

MEETING NOTES

DATE OF MEETING: February 8, 2001

GROUP/SUBJECT: Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rex Burkholder, Vice-Chair
Rob Drake
Charlie Hales
Fred Hansen
Larry Haverkamp
Bill Kennemer
Mary Legry, alternate
Annette Liebe, alternate
Dave Lohman, alternate
Rod Park
Craig Pridemore
Lonnie Roberts
Roy Rogers
Karl Rohde
Kay Van Sickel

AFFILIATION:

Metro
City of Beaverton, representing Cities of Washington County
City of Portland
Tri-Met
City of Gresham, representing Cities of Multnomah County
Clackamas County
Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Port of Portland
Metro
Clark County
Multnomah County
Washington County
City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas County
Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)

GUESTS PRESENT:

Martha Bennett
Bernie Bottomly
Steve Dotterer
Dick Feeney
Patty Fink
Gary Katsion
Suzanne Kunse
Stephan Lashbrook
Beckie Lee
Kathy Lehtola
Tom B. Markgraf
Tom Mills
Brian Newman
Robert Paine
Ron Papsdorf
Lynn Peterson
John Rist
Karen Schilling
Patti Seastrom
Deb Wallace
Theresa Weil
Dave Williams
Ross Williams

AFFILIATION:

City of Milwaukie
Tri-Met
City of Portland
Tri-Met
Tri-Met
Citizen TPAC Member
Representative Darlene Hooley's Office
City of Wilsonville
Multnomah Commissioner Serena Cruz's Office
Washington County
Representative Earl Blumenauer's Office
Tri-Met
City of Milwaukie
Multnomah County
City of Gresham
Tri-Met
Clackamas County
Multnomah County, TPAC Member
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Washington State Dept. of Transportation
Washington State Dept. of Transportation
ODOT
Citizens for Sensible Transportation/CLF

STAFF:

Andy Cotugno
Sharon Kelly

Richard Brandman
Rooney Barker

Mike Hoglund

SUMMARY:

The meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Vice-chair Burkholder at 7:30 a.m.

Vice-chair Burkholder introduced himself to the committee and said would be conducting the meeting this month in Chair Monroe's absence. He then introduced Councilor Larry Haverkamp from the City of Gresham who has taken the seat representing the Cities of Multnomah County. Councilor Brian Newman, the newly appointed alternate representative for the Cities of Clackamas County was also introduced, as well as visitors Tom Markgraf of Representative Earl Blumenauer's Office and Suzanne Kunse of Representative Darlene Hooley's Office.

There were no meeting notes to approve.

RESOLUTION APF (Agenda Placement Form) NO. 1501 – FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING PORTLAND REGIONAL FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES FOR FFY 2001 APPROPRIATIONS

Action taken: Commissioner Hales moved, with a second by Mayor Drake, to approve the resolution.

Mr. Cotugno called the committee's attention to the latest (orange) version of the resolution (which updated the yellow version sent in the agenda packet) which included TPAC's recommendations. He said this position paper was relative to this year's Appropriations Bill, and was tailored to the types of programs available for earmarking as well as to the size of projects Congress tends to earmark. In addition, he said, this paper reflected the projects that are clearly ready to go in the timeframe requested. The worst thing this body could do would be to ask for the money and then not spend it in time. With those caveats, he then briefly addressed each project outlined in the paper (in Exhibit A).

Responding to a request from Mr. Hansen to please put this in context with all the other projects for which the region has requested funding, Mr. Cotugno said New Starts is the big money that comes into the region and only comes through an earmarking process – that process happens in Congress when you've gone through the administrative procedures (EIS, Ranking, etc.). Those are the big dollars. The transit categories are additional, and also flow through a formula available to transit districts for routine projects. The majority of federal highway funds are not formula and are not earmarked. All highway categories add up to maybe \$10 to \$15 million. The total federal highway funds that come to the states is maybe \$300 million, of which we receive maybe \$5 to \$10 million. The MTIP process is involved in allocating that amount to about \$25 million.

There was a discussion in which Councilor Haverkamp suggested the possible removal of the words "for Preliminary Engineering" from the first bullet on p. 3 of 6, under D., Regional Highway Projects, in Exhibit A. Councilor Haverkamp said he'd like more wiggle room. Some of the committee felt it best to keep it as written, not to change words that have been traditionally used. Councilor Haverkamp said he would speak with his staff and address this later in the meeting.

Councilor Park said there were some concerns brought up by the Metro Council Community Planning Committee, the first of which was corrected or adjusted – it is the partnership between Metro and JPACT. The second was concern about the appropriateness of having the Columbia River Channel project in this particular document. Specifically, Councilor Park asked for clarification as to exactly what the following sentence from p. 3 meant: "Whether the sponsoring ports will seek additional construction appropriations in FFY 2002 depends upon the schedule for compiling the Biological Opinion." He wondered why a statement like that would be in here. Mr. Lohman said the Port, the Corps, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, and NMFS count on the Biological Opinion and they have asked that it be completed by the end of June and have asked for a regular update to make sure it stays on course. Whether that happens or not is a question, but if it does, the Port would be in a position to move forward to seek further funds. The money appropriated last year to start the construction will be held up until the Biological Opinion is complete.

Mr. Hansen asked, hypothetically, the Biological Opinion came in and indicated that the project could not proceed, would the Port then not try to seek a Congressional override of that opinion. Mr. Lohman said yes, if they couldn't proceed he didn't think there would be any way to get a congressional override.

Councilor Park asked if perhaps the sentence was placed in the document to ensure some environmental groups that the Port wouldn't proceed until that occurred. Mr. Lohman said he was not involved in crafting this particular paragraph, so could not respond. He said it might be there to provide reassurance because obviously the Port would not be able to proceed until all the environmental requirements were met. In that sense, he said, it was unnecessary but perhaps provided insurance.

Councilor Park then asked whether this document was the appropriate vehicle for this request since it would be from a different pot of money. Commissioner Hales said most of these listed projects were from different pots, but they represented the region's transportation priorities regardless of the source of funding. Mr. Lohman agreed. Councilor Roberts stated that the dredging was extremely important to this region and he agreed it needed to be done, but asked if these funds weren't used for this project, what they would be used for. Mr. Hansen said he was supportive of the language in the paper, that this committee had always taken a broad sense of their projects and that since this was a high priority last year, the committee needed to keep the congressional delegation informed on what they're doing today, and so he thought it very appropriate to leave the project in.

Commissioner Hales said the clarity of this body's presentation would matter quite a bit; the congressional delegation has lots of other things to do, so the clearer our request is, the better off we will be.

Responding to a comment from Councilor Haverkamp, Commissioner Hales cautioned the members that if they weren't going to build a project, do not ask for it to be requested, and to let the committee know ahead of time so they don't go back to D.C. and ask for the money.

Councilor Park, on p. 3, D. Regional Highway Projects, brought up the question of the appropriateness of the Preliminary Engineering for the Sunrise Corridor. There had been a motion in the Community Planning Committee to withdraw that portion, but after discussion that motion was withdrawn. He asked if the Clackamas County members would speak to the appropriateness of this item. Councilor Burkholder added that the question, as he heard it, was were we ready to go with it, was this the time.

Commissioner Kennemer said their point was well taken, but he felt this was not the time to have a full discussion. Briefly, he said, under the 2040 Plan Clackamas County is expected to have very substantial urban expansion. They already have a very congested Sunnyside area. The county's new policy of concurrency (so as not to repeat the mistake of Sunnyside) was that they won't approve urban zoning unless they can support it with infrastructure. The time span to get the Sunrise Corridor operational is of such a long nature that they need to put it on the table right now; it's big and it will take time. Also, he said, they have other issues to deal with such as the hobs/housing balance, which will mean more transportation issues. The whole process of trying to bring the inadequate infrastructure of Clackamas County up to livable standards is why they're also pushing so hard on the South Corridor project.

Mr. Hansen reminded the committee that, while this discussion was appropriate and informative, they all recognize that this is a process of give and take. He felt it critical to acknowledge that the reason they've been able to have such a strong voice in Washington, D.C., was that when they're all there, they speak with one voice. He said he speaks as strongly as in Washington as Commissioner Kennemer on the Clackamas County projects and not just when everyone's in the same room but privately as well. Some of these projects weren't necessarily his priorities, but when the committee reaches agreement they all need to say that's what they're there for. He concluded by saying he felt it appropriate to leave the PE for the Sunrise Corridor in the request. Councilor Park said the Metro Community Planning Committee's intent was to ask questions, to be more active and to make sure transportation planning and growth management were occurring together. Mr. Cotugno asked if JPACT wanted a presentation on the Sunnyside/Sunrise/Damascus area to understand the broader area UGB development; saying that Sunrise doesn't stand by itself. Mayor Drake said no, he felt it necessary to trust Clackamas County, that they were doing what they wanted to do and he didn't feel the need to delve into the specifics of their business. He recognized that their need was great and expressed confidence in them. Clackamas County agreed that a presentation was not necessary.

Action taken: The motion to adopt Resolution APF No. 1501, as amended, passed unanimously. Councilor Haverkamp said he would withdraw his question regarding the possible removal of the words “for Preliminary Engineering” from the Regional Highway Projects on p. 3.

ELDERLY AND DISABLED TRANSIT UPDATE – PROGRAM PROPOSALS; LETTER OF SUPPORT TO OREGON LEGISLATURE

Mr. Hansen gave the committee a brief overview of the Tri-County Elderly and Disabled Transportation Plan, beginning with the 1999 Legislature providing \$19 million in statewide funding. He pointed out the tri-county area plan, and said one of the things the Elderly and Disabled Committee felt very strongly about was that there should be a bigger picture of the needs within not only the UGB but in the entire three-county area, as well. Some of the state’s Special Transportation Fund authorized looking at a comprehensive needs assessment in a way that had not been done before. Tri-Met offered to take the lead and provide staff to do the study. Mr. Hansen introduced Patty Fink, who presented an update from the committee (a copy of which is included in the record).

There was discussion on the amount of service and costs, comparing the existing system to Strategy A (the Elderly and Disabled Committee’s recommendation) and then to Strategies B & C. There were questions regarding cost per ride and cost efficiencies. Mr. Bottomly interjected that the matrix showed expanding the system in outlying areas where efficiencies were harder to come by. There are about 65,000 elderly and disabled people living within walking distance of an existing fixed route system, he said, and the committee focused on the challenge of how to get them to use fixed route systems which cost far less per ride than a door-to-door system (such as the lift system).

Mayor Drake thought the legislators would dig their heels in on providing funding, and suggested that anything the Elderly and Disabled Committee could do to further explain their case would increase their chance of success. He said this program was a political football the last time the legislature looked at it and he didn’t think the elderly and disabled deserved that.

Councilor Rohde questioned the second page of the draft letter that JPACT was being asked to approve, and asked if the first full sentence on that page, encouraging the legislature to take the opportunity to expand funding, meant that we would ask for identified sources or was it a plea. Mr. Bottomly replied that the Governor’s budget proposed a reduction over the last biennium from \$19 million to \$18.2 million, statewide. The message to them is that we appreciate being included this time as we’re not starting from \$0, but if they can bump it up to the full \$19 million, it would be appreciated. The \$19 million allocation is statewide, he said, and this region received approximately 40 percent of the statewide total.

Another discussion began comparing Strategies B and C to Strategy A; Vice-chair Burkholder intervened, saying Ms. Fink was interrupted in the middle of her presentation and since the Elderly and Disabled Committee’s recommendation was Strategy A, he asked that the committee let her finish, which she did.

Ms. Liebe said she saw two requests of JPACT from the committee: to ask the legislature to continue funding at the same level as last time around, and to endorse Strategy A. She then asked if JPACT had seen this recommendation prior to this meeting; Vice-chair Burkholder explained that, although it had been scheduled previously, this was the first meeting where it was presented.

Commissioner Rogers said he thought that people chose where to live, and some of them made the choice of not living within the service boundary. Was it then incumbent upon those who formed the transit district and pay transit taxes to provide some sort of funding for those who chose to live outside transit district. Should we be considering providing urban services outside the urban boundary, he asked.

Mr. Bottomly said they struggled with that exact issue and what the correct balance should be. The committee makeup is primarily social service providers and their approach was that they want the program to reflect the region's strategy of land use and development. He felt Strategy A struck a good balance.

Vice-chair Burkholder reiterated the two issues requested in the draft letter, as pointed out by Ms. Liebe: to approve Strategy A and to approve sending the letter of endorsement.

Commissioner Kennemer had no objection to doing this, and felt it was appropriate, and then asked what other packages this body was suggesting go before the legislature. Mr. Cotugno replied that that information wasn't available now. Mr. Hansen reminded them that although Tri-Met was providing this presentation, it was not a Tri-Met request, they were only the messenger. He suggested each member check with their own elderly and aging services staff, particularly if they had a different view or concern, and that they work with their representatives.

Action taken: Commissioner Kennemer moved, with a second by Mayor Drake, to approve the recommended Strategy A as consistent with Metro's 2040 Plan and also approve sending the letter of support to the Governor and legislature in support of funding for elderly and disabled transportation.

Mr. Cotugno said this committee's questions raised about Strategies B and C were really the crux of the issue. The elderly and disabled community asks why they can't have the service everyone else has. Strategies B and C speak to that, but they are too expensive. That's why that service isn't provided. Strategy A, the recommendation, does involve an increase in service to some extent to these smaller communities outside the transit service district. The issue that comes next is how to pay for it. Forty million dollars for Strategy A is good, cost effective service for today. He thought the letter to the legislature should be more explicit and say thank you for the proposal in the Governor's budget for \$18.2 million but it sure would be nice if we could have \$19 million to get us partway towards Strategy A. He said he would be more specific in the letter and suggested a friendly amendment to tighten the language.

Councilor Park said he would support the motion but thought Commissioner Rogers had a valid point, and said he would like to continue discussion on this at a later time. Mr. Hansen said aging was a fundamental part of the elderly area and that needed a debate. Councilor Burkholder added that ensuring that housing would be provided in close proximity to transit service would be another issue to discuss in the future.

Commissioner Kennemer and Mayor Drake said they agreed to include tightening the language of the letter in their motion.

Action taken: Voting in favor of approving Strategy A and sending a letter of support (with amended language) – Mayor Drake, Councilor Park, Commissioner Hales, Mr. Hansen, Commissioner Kennemer, Ms. Legry, Ms. Liebe, Commissioner Pridemore, Commissioner Roberts, Commissioner Rogers, Councilor Rohde, and Ms. Van Sickle (12). Abstaining – Councilor Haverkamp (1). Mr. Lohman was not present for this vote. As Vice-chair and since there was not a tie vote, Councilor Burkholder did not vote. The motion passed.

WASHINGTON LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

Ms. Legry briefed the committee on the Blue Ribbon Commission, formed in 1998 by the Washington State legislature to look at transportation issues. The commission is composed of 46 members with the emphasis on people from business and environment as well as local jurisdictions to have an outside view. The commission is totally independent, even to having their own staff. They were asked to look at new approaches, constraints, and things that are in the way of making improvements to how Washington does business now. It was not business as usual, she said. One of the main things they are looking at is that it should not be up to individual jurisdictions to solve their transportation problems, but there is a big emphasis on regional discussions, regional decision making and regional funding. This means the counties and the state will possibly put their decisions and funds together. It may not be happening yet, but you will see the shape of how they're going to approach things in the future, she said. They're trying to address what they call the crisis of competence, the view of the general public, meaning that the public doesn't believe it when a jurisdiction says it doesn't have the money for a project; they're trying to find a way to approach this. Some of the commission's recommendations address efficiencies and services within agencies. They very much tried to tie these to benchmarks so as to say we're trying, we're giving you service, we're getting things paved, etc.

Another emphasis they're looking at, she said, is can they have a more private sector approach to things, can they have more private sector actual delivery of the services. That would involve changes in union contracts, changes in contracting out, some fairly major changes. This has resulted in 27 bills having been introduced into the Washington Legislature early on, and they expect to consolidate them into fewer than that. Regionalization could result, she added, with providing them with some sort of council where decisions will be made, but with no new bureaucracy or governmental structural redundancy.

She then referred the committee to the January 10th memo from Don Wagner, which listed the commission's recommendations on six critical elements, a closer look at regional empowerment, and a summary of their recommendations. She said they would report back later this year on what happens in their legislative session.

PORTLAND OZONE CONTINGENCY PLAN AND STATUS

Due to time constraints, this agenda item was postponed to the next meeting.

Vice-chair Burkholder reminded the committee that because of the Washington, D.C. trip March 6-8 that the next meeting would be March 15th. He then invited the committee to the groundbreaking for the 9:30 a.m. Oregon Convention Center expansion across the street.

Vice-chair Burkholder then welcomed a special guest, former Metro Councilor Ed Washington. Mr. Cotugno presented Mr. Washington with a framed "Walter Richfield" photograph, signed with well wishes by the committee members and many Metro staff, thanking him for his years of distinguished service on behalf of JPACT and the region. Mr. Washington thanked everyone, saying he appreciated the recognition and that he had enjoyed serving with them all. He was enjoying his retirement, he said, and he wished them well, adding that with all the hands around their table, they'll get it all done. He was resoundingly applauded.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:58 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rooney Barker
Recording Secretary