

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)

June 14, 2001
Meeting Notes

MEMBERS PRESENT

Rod Monroe, Chair
Rob Drake
Rod Park
Bill Kennemer
Fred Hansen
Rex Burkholder
Andy Ginsburg
Dave Lohman, alternate
Craig Pridemore
Brian Newman
Kay Van Sickel
Don Wagner
Larry Haverkamp
Dean Lookingbill, alternate
Lonnie Roberts

AFFILIATION

Metro
City of Beaverton, representing Cities of Washington County
Metro
Clackamas County
Tri-Met
Metro
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Port of Portland
Clark County
City of Milwaukie, representing Cities of Clackamas County
Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) – Region 1
Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
City of Gresham, representing Cities of Multnomah County
SW Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC)
Multnomah County

GUESTS PRESENT

Dave Williams
Patty Fink
Steve Kelley
John McConaughy
David Bragdon
Gary Katsion
Thayer Rorabaugh
Ross Williams
Ron Papsdorf
John Rist
Steve Dotterer
Judy Edwards
Bernie Bottomly
Beckie Lee
Karen Schilling
Robert Paine
Dick Feeney
Stephan Lashbrook
Gregg S. Everhart

AFFILIATION

Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
Tri-Met
Washington County
Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
Metro
Kittelson & Associates, Inc.
City of Vancouver
Citizens for Sensible Transportation/CLF
City of Gresham
Clackamas County
City of Portland
Westside Transportation Alliance
Tri-Met
Multnomah County – Serena Cruz's Office
Multnomah County
Multnomah County
Tri-Met
City of Wilsonville
Portland Parks and Recreation

GUESTS (continued)

Tom Markgraf
Louis Ornelias

AFFILIATION

Office of Earl Blumenauer
Oregon Health and Sciences University (OHSU)

STAFF

Andy Cotugno
Francine Floyd
Gina Whitehill-Bazuik
Sharon Kelly

Mike Hoglund
Ross Roberts
Kristin Hull

I. SUMMARY

The meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Chair Rod Monroe at 7:40 a.m.

II. MEETING REPORT

Action taken: Craig Pridemore moved, with a second by Fred Hansen to approve the May 10, 2001 meeting report. The motion passed.

III. 2040 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Andy Cotugno reported that they were working with MPAC, Metro Council and other subcommittees to develop a means of measuring the progress on goals toward an implementation of the 2040 growth concept. One of the goals is transportation. The performance measures evaluation establishes the means of engaging what goals will be set and the progress toward those goals. To provide a framework, Mr. Cotugno referred to the "2040 Fundamentals – Approved by Metro Council Community Planning Committee (Performance Measures Program)"—the ivory handout. The Performance Measures Program includes eight fundamentals that represent the major 2040 growth concepts. Quantitative and qualitative measures are being developed to determine how much we have implemented those objectives as well as how well it is working. In addition, Mr. Cotugno reported on the "Tier Breakdown of Scored 2040 Performance Indicators" dated April 13, 2001 (ivory handout).

Mr. Cotugno explained that there were three parallel efforts underway which included:

- 1) A scientific public survey asking how things are going in the areas of growth, transportation, and open spaces.
- 2) Metro's business card "Where do we grow from here?" is another effort underway that surveys ideas and opinions on land-use, transportation choices, etc. This survey can be accessed through Metro's website: www.metro-region.org/survey until June 29. The responses from the electronic survey provides additional comments to be correlated to the scientific survey, and

3) City Councils and planning commissioners have been asked to give an evaluation on how various aspects of the 2040 growth concepts are going. Stakeholders were asked to weigh in on that. This would allow us to compare attitudes on the progress of 2040 with the surveys. The transportation measures deal with two issues as follows: a) what are the goals for road, transit, bike and TDM improvements? b) how much progress is being made toward those goals, as well the measured effectiveness (i.e., mode share, BMT per capita congestion).

Mr. Cotugno reported the data collection is well underway now. All eight of these factors, including transportation, will be used during the next year and a half as part of Metro's periodic review to deal with questions of 1) are we on track, 2) are there refinements that we should be considering to our 2040 growth concept, and 3) how does that ripple into changes to the concept that affects more growth to be targeted as well as urban growth boundary decisions. The measures will be used to inform UGB decisions in the fall of 2002.

Andy Cotugno presented the "Preliminary Draft Recommendation of 2040 Performance Indicators" modified 5/9/01 (ivory handout). He pointed out that each of the eight performance "fundamentals" were noted on the top of the pages followed by the recommended indicators.

Fred Hansen commented that one of the measures included, regarding transit, raises a fundamental issue that he had strong views on. In the long run, the issue was 1) to be able to achieve some of our goals, and 2) to be able to have free transit within certain regional centers (i.e., Hillsboro, Beaverton, Gresham). When Tri-met surveys their riders, price is generally the third or fourth most important concern. What was more important is service. He said that his board was clear that when they have the dollars, they want to put it out into more service---not into reducing fares. This projection is out 20+ years, but it starts to set up a course of action that is an important one. Mr. Hansen said that we should be finding ways to put dollars into more service because that is what their riders want.

Lonnie Roberts asked Mr. Hansen, what percent of operating costs comes from the fare box? Fred Hansen answered 27%. He added that over the past two years, by using some productivity improvements programs, they have bumped that from about 24+% up to 27%.

Lonnie Roberts commented on the idea of expanding the fareless square (fare-free rides). Mr. Roberts said his district has a concern about this. Basically, they board paying full cost all the way. They don't have the luxury of riding around fare free. The service is not free. Someone has to pay for that service. That is what bothers his district.

Fred Hansen agreed saying that was his point as well. Mr. Hansen said it's more important to use dollars to expand transit service, not to reduce fares. That is the choice they would make.

Andy Cotugno said this is a policy issue that needs a significant level of discussion because of the way the 2040 concept is structured and from the RTP standpoint. The 2040 growth concept is designed around a major focus on the hierarchy of the central city, regional centers and town centers. In the regional centers, there is emphasize because of the highest density, the most

redevelopment, and the most public interventions that help cause that redevelopment. That's where we emphasize: 1) reducing the parking ratios as much as possible, and 2) improving the pedestrian environment. Those locations and the kinds of service to those areas is really the priority. Those are the places that we place an emphasis on TDM measures at the highest level, TMAs to help develop those programs, and the fare-free programs for transit travel within those regional center districts. The objective is to encourage people that when they get to the regional center districts (via driving, carpool, bike)---they can get around the regional district center easily by transit and by walking. So a fare-free zone is called for. Implementation of the fare-free zone is a whole other set of discussions on how to pay for it. Part of the expansion of the Lloyd Center fareless square service is with the City of Portland, so that's not an obligation for Tri-Met. There are issues of when is it necessary, when is it appropriate, when is a critical mass reached---and who pays for it.

Fred Hansen agreed that the idea of moving people within a central city area (regional central area) is important. Mr. Hansen added that he and his board would be very happy with that. But if people see it as a step toward a free system, then it starts to have a different context. If it were seen in the context that says we need to put more service out, and how do you make the regional centers work---then his board would have no difficulty with that. He wants them to be able to see it in that broader context and then the implementation issues are real. It's movement within those regional centers that does make sense. The issue that it's just one step toward a fare-free system is a concern.

Rod Park added that people weren't considering a completely fareless system for the entire area. The expansion of the convention center and the hotel tax increases will help offset the additional costs to service that area.

Rex Burkholder suggested this issue be a future agenda item for further discussion.

Lonnie Roberts asked Fred Hansen, what is the total operating budget for Tri-Met biennial? Fred Hansen answered, in all, about \$250 M.

Rod Monroe explained that Mr. Hansen's point was that the expansion of fareless square here or in other centers should not be done at the expense of improved services. He added that the expansion of fareless square in the Lloyd area is not at the expense of better service because it's being paid for (subsidized) by the city and Lloyd TMA members and businesses.

Rod Monroe said that when there is a transit service frequency increase, people were more apt to use the service. So this needs to be the goal wherever possible in the major corridors.

Larry Haverkamp agreed that money should go into service. Service was a big item in his area. He doesn't have a problem with increasing fareless square but wanted to be assured service is maintained out in his areas. Mr. Haverkamp supported the idea of money going into service rather than reduced fares.

Fred Hansen said that people's ability to easily get around during the day (i.e., to a doctor appointment, shopping, lunch, etc.), then the likelihood of having to go by car is reduced. Therefore, the willingness of commuters to use transit for initial to and from trips is accomplished. In the long run, it makes good sense in some settings. He agreed with the need to expand service.

Rod Monroe asked Mr. Hansen, you said fare box receipts were up to about 27% of operating cost? Do you have a breakdown between bus and light rail? Mr. Hansen said operating costs were difficult to analysis due to the substantial federal help for the capital costs of rail. Operating costs were about 33% on light rail from the farebox.

IV. LCDC ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Andy Cotugno explained that at the last JPACT meeting, Metro thought they would get LCDC acknowledgement on the RTP. This agenda item was bumped. An acknowledgement hearing with LCDC was scheduled for June 15. Mr. Cotugno referred to the second set of possible amendments to the RTP included in the memo dated June 7, 2001 addressed to TPAC regarding the RTP Acknowledgement Update (green handout). The memo lists a set of amendments (draft) to the RTP. What he expected from the LCDC Commission on June 15 is an acknowledgement of the "lion's share" of what's in the RTP. The second set of components in the RTP will be acknowledgeable once we adopt the amendments that were distributed three months ago. Mr. Cotugno said the second set of amendments was clarifying changes, but won't be final until adopted. This will be an ordinance that requires two meetings in front of the Metro Council and recommendation from JPACT, as well as a recommendation from MPAC (because it is part of our functional plan).

There will be another opportunity at these amendments before they are finally adopted. If the LCDC Commission approves what is finally adopted and submitted, then they will be acknowledged. There are a few things not yet finished. Therefore, there will be a continuance with a schedule to accomplish those things. For example, one of the requirements to the rule is that there are performance measures. The performance measures were discussed earlier at this meeting. That product won't be ready for about another six months. That's an item that will be continued. The LCDC is comfortable with that. The Commission proposed continuance for two exceptions---two major highway corridors (the Sunrise Corridor on the eastside and the I-5/Tualatin connector on the Westside). An exception is required for those two projects for the portion located outside the urban growth boundary. There are a series of parts to that exception. LCDC agreed that we have met some of those parts, but not all of those parts. Until the whole package is completed and adopted, they won't consider approval of that particular step---that's why it's up for continuance. LCDC felt that we had met the conclusions about the need for those corridors---so that was a significant finding from them. They agreed that it's in these corridors and this mode that we should be doing these kinds of improvements. They agreed that we had done the analysis of other alternatives that would not require going outside the urban growth boundary and they agreed with those conclusions. There will be follow up actions to define what the enforceable actions are to protect the rural areas the right of way. Basically, what LCDC said

was that the analysis was okay but the enforceable actions aren't in place yet until the whole package is there, then it's a continued item. So we are part way there on those things.

Mr. Cotugno referred to "Attachment 1 – Metro RTP Compliance review Summary" (green handout). This is a summary of the major issues. TPAC has spent time on these issues that have an effect on local transportation plans and what they need to do with their local plans.

Rod Monroe asked, essentially what you are saying regarding the two proposed highway corridors which are partly in and partly out of the urban growth boundary, is that Mr. Cortright and DLCD staff would like to have the information on impacts that would not be gleaned until we do an EIS?

Andy Cotugno answered no, it's not an EIS level of impact (i.e., which wetland will be impacted), but rather how this access would induce growth. It's a much broader set of issues than an EIS level of impact. Mr. Cotugno said they agreed that we have done the studies, the evaluation of impact. Now they want to see the enforceable protections in place. They are ready to acknowledge the rest of the RTP and continue those two exceptions until those actions are adopted.

Rod Monroe said at the next meeting they would report on the results from the acknowledgement hearing on June 15.

Fred Hansen asked Mr. Cotugno to clarify the effect of not having the approval on those two corridors? Andy Cotugno explained that if those two major highway corridors (the Sunrise Corridor on the eastside and the I-5/Tualatin connector on the Westside) were at the point of construction, procedures could not occur until all those things were dealt with. So it is part of the whole process in order to proceed with construction. So we have to deal with these land use issues, engineering and environmental impact statements. Until all these issues are settled, it would hold up construction.

Fred Hansen said that we aren't up against a critical time limit yet.

Rod Park asked Mr. Cotugno to expand on the effect if it's not approved. Andy Cotugno explained that if this RTP isn't acknowledged in this fashion, for example, then we may have to proceed with the inclusion of Powell Boulevard as a Sunrise Corridor alternative, doing preliminary engineering, and making it a much bigger study. So acknowledgement will allow the Sunrise Corridor to go forward in a much less complicated way.

Fred Hansen asked, is that if the LCDC approves what the DLCD is recommending? Andy Cotugno answered yes.

V. TRI-COUNTY ELDERLY AND DISABLED TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Andy Cotugno said that during the past year, there has been a consortium doing a special needs transit plan for the Tri-County Metropolitan region. The effort was undertaken by a group of

providers. Tri-Met was here to present it. Other participants of the effort included smaller transit districts, social service agencies and non-profit organizations that provide service and/or pay for service or do a volunteer program. In addition, the three counties, AAA and area agencies on aging were active participants. The various providers developed this overall plan. In addition, the community was well represented from a diverse set of participants including ethnic groups, elderly and handicapped groups. During the course of the yearlong effort, there were outreach efforts to get out into the broader communities. The whole process is now concluded. Mr. Cotugno introduced Bernie Bottomly and Patty Fink who would give an overview of the plan. Mr. Cotugno said that a portion of the plan would need to be adopted as an amendment to the Regional Transportation Plan. The plan goes beyond the balance of the Metro Regional Transportation Plan because of the rural territory that it covers. The rural territory is where a big part of the service improvements are called for. The overall effort was a good collaborative effort among the providers and users. They have reached the end of that process and have a plan to service the needs of future implementation and funding.

Bernie Bottomly started this project with the encouragement from the AAA in Multnomah County. There were a number of planned visions and guiding tenets developed. Mr. Bottomly gave a brief explanation of "The Tri-County elderly and Disabled Transportation Plan – Executive Summary dated June 2001 (handout).

Patty Fink handed out a set of maps ("RTP Priority Strategy," "RTP Preferred Strategy," and "Rural Preferred Plus Strategy"). Also handed out was a matrix report "Operating Cost for 2002." Mr. Bottomly referred to the map handouts. The "RTP Preferred Strategy" map was the recommendation from the Committee for changes in service. The recommendation was 1) to focus on the urban growth area as the most appropriate geographic area to provide the highest level of service, 2) to improve services in the large and small communities outside the urban growth areas and in the rural areas---but not so much as to give incentive for elderly and disabled to move farther away from the urban areas. Rather, provide a minimum level of service appropriate to the size of the community and meet basic minimum life requirements, without making it so easy to live in the more disperse population areas that we encourage people to move there, and then have to provide the service which is the most expensive type of service.

Lonnie Roberts asked, is what you described an attempt to control where people live because you don't want to provide the service? If people decide to move out of the urban growth areas, then they have to accept responsibility that there is no service out there. It's not the government's job to decide where people should live.

Birney Bottomly said one of the options the committee looked at was to extend the same level of urban service to the entire Tri-County areas. The committee, including the social service providers, Tri-Met and the elderly and disabled community, looked at that option and basically said it would be terrific if we had unlimited dollars. If there were unlimited resources, then that was the kind of system they would like to see. However, we don't have unlimited resources. Resources for transportation (at some level) compete with resources for social services. The source we primarily look to is the cigarette tax and the general fund from the State. The conclusion was that the best mix (the best allocation of resources) was to provide adequate, but

not extraordinary, service in the rural and smaller communities. In addition, focus the highest level of service where we could provide the most efficient service.

Rod Monroe asked, isn't even minimal service to those rural areas more expensive than the high level of service provided within the UGB?

Birney Bottomly explained that on a per ride basis, the farther you go from the urban center, the more expensive the ride is. For example, the difference between a fixed route ride inside an urban growth area for the elderly and disabled is about \$2.50 for a lift-type ride. A door-to-door ride is about \$18.00. The community recognized that wherever service could be provided to encourage use of fixed routes; whenever individuals in small, large or rural communities could be connected to the fixed route system---then we could provide needed transportation, reduce costs, increase efficiency and meet their transit needs.

Mr. Bottomly referred to the map "RTP Priority Strategy." This recommendation says that inside the ADA service boundary that we improve services to 20 - 24 hours per week, seven days per week for those who qualify for ADA. There are other groups of elderly and disabled who may not qualify for ADA, but still need some kind of service to meet their needs. They may need assistance to learn how to use the fixed route system. The more difficult group to serve are those who qualify under ADA but are so disabled that they may need assistance to get into the bus or van and need assistance once they reach their destination (i.e., assistance with shopping, or at the doctor's office). Other types of agencies and programs may need to become involved to provide that service. This is an issue of who is the most appropriate provider for that type of service.

Fred Hansen said that Tri-Met employees are trained to operate lifts and ensure mobility devices are properly secured. The "through door service" (actually going into the house or going into the destination) is provided by a social service. Who will supply that service, is still an issue to be addressed.

Bernie Bottomly said the plan reached a conclusion as far as recommended types of service. A cost analysis was done to determine the cost for the service. There was no conclusion that the region or inside the urban growth boundary or JPACT is responsible for that cost. It is what can we do cooperatively with the counties and state to reach these goals.

Rex Burkholder agreed that we don't want to tell people where to live, but we certainly don't want to subsidize them when they make those choices. Mr. Burkholder asked, did the group look at the land use possibilities of how do we provide, and are we providing to the disabled---housing in areas that do have services so that we don't have to think transportation? Do we have recommendations to look at our town centers and regional centers---how can we ensure that there is a sufficient supply of housing to accommodate the mobility impaired according to their condition? Are there other recommendations besides transportation, for us in terms of possible changes that would help achieve that goal?

Bernie Bottomly said the land use issue was addressed in the Executive Summary including 1) encourage elderly and disabled housing in mixed-use areas 2) provide transportation services that they use nearby, 3) better connect to fixed route system from centers where they live or go for services. This will allow for opportunity to utilize the fixed route system, as opposed to the more expensive alternatives. Recommendations are included in the report.

Mr. Bottomly said what they are going to ask JPACT to do, is to adopt the plan. The RTP amendment will roll this into the RTP---the portion that is inside the Urban Growth Boundary. We have an RTP priority that is in between the goal the committee set out and the existing system---it's in between in terms of the level of service and cost. The total additional operating requirement for the RTP priority system is about \$2.5M per year. The capital component of that is about \$1.0 – 1.5M. The “Rural Preferred Plus Strategy” was an additional piece was requested by Clackamas County to look at. The question was raised, if you had additional resources, what service would you provide to rural and small communities outside the UGB?

Bill Kennemer commented that he appreciated the process that had occurred here. It is a complicated issue and some good questions were raised. Good program ideas.

Chair Monroe thanked Mr. Bottomly for his presentation. It was noted that recommended RTP amendment language would be forwarded to JPACT in the fall.

VI. SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY

Rod Monroe reported that the South Corridor Policy Group had a meeting on June 5 and some decisions were made as to alternatives to advance into the supplemental DEIS.

Ross Roberts referred to the “South Corridor SDEIS Alternatives – Staff Recommendation to Policy Group 6/5/01 Revision” and the “South Corridor Study – JPACT Briefing” dated 6/14/01 (purple handouts). Last Tuesday, the policy group made some decisions as to what alternatives in South Corridor should be moved into the Environmental Impact Statement process. The group adopted the recommendation as stated in the packet handout. This was a significant decision. It took the project into a new phase, which will help us to determine environmental impacts of the alternatives and ultimately select a locally preferred alternative to be advanced into preliminary engineering. Ross Roberts briefly explained what was included in the staff recommendation that was adopted by the policy group. Followed by a summary of where we are and what the next steps are. He reported that one of the biggest actions that the policy took last week was to include the I-205 light rail alignment in the SDEIS.

Brian Newman said that Milwaukie was trying to schedule a town hall the last two weeks in July in order to narrow the choices for a transit center, park and ride lots and light rail stations in central Milwaukie.

Lonnie Roberts asked, is he to understand that the federal government in their transportation planning, are now considering supplementing the rail with bus service as part of the package?

Fred Hansen explained that the new starts money is where most of money will come from (as described later in the report). Essentially, there is a certain amount of money that could be used for a busway. But there is no interest from the federal government to get back into providing operating subsidies, or to do more than they do now which is provide capital under a different program for bus purchases.

Ross Roberts pointed out an error under "Milwaukie to Clackamas Regional Center Segment" in the "South Corridor Study – JPACT Briefing" dated 6/14/01. Light Rail is not an option in the Milwaukie to Clackamas regional center segment of the corridor. On the back of this report, the two light rail alignments under consideration are shown on the map. Ross Roberts added that project staff were still in the process of procuring consultants to provide assistance for the conceptual engineering and the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). That process will conclude within the month. The SDEIS will be the project's focus over the summer and into the coming months. Ross Roberts said he would return to JPACT at key points and update the committee on the project's progress.

VII. MTIP STATUS REPORT

Andy Cotugno referred to the "Help make out transportation dollars count" and "Priorities 2002 MTIP Update Public Comment Packet (handouts) that announced the public hearing meeting on Monday, June 18, 2001. Mr. Cotugno reported they are into the technical ranking step of the MTIP process. In the back of the booklet, is a first draft of the technical ranking based on adopted criteria. This is Metro staff's effort to rank the projects based on the information from each individual application. The process of consultation with the individual project sponsors is ongoing. The purpose of the public hearing meeting is to get public feedback on: 1) are we characterizing a project properly and 2) are we considering the data to properly rank the project. Just as important are administrative criteria---what other factors should be weighed in on the importance of a project, besides the strict numerical ranking. At the public meeting they are asking a few major questions: 1) do you have input on these rankings 2) are there additional factors that should be weighed? Andy Cotugno said he anticipates concluding all the data collection and ranking information within the next couple of weeks so that a first cut down to 125 – 150% level can be concluded at the next JPACT meeting.

Rod Monroe announced that the MTIP Public Meeting Open House was scheduled for June 18, 2001 at 6 p.m. Open House. He encouraged JPACT members to attend to help with this public process.

VIII. TEA-21 REAUTHORIZATION ISSUES

Andy Cotugno reported that in January, a set of priorities was adopted for the upcoming one-year appropriations process. Some of what was adopted set the stage for the longer term---six-year reauthorization bill. The appropriations bill every year deals with money issues within funding categories that are available. The six-year reauthorization bill deals with setting up those categories. What are the terms? What programs will be eligible? What sort of dollar emphasis will go into each of those funding categories? It also deals with broader policy and eligibility

issues. There's a much bigger field of issues that the six-year bill undertakes. The current six-year bill expires at the end of 2003. The new bill will be adopted during the 2003 calendar. By September 30 (end of fiscal year), it would be in place and start with 2004 for the next six-year period. The "Authorization Bill Policy and Program Issues (buff handout) attempts to layout some of the policy issues we want to weigh in on. Some of these will be developing outside our control; therefore, our agenda of issues will be a work in progress. This is an attempt to layout some of the issues that we think we need to pursue. We see this as a tool to start a dialogue with our own congressional delegation and to have them help with these issues within their own circles. This will also give us feedback on issues we may have missed, or indicate that we are headed in the wrong direction on some of these issues. In addition, a lot of people are participating from various associations (state highway transportation, transit associations, county and city associations). This is very much a work in progress. It's open for people to raise issues.

Dick Feeney further explained the intent and organization of this report. We are trying to get into dialogue with Congress about what the reauthorization should look like, and get well placed to receive money. He explained this report listed regional policies and programs that we have already talked about for a long time at Metro and JPACT. In addition, included are key initiatives. There are a number of issues that have been developed by our larger constituents i.e., ODOT, the Port of Portland and the City of Portland). Some of those issues coming forward are for the region as a whole to support. This paper identifies who in those organizations will be responsible for developing those programs for us. As we go through this, next year you may want to vote on this report. Some of you were at a meeting that Congressman Blumenhauer had initiated where he talked about this same thing---what's on your mind, what do you really want to see us do? Those kinds of conversations will be ongoing. So this is to prepare us right now for that kind of conversation. By the time you come to a vote on this in about a year, much of this will already have been a subject of much conversation. That is the purpose of bringing this report to you now, so that you can be part of it and suggest where this ought to be improved or expanded.

Fred Hansen asked, what could we expect dollar-wise in the next authorization? Dick Feeney referred to the last chart -"Next Federal Transportation Authorization: Hypothetical "Next" Project Sequence" that lists projects and costs. Our information to date, suggests we should figure about \$70M (maybe \$80M) per year for the next reauthorizing period. Somewhere between \$420 - 480M for the next two authorizing periods. Dick Feeney said that is probably not an unreasonable amount. You get to that estimation by looking at where we've gone with Interstate Max, and what kinds of projects we are thinking about getting authorized in it. Also it reflects our competitive situation with the rest of the nation. With a community this size, and a state this important---how much of someone else's money can you reasonable expect is due here?

Larry Haverkamp asked how much do you think we have to put up in matching funds? Dick Feeney said probably about a 50/50 match. However, 60/40 would be a good goal to pursue. Mr. Feeney invited everyone to become involved in adding to the tables and to become familiar with the projects listed.

Rod Monroe asked, what are the federal matching ratios for Interstate highway projects? Mr. Feeney said, 92/8. Rod Monroe said, and they're talking 50/50 for transit projects. It shows you where their priorities are.

Larry Haverkamp said that when visiting with senators last year, the message was that they had available money, but we needed matching project funds. Rod Monroe added that we have to be creative and innovative in order to keep money flowing from Washington, DC. We need one voice in the region (Washington and Oregon) in order to be successful.

Andy Cotugno said highway projects do get earmarked in the authorizing bill. The projects we ask to be earmarked from that category will be important.

Mr. Cotugno explained there are questions (actually three parts to this discussion) for the committee: 1) policy issues, 2) scheduling of the new starts category and 3) highway issues. He asked the committee whether they wanted to schedule more discussions on these issues at future JPACT meetings?

OTHER BUSINESS

Craig Pridemore reported that they had their new secretary of transportation down earlier this month. He thanked Rod Monroe for coming over to meet with Mr. McDonald.

IX. ADJOURN

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:14 a.m. Next meeting was scheduled for July 12, 2001.

Respectfully submitted,

Francine Floyd
Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING ON JUNE 14, 2001

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

AGENDA ITEM #	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT NO.
2	Minutes of May 10, 2001		JPACT Meeting Report	061401jpact-2a
3	2040 Performance Measures	6/5/01	2040 Fundamentals Approved by Metro Council Community Planning Committee	061401jpact-3a
		4/13/01	Tier Breakdown of Scored 2040 Performance Indicators (Draft)	061401jpact-3b
		Rev5/09/01	Preliminary Draft Recommendation of 2040 Performance Indicators	061401jpact-3c
4	LCDC Acknowledgement of the RTP	6/07/01	Memo from Tom Kloster to TPAC Members and Interested Parties	061401jpact-4a
		6/06/01	Supplement to Exhibit 'B' (Chapter 6 – Implementation)	061401jpact-4b
		6/13/01	Attachment 1 – Metro RTP Compliance Review Summary	061401jpact-4c
5	Tri-County Elderly and Disabled Transportation Plan	May 2001	Tri-County Elderly and Disabled Plan Update	061401jpact-5a
			Operating Cost for 2002	061401jpact-5b
		June 2001	The Tri-County elderly and Disabled Transportation Plan – Executive Summary	061401jpact-5c
			Maps (3) RTP Priority Strategy; RTP Preferred Strategy; Rural Preferred Plus Strategy	061401jpact-5d
6	South Corridor Study	6/05/01	South Corridor SDEIS Alternatives – Staff Recommendations to Policy Group (June 5 Revision)	061401jpact-6a
		6/14/01	South Corridor study – JPACT Briefing	061401jpact-6b
7	MTIP Status Report	6/12/01	Priorities 2002 MTIP Update Public Comment Packet	061401jpact-7a
8	TEA-21 Reauthorization Issues	May 2001	Authorization Bill Policy and Program Issues	061401jpact-8a