region beyond the funding for the Boeckman/Sunnyside Road projects.

Andy Cotugno stated that under Option 1A they would backfill the Boeckman/Sunnyside Road projects and then fund three more projects that were on the original submittals as priorities. The amount of funding this region will receive is about \$17 million.

Fred Hansen stated that he concentrated heavily on prioritizing projects down to Boeckman/Sunnyside Road, but did not comment on prioritizing projects further down the list as he did not anticipate funding would be available. He asked the JPACT Committee if they were satisfied with the project priority list beyond the Boeckman and Sunnyside Road projects.

Dave Williams stated that the OTC asked ODOT staff for a project priority list and were told to try to stay within previous requests from the ACTs and MPOs without having to contact them

```
JPACT - April 11, 2002
Page 4 of 7
```

again. Therefore, ODOT staff looked at the last memo written to the OTC board and submitted those projects that fell beneath the bubble for funding:

| a) US 26 - Murray to Cornell (Washington Co.)  | \$ 2.811 million |
|--|------------------|
| b) Powell Blvd. (Gresham)                      | \$ 5.250 million |
| c) US 26/Cornelius Pass (Hillsboro)            | \$ 2.250 million |
| d) Murray Extension (Beaverton)                | \$ 4.024 million |
| e) 209 <sup>th</sup> /TV Hwy. (Washington Co.) | \$ .885 million  |
| f) 162 <sup>nd</sup> /Foster (Portland)        | \$ 1.500 million |

Andy Cotugno asked if JPACT wanted to request an additional month from the OTC in order to make a recommendation regarding project priority or state its preference for Option 1A to the OTC.

Vice-Chair Burkholder asked if the OTC would accept a recommendation from JPACT on its priorities and if so, does JPACT want to look at the projects and move any to a higher priority.

Andy Cotugno stated that JPACT is limited to the long list of projects that was originally before them in October 2001. He asked Kay if JPACT could ask her to take to the OTC JPACT recommendation to pursue the portion of option 1A which backfills Sunnyside and Boeckman Road projects but request an additional month to comment on the next series of projects beyond those projects and within the Region 1 funding target that is defined by option 1A.

Kay Van Sickel stated that she could express that to the OTC and that she had already planned to speak about option 1A. She stated that the Sunnyside and Boeckman Road projects were not only prioritized by JPACT but that a follow-up letter to the OTC emphasized those priorities. The OTC directed ODOT staff to determine additional priorities; therefore ODOT staff went back to JPACT's original memo and took the priorities from there.

Rod Park stated that the projects given to the OTC were the next five ranked on the list. He asked whether there was something that had changed since the list was put together that would alter the priorities of those projects.

Fred Hansen replied that he did not take a lot of time to look at those projects that were further down on the list. He stated that Tri-Met has a couple of projects that have the potential to move up on the priorities list.

Dave Williams stated that when the review process started for the modernization projects they took the projects and ranked them with a numerical score, 1-76, by the criteria given to them. ODOT staff drew a cutline at 12 projects. Of these 12 projects, the ones not funded in the first round of OTIA funding are the projects ODOT staff submitted the OTC in this memo.

Fred Hansen asked if JPACT wanted to recommend to the OTC that they fund the backfill for the Sunnyside Road/Boeckman Road Projects or if they wanted to leave the arrangements they currently have in place, which call for more local funding and allocation of future MTIP/STIP money and allow the additional OTIA funding for more projects.

Rob Drake stated that with all of the requirements in place with 2040 and Centers and Mainstreets, the local revenue sources are non-existent. It is a lot to ask of local communities to stretch their use of general funds to pay for a greater share of these projects that benefit the region.

Karl Rohde stated that the localities are using money drawn down from the local system to pay for regional projects. He stated that backfill is needed because regional dollars should pay for regional projects. This would enable the local jurisdictions to use their local funds on local projects.

Rex Burkholder stated that a letter would be drafted to the OTC that recommends option 1A as the preference of JPACT.

## IV. TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT - ANNUAL REPORT

Tom Mills presented the Annual Report for the Transportation Demand Management Program in the Portland Metropolitan Region (Included as part of this meeting record).

Karl Rohde asked how much does the TDM program cost annually to operate.

Tom Mills replied that a good estimate would be \$1 million per year.

# V. RESOLUTION No. 02-3183 FOR THE PURPOSE OF REVISING THE REGIONAL TMA POLICY

Andy Cotugno gave a brief description on Resolution No. 02-3183 for the purpose of revising the regional Transportation Management Association (TMA) policy to provide additional regional funding options for TMAs. (Included as part of this meeting record.)

Rob Drake accorded thanks to the TDM Subcommittee for the hard work in preparing this resolution and asked for JPACTs support in adopting it. He stated that he has witnessed firsthand how hard the TMAs are working, specifically the Westside Transportation Alliance (WTA) and the Tualatin TMA in his area, how successful they have been, but said they need help to continue operation. He felt that the new criteria involved for funding would help them to grow smart.

Andy Cotugno stated that the TMAs are frugal in their spending and receive many in-kind help from their supporters, office space and copying so they are very efficient. This resolution should provide a more stable base for their operations and therefore get more results from them.

Karl Rohde asked if the money for the TMAs is CMAQ funding.

Andy Cotugno stated that the only funding they have available for the TMAs is CMAQ and STP funds and each set of funds comes with the stipulation that new programs can be funded up to three years. After the three years, CMAQ and STP can not be used for operating costs. What

JPACT - April 11, 2002 Page 6 of 7

this resolution will allow them to do is use the CMAQ and STP funds for new programs and allow them to use their employer contributions and dues for continuous operating and administrative costs.

Rob Drake moved and Fred Hansen seconded the motion to approve Resolution No. 02-3183 For the purpose of revising regional Transportation Management Association (TMA) policy to provide additional regional funding options for TMAs.

Rod Park asked if the TDM Subcommittee would be looking at performance measure criteria up front when considering applications for feasibility and sustainability.

Tom Mills stated that they currently have criteria they use when evaluating a potential TMA. They use a feasibility study to determine whether a TMA has a good probability to succeed. Once the TMA begins, they sign a contract with Tri-Met that requires them to meet several criteria in order to continue through the process of receiving funding, building up their organization, etc. They essentially are given a three-year period in order to prove they can be successful.

<u>ACTION TAKEN:</u> After discussion, the motion to approve Resolution No. 02-3183 for the purpose of revising the regional Transportation Management Association (TMA) policy to provide for additional regional funding options for TMAs <u>passed</u>.

## VI. TRANSIT INVESTMENT PLAN

Fred Hansen presented the Tri-Met Transit Investment Plan. (Included as part of this meeting record.)

Bill Kennemer accorded thanks to Fred Hansen and Tri-Met for their hard work in improving service for Clackamas County.

Andy Cotugno stated that in the last MTIP process, JPACT allocated funds to Tri-Met for improvements, but Tri-Met did not list them specifically. A condition was adopted as part of the MTIP that said JPACT would go back and revisit how the money would get spent once Tri-Met finished its five-year plan and offered a better understanding of how the MTIP allocation fit with the rest of the funds. At that time, JPACT would then allocate funds towards specific projects and that is yet to come.

Fred Hansen stated that they would be back once they finished identifying specific projects with the local jurisdictions. He further stated that the MTIP dollars allow them to start a major investment (new project) much earlier then they normally could because they are not using the MTIP dollars as ongoing funding but rather as a "jumpstart."

Rob Drake accorded thanks to Fred Hansen. He stated that he has witnessed more energy at Tri-Met and how they are working with jurisdictions outside of the City of Portland. He stated that Tri-Met is trying to reach out and look for additional opportunities to provide service.

JPACT - April 11, 2002 Page 7 of 7

#### VII. MTIP REFINEMENT ISSUES

Andy Cotugno presented the MTIP Refinement Issues, MTIP Stakeholder Questionnaire and the MTIP Refinement Stakeholder Questionnaire Presentation List. (Included as part of this meeting record.)

Rex Burkholder stated that any comments could be directed to Ted Leybold, Metro staff person.

#### VIII. HYBRID BUS PREVIEW

Chair invited the committee members to preview Tri-Met's new Hybrid Bus after the meeting adjourns.

Fred Hansen described the new hybrid bus. (Pamphlet included as part of this meeting record.)

Charlie Hales asked when would Tri-Met begin rolling these buses into the fleet

Fred Hansen stated that the normal replacement process is 55 buses per year. They hope to be able to replace about 15 to 16 of those buses with hybrids, but will not slow down their pace of replacement in order to wait for this new technology.

#### **CORRECTION TO MINUTES**

Bill Kennemer added the following correction to the minutes of April 11, 2002.

"Request that JPACT look at the issue of the connection between the existing land use/urban growth expansion and transportation."

#### IX. ADJOURN

There being no further business, Vice-Chair Burkholder adjourned the meeting at 8:51 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Renée Castilla