

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: November 9, 2000

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

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jon Kvistad, Chair
Serena Cruz, alternate
Rob Drake
Fred Hansen
Bill Kenemer
Jim Kight
Annette Liebe, alternate
Dave Lohman, alternate
Rod Monroe
Karl Rohde
Kay Van Sickel
Don Wagner
Ed Washington

AFFILIATION:

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

GUESTS PRESENT:

Jadual Waktu Ada
Martha Bennett
Clark Berry
David Bragdon
Victoria Brown
Judy Edwards
Ed Immel
Gary Katsion
Susie Lahsene
Stephan Lashbrook
Tony Mendoza
Ron Papsdorf
Lynn Peterson
Dave Williams
Ross Williams
Marc Zolton

AFFILIATION:

Bangladesh State Railway
City of Milwaukie
Washington County
Presiding Officer, Metro Council
Tualatin TMA/Tualatin Chamber of Commerce
Westside Transportation Alliance
ODOT - Rail
TPAC Citizen Member
Port of Portland
City of Wilsonville
Tri-Met
City of Gresham
Tri-Met
ODOT
Citizens for Sensible Transportation/CLF
Commissioner Charles Hales' Office, City of Portland

STAFF:

Andy Cotugno
Mike Hogle

Richard Brandman
John Houser

Bill Barber
Rooney Barker

SUMMARY:

The meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Chair Kvistad at 7:35 a.m.

MEETING REPORT:

Action taken: Councilor Rohde moved, with a second by Councilor Kight, to approve the meeting report of October 19, 2000. Councilor Rohde asked that his question to Councilor Monroe regarding the Bi-State Committee be included in the discussion on p. 14. The following sentence was added: Councilor Rohde asked if they were being allowed to take on so much work that it would allow them to compete with JPACT. The motion passed unanimously. (Commissioner Kennemer and Mayor Drake were not present for this vote.)

RESOLUTION NO. 00-3001 FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE FY 2000-03 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) TO INCLUDE \$3,443,122 OF CMAQ FUNDS FOR HIGH-SPEED RAIL TRACK IMPROVEMENTS IN THE PORTLAND AREA

Mr. Cotugno gave a brief explanation of the resolution, as stated in the staff report. He then introduced Mr. Ed Immel of ODOT. Mr. Immel said this is a request to match a laundry list of other funds that are available to do track and signal work in southeast Portland. ODOT has looked at the rail corridor from the Oregon/Washington border down to Eugene, and divided it up into thirteen projects; these projects are needed in order to reduce running time to one hour and 55 minutes. One project has been completed – one of the biggest bottlenecks, north of Union Station. The second biggest bottleneck is in southeast Portland. Signaling systems and tracks that only work in one direction need to be fixed as they severely limit the number of trains that can be put in that corridor. The total project expense is \$13.2 million. Of that, the Union Pacific Railroad is contributing \$5.1 million, and other funds are available from ODOT for the High-Speed program. When the project is complete, there will be a double-track, reverse-signal railroad all the way from Albina Yard to Milwaukie Avenue. The major benefits of this project are that it will allow trains to move on time, and freight trains will be able to move much faster through southeast Portland, their time possibly cut in half. The running time between Albina and Brooklyn Yards will also be reduced from approximately 37 minutes to approximately 10 minutes. This will be a major fix for the rail system in Portland.

In response to a question from Councilor Rohde regarding the project's timeline, Mr. Immel said they are in engineering now and hope to have construction started in spring 2001, taking about twelve months. The delay, he said, is the signaling parts, that the signaling industry can only move so fast. Saying he was strongly supportive of this, Mr. Hansen asked Mr. Cotugno if, when CMAQ funds are available for OTC to allocate within the region and obviously reflected in the MTIP, what would happen if there were a disagreement. Mr. Cotugno said we could reject these funds which would mean they wouldn't be able to be spent on these projects in the region. It would be a deadlock. These funds are not controlled by a formula allocation, but OTC's decision.

Commissioner Kennemer said Clackamas County was fairly excited about these upcoming improvements and the fact that they will soon have an Amtrak station in Oregon City. He said, however, that they were concerned about some serious grade crossing problems, the most

notorious being Lynnwood/Harmony with a probably \$10 million overpass price tag. He reiterated the County's support of the rail project.

Action taken: Councilor Rohde moved, with a second by Mr. Hansen, to approve Resolution No. 00-3001. The motion passed unanimously. (Mayor Drake was not present for this vote.) Chair Kvistad thanked Mr. Immel for sharing his knowledge and expertise with the committee.

RESOLUTION NO. 00-2999 FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING THE AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY DETERMINATION FOR THE 2000 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Mr. Cotugno reminded the committee that in August, when the 2000 RTP was adopted, it was subject to demonstrating that it conformed with air quality standards. This has not been submitted for approval to the federal government yet; with this resolution in place, that submission can take place. Demonstration of air quality conformity involves a number of pieces, he said, one being the estimate of vehicle emissions for different milestone years between now and 2020 to ensure that projects in the RTP will stay under the budgeted emission level assigned to the Transportation Sector of the State Implementation Plan. We also have to show we're making progress on the transportation control measures. Both those things are demonstrated in this resolution. This is the first major overhaul of RTP air quality conformity that we've done in three or four years. We've done a series of amendments over that time – Interstate MAX, Airport MAX, Washington County Commuter Rail – each one was an amendment to the old air quality conformity which was based on the RTP adopted in 1995. The new RTP 2000 is substantially different and this is the first time we've done the air quality conformity that now gives us the confidence that all those things do stay within those limits. Given the fiscally constrained level of funding in the RTP, this is a demonstration that if we build those projects that we will stay within the air quality limits. Clearly, we have adopted a plan that says we want to go farther than that, so for local purposes we've also done an analysis to ensure the priority RTP (formerly strategic) system stays within the limits as well.

We've only done the one level at the fiscally constrained level with all of those projects, and then the second level with all the additional projects associated with the priority RTP. If individual projects get funded over the next few years and need to be added to the fiscally constrained, then we'll need to determine the air quality impact of those individual projects. The system as a whole, if we do everything in the priority, would meet the air quality standards but an individual project might not.

The subarea emission estimates still need to be inserted into the plan, so Mr. Cotugno asked the committee to give staff the latitude to submit those later, for the winter carbon monoxide. He said there would be no submission to the federal government until those are included.

Councilor Monroe asked Mr. Cotugno to verify his understanding that if we did just the fiscally constrained programs, then we meet air quality standards twenty years out. If we did everything in the strategic, we meet air quality standards twenty years out. But if we did the fiscally constrained and some selective projects from the strategic, then we'd have to double check those

because what we have is a balance and some of the projects would possibly add some pollution, some would reduce pollution. If we pick and choose, we might not be in balance. Mr. Cotugno told Councilor Monroe that his understanding was correct.

Mr. Hansen said his understanding of the "extra room" in the fiscally constrained was not much, that we were just bumping against the lid. He asked if his perception was accurate. Mr. Cotugno replied that on three of the four pollutants we had a fairly good cushion, and on the fourth we didn't, but were very close (NO_x associated with summertime smog). Mr. Hansen then said that within the fiscally constrained there were some assumptions being made that there would be funds to do the projects, and some of those funds were not yet identified. Mr. Cotugno said the fiscally constrained, being very conservative, was based upon adopted state and local funding sources and an inflationary component on the federal resources, but not major increases. Of the federal resources, he said, it's based upon only a portion of the federal resources being spent on expansion. Mr. Hansen said his question was perhaps moot in the sense that there were sufficient dollars under no change whatsoever at the state or local level. His concern was that if we aren't able to make everything within the fiscally constrained system, how we would manage that relative to conformity. He asked if we would have to go back to reevaluate at period times or how it would work. Every three years it had to be redemonstrated, Mr. Cotugno said.

Councilor Washington asked what kind of public participation was received during the 30-day public comment period. He wondered who had been heard from, or if anyone had called. Mr. Hoglund said there had been a Port of Portland comment and a few questions. Councilor Washington, not meaning to be funny, asked if we had any citizens coming down and knocking on the doors. He said we always have public comment periods but does the public really comment. Mr. Hoglund said they do in other areas, but haven't in the Portland area on conformity.

Ms. Liebe said when the next conformity was done she'd like to get the subarea analysis for carbon monoxide as part of the adoption package.

Councilor Washington said he understood the process for public comment, and that many times we make a big deal of public involvement, but in many cases there is none. He said he thought there should be some other way to solicit this. We assume most people will go along but a lot of them don't. Mr. Hansen said he appreciates Councilor Washington's comments. As he's watched the public's involvement over the years, he said, he's seen the tendency for them to comment not on the conformity determination but on the issue(s) of the individual projects and their popularity or lack thereof on an ongoing basis. He said he felt this was more of a technical review, and this was a very serious issue across the nation, to ensure that if the projects aren't able to achieve conformity the whole process must begin again. Essentially EPA is the keeper of that and can veto the conformity. It becomes a big issue, but primarily as a technical review that looks at the conglomeration of all of the projects that will all come out of the fiscally constrained system.

Mr. Cotugno said the biggest reason for the public comment requirement being added, which was instigated by the air quality advocacy groups at the national level, is that the process for

estimating emissions is a very detailed one, it's difficult to penetrate, hard to break down. Only a few technicians can make the decisions and assumptions. The public can examine it, and it does get examined.

Ms. Liebe added that Metro is one of the leaders in the technical analysis process, and many advocacy groups recognize the expertise and leadership in the modeling field that Metro demonstrates.

Action taken: Ms. Liebe moved, with a second by Commissioner Kennemer, to approve Resolution No. 00-2999. The motion passed unanimously.

FY 2002-05 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP):
RECOMMENDED PROCESS FOR PUBLIC REVIEW

Mr. Cotugno said he would like to continue the discussion the committee began at their meeting last month, where TPAC was looking for feedback and direction. The MTIP issues include whether to look at a few big projects or more small projects, and whether to consider freeway oriented projects, whether to stick with the old list or open it up to new possible projects. On a few of these issues, TPAC had some recommendations, starting on page 2 of the November 2 memo to JPACT, and there were some areas where TPAC didn't have recommendations and these would need to be settled within the next few months. The memo outlined TPAC's suggestions and provided feedback to this committee. The second paragraph included the revenue estimates for the 2002-05 MTIP.

Regarding the criteria, TPAC has suggested we stay with the criteria used last time. Other factors that may be relevant but that aren't shown in the criteria need to be looked at as well, he said, such as leveraging, past commitments, etc. TPAC felt the 150% list was a reasonable starting place but not necessarily a reasonable ending place. They felt there should be some cautious consideration of additional projects rather than substituting, and allowance to some jurisdictions for submitting additional applications. The area where we still have no conclusion is big projects vs. small projects.

It was suggested at the TIP subcommittee, Mr. Hoglund added, that projects submitted for addition be limited to what's in the financially constrained RTP, unless a project has funding. Mr. Hansen said at the last discussion, he, Councilor Rohde and Commissioner Hales were concerned that more dollars would be spent to achieve the conformity determination and not actually end up in the projects. Mr. Cotugno said the staff cost of running a conformity determination is not insignificant, and Mr. Hansen said that was what he wanted to underscore. Since there are limited dollars, he wanted to make sure actual benefit was received.

Councilor Rohde said he'd put a placeholder in his mind to relook at the criteria and look at the alternative modes. Understanding that there are few dollars available that can actually go toward alternative modes in this state, he had hoped the criteria could be looked at and discussed. Mr. Cotugno said it could be brought back for discussion at the next meeting.

From the audience, Councilor Bragdon had a question to the committee regarding asking the jurisdictions if the projects on the 150% list are still what they want. Mr. Cotugno responded that once the process is adopted, that will be laid out – whatever the timelines, application procedures, criteria, etc. – whatever process this body decides. In the past, the application is required to come from the sponsoring jurisdiction and they have been required to demonstrate that they've met Metro's public involvement requirements.

Mayor Drake said the 150% list was the result of a great deal of work. It defined the region's priorities, and barring some slight modifications due to a change of something that's already on the list, he was very reluctant to open the process up again. The list wasn't that old, and he would like to stay the course.

Commissioner Cruz thought if the jurisdictions were asked to stay within some level of constraint and to reprioritize, it would not open the floodgates but would require reexamination of projects and possible reprioritization. Mr. Cotugno said this was TPAC's philosophy, but there may be changes in priorities.

Mr. Hansen said he wanted to take one step back from the projects that will have to be evaluated. He said the level of dollars needed to be pinned down, that the CMAQ dollars are clearly federally constrained and can be used only for those things that will improve air quality. For the STP dollars, which essentially are the flexible dollars, he said these have always been used for alternative transportation efforts, not necessarily road projects. Mr. Cotugno clarified that they've been used for arterial widening, freight access, bridge rehab, boulevard projects, and Mr. Hansen agreed, saying they were used for things that further the 2040 goals. He then said that even though this is a constrained setting, Mr. Cotugno had pointed out that the committee needed to look at both the federal priorities as well as whatever may be the agenda at the state level. Mr. Hansen urged the committee to not abandon the approach they've always used for STP dollars within the region, and to keep their focus on the long-term 2040 goals. He said if the broader framework is kept in mind, it will help the region get the type of projects it ought to have.

Mr. Cotugno, prompted by Councilor Rohde, addressed the Transportation Budget Review sheet (salmon colored) which the committee had requested at last month's meeting. The Budget Review sheet provided a five-year history of the different parts of the Metro Planning program with the personnel and the resources available as well. Last month, the committee looked at the Unified Work Program portion that keyed into the dollars listed in the last column on this sheet, the current fiscal year. He pointed out that the FTE (full-time employee) number has been scaled down over the past five years working on the various planning programs, and the dollars have been scaled down as well. Another question that was raised, and he said he doesn't have the answer ready yet, was how much was being spent on projects on the ground vs. how much was being spent on planning, preliminary engineering and environmental work that was intended to get projects ready. Mr. Hansen asked if the cutting back meant losing the capacity to do the quality of work that's always been done. Mr. Cotugno said his staff hadn't run into that problem yet as junior staff was where the cuts were, but he was worried that the Materials and Services were very thin. Long-term growth would be limited, however, by losing junior staff.

Chair Kvistad briefly mentioned the November 9th memo sent to committee members and their alternates, reminding those present to respond as to their preference in how they receive their agenda material each month.

TRI-MET TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT PROGRAM SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT

Mr. Tony Mendoza of Tri-Met opened his presentation by saying two years ago there were questions on what was going on in Transportation Demand Management, so now JPACT and TPAC are updated approximately every six months. A copy of Mr. Mendoza's presentation is included in this record.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 a.m. by Vice-Chair Rod Monroe.

Respectfully submitted,

Rooney Barker
Recording Secretary