

## MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: July 13, 2000

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: AFFILIATION:

Jon Kvistad, Chair	Metro
Rob Drake	City of Beaverton, representing Cities of Washington County
Andy Ginsburg	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Charlie Hales	City of Portland
Fred Hansen	Tri-Met
Sharron Kelley	Multnomah County
Bill Kennemer	Clackamas County
Jim Kight	City of Troutdale, representing Cities of Multnomah County
Dave Lohman	Port of Portland
Rod Monroe	Metro
Royce Pollard	City of Vancouver
Karl Rohde	City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas County
Roy Rogers	Washington County
Kay Van Sickel	Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
Don Wagner	Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
Ed Washington	Metro

GUESTS PRESENT:

David Bragdon	Presiding Officer, Metro Council
Susan McLain	Metro Council
Rod Park	Metro Council
Steve Dotterer	City of Portland
John Rosenberger	Washington County
Kathy Lehtola	Washington County
Steve Kelly	Washington County
Pat Colmeyer	Neil Goldschmidt, Inc.
Mike Collmeyer	1000 Friends of Oregon
Bob Stacey	Tri-Met
Bernie Bottomly	Tri-Met
Lynn Peterson	Tri-Met
John Rist	Clackamas County
Dean Lookingbill	Southwest Washington RTC
Jim Howell	Association of Oregon Rail & Transit Advocates (AORTA)
Martha Bennett	City of Milwaukie
Ron Papsdorf	City of Gresham
Dave Williams	Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
Bob Duehnig	Oregon Health Sciences University (OHSU)
Karen Schilling	Multnomah County
Paul Silver	City of Wilsonville

STAFF:

Andy Cotugno  
Tom Kloster  
Ted Leybold

Mike Hoglund  
Kim White  
Rooney Barker

Ross Roberts  
John Ottomanelli

SUMMARY:

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

MEETING REPORT:

Action taken: The meeting report of June 8, 2000, was moved for approval by Mayor Drake, with a second by Councilor Kight. The motion passed unanimously.

RESOLUTION 00-2972B – FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE FOR THE WILSONVILLE TO BEAVERTON COMMUTER RAIL STUDY

Ross Roberts briefed the committee on the project's development and how this resolution would be the step that moves the project forward into the project's next stage. There were no questions from the committee.

Action taken: Commissioner Kennemer moved, with a second by Councilor Washington, to approve Resolution No. 00-2972B. The motion passed unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 00-2978 – FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE PORTLAND AREA AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY DETERMINATION FOR AMENDMENT OF THE 1995 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND THE FY 2000 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO INCLUDE THE WILSONVILLE/ BEAVERTON COMMUTER RAIL

Mr. Cotugno explained that this supplemental agenda item (faxed to the committee after their agenda packets had been mailed) accompanied Resolution 00-2972B (above). In order to have the Wilsonville to Beaverton Commuter Rail project approved it also must be demonstrated that it conforms with air quality standards. This resolution does that, based on the analysis included in the staff report that estimates the change in emissions that implementing this project would produce. In doing that, it's required to demonstrate that for a series of benchmark years, approximately every five years that reduction take place, and that the reduction stays within the budgeted emissions amount that has been set aside for transportation purposes. The public comment period on this will not close until August 8<sup>th</sup>, but this committee's approval is requested, contingent upon receiving no substantive comments from that public comment period. If there are substantive comments received, then those will have to be taken up in a follow-on to be recorded when it's finally adopted. Assuming there are none, it would be considered for adoption by the Metro Council August 10<sup>th</sup>, and then forwarded to the FTA and DEQ for their

approval. If there are substantive comments, there is an option of either holding it over for the next JPACT meeting for consideration of the comments, or trying to connect with a conference call to resolve the comments. Mr. Cotugno asked the committee for input on this.

In preparation for the next Transportation Planning Committee, Councilor Monroe asked Mayor Drake and Commissioner Rogers if there was any significant or organized opposition that they were aware of to the Commuter Rail project in Washington County. Commissioner Rogers said he had not heard anything. Mayor Drake added that the City of Beaverton earlier in the year had received public comments that were strongly in favor of the Beaverton Transit Center alignment, and he thought there was only one comment looking for something other than rail, with no further clarification. When Beaverton had their Council decision-making hearing, no one showed up against or wrote in to comment against.

Action taken: Commissioner Rogers moved, with a second by Mayor Drake to approve Resolution No. 00-2978. The motion passed unanimously.

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE 2000 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN;  
AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 96-647C AND ORDINANCE NO. 97-715B 00-869A.

Mr. Cotugno said this ordinance (00-869A) was to adopt RTP and meet state Transportation Planning Rule requirements, while the resolution (00-2969A) was to adopt the same RTP and meet the federal transportation requirements. The two separate actions were proposed because of the two separate approval processes. He explained that it's done this way to assure that if one instrument were held up, i.e., if there were an appeal from the land use point of view on the state side, the funding flow on the federal side would not be jeopardized. Any change along the way to one instrument would affect the other and would need to be reconciled.

Chair Kvistad said the committee first would address the public comments received before addressing the ordinance or resolution.

Mr. Cotugno told the committee that the Metro Council public hearing on June 29<sup>th</sup> concluded the 45-day public comment period on the RTP. The first reading of the ordinance took place at this council meeting. The memo to JPACT from Mr. Cotugno of June 29<sup>th</sup> regarding TPAC Recommendations on RTP Public Comments (ivory) included a summary of the written and transcribed final public comments in Attachment 1 to the memo and the accompanying TPAC recommendations for amendments. It was pointed out that in Attachment 1, the comments were organized into Discussion Items and Consent Items. Staff had summarized all the comments into this packet together with the TPAC recommendations. Most of the comments received, staff feels, are technical in nature or not of large regional significance, so those are proposed to this committee as Consent Items (Part 2), and are the major part of Attachment 1. The first three comments TPAC set out as Discussion Items, and associated with some of the comments received are additional comments received, one from DEQ on parking and another from Mayor Drake.

Referring to the single sheet (ivory) with the Proposed Discussion Items identified by TPAC, Mr. Cotugno gave a quick synopsis of the three comments staff had summarized together with the TPAC recommendations. The first was the comment from Sherwood that related to the proposed Tualatin/Sherwood connector from I-5 to 99W that's already in the RTP. This comment proposes that UGB issues that affect Sherwood be addressed in conjunction with determining the alignment of the connector, and those two should be coordinated with one another. TPAC suggested additional language to acknowledge the connection, and agreed with the comment.

The second comment, from Washington County with a supplemental letter from the City of Beaverton on behalf of the Washington County Coordinating Committee, asked for a six-month delay in adoption of the RTP to allow for consideration of four items, as set out in their letter. Mr. Cotugno said that TPAC was encouraged by the attention this is getting from the business community and they agreed that a process should be undertaken with that business community to address this, but recommended that the RTP be adopted at this time.

The most important recommendation of TPAC was that now that the business community is engaged and interested in addressing these issues, TPAC recommends that they be taken up on their offer and be actively engaged in these issues.

The third comment was a request from FHWA to more clearly distinguish between which parts of the RTP meet federal requirements and which parts meet state requirements. Essentially, Mr. Cotugno said, there are two levels of investment laid out in the RTP. The strategic (or priority) component of the RTP is the level of investment that's needed to implement all of the land use plans, that's the level of investment that complements 2040. This would meet the state requirements for land use and transportation. Conversely, the federal requirement is that there be a fiscally constrained RTP that is a fairly conservative estimate of what resources are expected to be available and to demonstrate that, given those resources, air quality standards can still be met. This needs to be more clearly established. The FHWA supports the distinction between the two, but they want a better clarification so TPAC has suggested revisions to address this. TPAC approved an expanded explanation to be included in the Preface and Introduction portions of the plan.

The DEQ comment of July 12<sup>th</sup>, which did not go through TPAC, and which is the fourth comment presented for today's discussion, addresses an associated issue (not the RTP but the ordinance that would adopt the RTP) which is the proposed amendment to the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP) on parking related standards. The parking related requirement is not in the RTP but is in the UGMFP. Staff has proposed amendments to the UGMFP because there are two additional state Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) requirements that weren't picked up. In order to meet the TPR fully, those two additional items must be included. In the Parking, Title 2, amendment are those two requirements to provide for residential parking permit programs in situations where they're needed to manage overflow parking surrounding business districts; not to establish them, but to establish where, why and when they would be established. Second, when the three-acre or larger parking lots are built, that they include street light features in order to at some time in the future provide for better street connectivity. This actually relates to a deletion from the Parking title that is recommended

as part of the Title 2 amendment. Most of the local governments have now adopted the set of ratios that were set out when Title 2 was adopted in 1995. These ratios set out the minimums and maximums for the number of parking spaces in new development. Associated with that, there is also required a reporting mechanism to report back to Metro on how many parking spaces were actually being filled. That requirement is not actually in the TPR, so it's being recommended that it be dropped. DEQ has indicated that it can't unilaterally be dropped because it's not just part of the RTP; the RTP is now part of their state implementation plan for air quality purposes, so if it were to be dropped, a request would have to be submitted to have that done as part of the state TPR. The choice here is that it not be changed, which means it's not dropped, or it's recognized that a change needs to be applied for before that can come into effect.

Chair Kvistad asked if any members wished to move any item from the Consent List to the Discussion List, or if anyone had anything of import beyond what has just been discussed.

Commissioner Kennemer said he thought there was a technical issue on **Comments 7** (p. 4), **120** (p. 34) and **159** (p. 41) on the Consent List. These were placed onto the Discussion List.

Action taken: Fred Hansen moved, with a second by Commissioner Kennemer, to approve the Consent List, with the above three items removed. The motion passed unanimously.

In discussion, Commissioner Kennemer's issues were addressed first. In **Comment 7**, he said, the mode split issue was problematic for Clackamas County, that it was unrealistic and not achievable. Even with an adjustment down, his staff told him it would still take a 300% increase in transit to achieve that modified, lower goal. It's fine to set lofty goals, he said, but at some point reality needs to be looked at in what is achievable and not set such unrealistically high goals that they can't be attained. Making the jurisdictions stretch is good, and he wasn't recommending any changes to this comment, but he wanted to express his concern that caution be used when setting these goals. It's important not to give the illusion of mode splits that aren't achievable. If they're achievable, he has no problem with them.

Mr. Hansen said he thought a three-fold increase at the Clackamas Town Center would not have been too far off from where they'd hoped to get. Mr. Cotugno agreed that the goals were aggressive, but said the systems were designed in the body of the RTP based upon the demand expected to serve, and the forecast of transit ridership and mode split that is expected would result if that system is built. They are based upon what is expected to happen, and they aren't reaching that lofty goal. The actual planning for facilities is based upon what we expect to see, but they're intended to say let's keep trying to move toward that goal – let's design the system to get us toward that goal. Once we design the system, arriving at how many vehicles are needed, lanes needed, etc., will be based upon the demand actually seen. He said he thought the plan was being realistic on what we could get to, but it was also useful to set that target out there and to continue to stretch in that direction. Third, a sort of recycling process will happen when local plans get implemented. They'll provide an opportunity for this committee to go back and revisit some of those in looking at how well you did. During that reexamination, if you believe it really is too aggressive, that is the opportunity to change those. Or there's the notion of leaving them there and keep trying to stretch.

Mayor Drake addressed Commissioner Kennemer, telling him that in looking at Clackamas County's Regional Center plan it's hard to believe from what's out there currently today that, if the full plan were implemented, that they couldn't achieve that kind of growth. Commissioner Kennemer said he didn't mean to imply that Clackamas County couldn't do the 300%, although that would be a challenge, and added that he thought the South Corridor Plan, depending upon what it was, would probably do that. The problem he saw was that the goal was set at higher even than that. He said Clackamas County was seriously committed to doing everything they could, but wanted to state this caution.

Both **Comments 120** (p. 34) and **159** (p. 41) are related, he said, in that Clackamas County is particularly concerned about the jobs/housing balance. He said they thought they had a problem in meeting both the revenue and economic issues as well as the transportation issues in the County. What concerned him was the TPAC recommendation on **Comment 120** that said the appropriate place for discussion is during adoption process for the Unified Work Program. That program for the year 2000, however, has already been adopted. If there's some way to amend it, he said he'd like to do that. Clackamas County is involved in an intensive land use discussion called Complete Communities Clackamas County, which they thought would have a lot of bearing on decisions of where they'll locate jobs land as well as housing land, and will have recommendations to help in future decisions for urban growth.

Mr. Cotugno said the policy issues that this Comment raised about the importance of addressing jobs in the Clackamas County area, particularly in the Clackamas County area east of the river and on out through Damascus, is acknowledged in the RTP. There are a number of sections that deal with both the urban reserve areas and the general Clackamas County areas. With the jobs/housing imbalance, and even with substantial transportation improvements from which there is a significant exodus of traffic from Clackamas County toward Multnomah County and Washington County, the road system can't support that load of traffic. That clearly is called out as an issue that needs to be addressed in this RTP, and this issue has been acknowledged on both the land use side and the transportation side (on p. 6-40 and p. 6-41 in the RTP document). Relating to the Work Program, Mr. Cotugno explained that there is a commitment in it this year to address the issues in this area. There is funding in the Work Program and ODOT has funding for the County in the Work Program, so there's a substantial commitment from Metro and ODOT to help address this issue. Commission Kennemer said that since this is probably Clackamas County's top regional concern, he wanted to be sure everyone knew this was a priority concern for them.

Action taken: Commissioner Kennemer moved, with a second by Councilor Rohde, to approve **Comments 7, 120 and 159** as submitted by TPAC. The motion passed unanimously.

## DISCUSSION ITEMS

There was no discussion on **Comment 1**.

Action taken: Commissioner Kelley moved, with a second by Commissioner Kennemer, to approve Discussion Item, **Comment 1**. The motion passed unanimously.

**Comment 3** was taken under consideration next. There was no discussion.

Action taken: Councilor Washington moved, with a second by Mayor Drake, to approve Discussion Item, **Comment 3**. The motion passed unanimously.

Before considering **Comment 2**, the committee discussed the July 12<sup>th</sup> letter to Mayor Ogden from member Andrew Ginsburg of DEQ. Mr. Ginsburg summarized his comment referring to the reporting requirement that goes along with maximum parking ratios, which is part of the Ozone Maintenance Plan in the federally approved state implementation plan. He said that even though it's not required under the TPR now, it's still helpful in making sure that progress is being made in implementation of the maximum parking ratios which are important in the maintenance plan. When the **D.1.** and **D.2.** subsections of the Title 2 Parking Requirements were looked at, DEQ thought that **D.2.** was particularly important because it tracks variances to the maximum parking ratios, and if there is no handle on how many variances are being handed out, there's no way to tell how well the implementation is going. DEQ thought **D.2.** would trigger the requirement for modifying the transportation control measures in the Maintenance Plan. **D.1.** probably wouldn't trigger it but DEQ thought that was a good idea for the reporting information it provided, if it wasn't a tremendous burden to locals.

When DEQ developed the Maintenance Plan, they included some of the specific transportation control measures in it, including the maximum parking ratios, recognizing that there probably would be a need over time to change those. The process for amending the state Implementation Plan is very cumbersome, and the alternative method they came up with is more streamlined but still fairly cumbersome. His basic question was whether the proposal was to remove the reporting of **D.1.** and **D.2.** just because they weren't required and for streamlining, or was there a strong need to remove them.

Chair Kvistad explained that the language Mr. Ginsburg referred to was in **Attachment 4** of the large ivory-colored packet, under **3.07.220 – Performance Standard, D.1. and 2** (the language that has been deleted by ~~strikeout~~ and replaced by new, underlined language in **D**. Mr. Ginsburg was requesting that the stricken language be added back in.

Mr. Cotugno said he heard Mr. Ginsburg say that he would like to keep **D.2.**, but it was not as critical to keep **D.1.** He said it had been proposed for removal because reporting requirements for the local governments really is a burden, and if they don't have to do it they won't, but the extra reporting requirement, to go out and count spaces, is a fairly cumbersome task. His sense on **D.2.**, he said, was that it wasn't that difficult as it was reporting what happens during the permit process. He asked the members how they felt about **D.2.**, saying he felt it made sense to keep **D.2.** but strike **D.1.** Councilor Jim Kight agreed. Generally, the members nodded their heads in agreement. Mr. Ginsburg said as long as DEQ received the information they need, and since they currently receive information from Metro's parking surveys, DEQ would not really lose anything except timeliness on this compromise.

Action taken: Commissioner Hales moved, with a second by Councilor Monroe, to restore **D.2.** in **Attachment 4, under 3.07.220 – Performance Standard, D. 1. and 2.** Mr. Hansen said he assumed this motion included rewording so it would read correctly. That was a given, Chair Kvistad said. Councilor Monroe said there was considerable discussion of this issue at the July 12<sup>th</sup> Transportation Planning Committee, and there was considerable discomfort on the part of several Councilors to this deletion; an approval of this motion would comfort those Councilors to have this language reinserted.

Commissioner Kennemer said he felt this was an onus on Clackamas County, but said he wasn't prepared to comment on it right now. Consequently, he was not prepared to support the motion at this time; he needed to speak with his land use staff before he could do that.

Mayor Ogden, Chair of MPAC, was invited by Chair Kvistad to address the committee. Mayor Ogden said that MPAC's discussion of this (at their July 12<sup>th</sup> meeting) was that they didn't want to abandon the notion of keeping track of what was being done. In the general sense, the attitude was for them to not try to solve this or adopt it right then, but thought there must be a way to do it that would not be onerous, that would give the information needed. There was a suggestion by Gresham, he said, of a different strategy and MPAC decided to set the decision aside in order to work on a good way to accomplish the objective. He said they spoke more to **D.1.** than **D.2.** However, he continued, if this committee is going to take the time to come up with a different approach on **D.1.**, maybe it can accomplish the **D.2.** part at the same time.

Mr. Hansen and Mr. Cotugno reminded Mayor Ogden that at this point, this committee's motion was on the table, and that they were taking action on it.

Commissioner Hales said the language was general enough that staff at the local level could figure out a methodology that worked. Everyone was subject to the regional ratios, every project, therefore, was subject to the regional ratios; on the variance and land use decisions, everyone keeps track of their variances – it's a simple accounting process. He told Commissioner Kennemer that unless Clackamas County got an exception from SB 100 and gave variances without keeping records, which no one has, it's would be a simple process and this language was general enough to allow people to figure out how to do it.

Mr. Hansen said what this information would be important for, among other things, is that if a project was pulled back out of either the strategic or the preferred into the constrained, the air quality determination and a conformance determination would have to be made, and this would be an important factor in that you all would have to do that work at the last minute around the project. It seemed to him that one of the balancing issues was having that information on the table would allow those types of evaluation to be made much more expeditiously. So this would be a plus, he said, rather than looking at just the burden side.

Commissioner Rogers said that since he really didn't know the implications, he would need to abstain.



The question was called: The motion to restore **D.2.**, with the appropriate rewritten language, passed, with thirteen yes votes (Hansen, Hales, Monroe, Rohde, Kelley, Pollard, Lohman, Kight, Ginsburg, Wagner, Van Sickel, Washington, and Drake). Commissioner Kennemer voted no. Commissioner Rogers abstained.

Regarding **Comment 2** on the Discussion List, Commissioner Rogers told the committee that the Washington County Commission Board Chair, Tom Brian, convened a group of business interests based upon a number of comments he had received. They had come to him singularly and sometimes in a plural sense to voice great concerns about a number of things. He convened this group, and Commissioner Rogers happened to have been there, he said. The group had three meetings, and neither Commissioner Brian nor Commissioner Rogers attended the last one, and this was the meeting from which the letter of June 29<sup>th</sup> and their position came forward.

He said this group, the Westside Business Coalition on Transportation, has a great concern about the jobs/housing issues and what all that means regionwide. Once they started looking at it, they asked what was really happening. Commissioner Rogers said he'd been involved in elected positions for approximately 23 years, and it always happens that after a project has gone on for a great deal of time and is just ready to come to a close, that's when people start looking at it and evaluating it. He said he thought that's what was happening here. People are thinking they don't like what they see, and what they didn't like brought back these comments, some of which were that they wouldn't be able to attract and retain employees to the region – and this is a huge issue together with the livability issue. They believe that this huge livability issue will make it less desirable for them to locate here in this state and in this region, that there's elsewhere in this country they can go if this is what's going to transpire. They were concerned about the transit system, which concern he said he had shared with Mr. Hansen. Intel, for instance, remarked that they spent over \$7 million a year in payroll taxes and supplemental in-house transit services, and this still wasn't meeting their needs. They understand they are probably straining the system, but the system needs to be strained a lot more to meet their particular needs and they're concerned about it. UPS was not listed as a member of the group only because they were experiencing a changing of the guard at the time of participation, but they're moving to Multnomah County because they feel Washington County is congested enough. They had huge issues about how regional dollars were allocated, they had significant issues regarding the transit of goods and products. When we explained that general service levels were at "F," they gave us an "F" on the spot. They felt it was unbelievable that there wasn't anything in place to move their goods and products or anything in place to move their employees. They felt we were planning for failure.

That kicked off the discussion, he said, and these business people had questions ranging from how it all would get paid for to how we might more actively involve them in some sort of ongoing dialog. Commissioner Rogers said he and Commissioner Brian explained the attempt at public education, but said sometimes the more you talk the more things aren't as clear as we'd like them. The business group said they wanted a lot more public education. They questioned the whole 2040 process at this point, not from the standpoint that it's not good planning, but they looked at where the jobs and where the houses are going, they looked at whether or not that makes a great deal of sense, and whether it should be revisited. They questioned who really did all the planning. Commissioner Rogers said he didn't want to repeat everything the group said,

but they did say some positive things. He said they were thoughtful people from a high level and that they were not without understanding. What they've asked, after looking at all this, is that this body not look at a gas tax or vehicle registration at this point; it would be premature, it would not be good to do. They said they needed some time to assist in coming up with something that might make sense. Commissioner Rogers quoted, "If you want to retain our investments in this region, if you want to retain investments in this state, and you don't want us to go elsewhere, and you want us to be able to be viable and attract world class kinds of investments and technology centers like you see Intel proposing for the Hillsboro area, if you want all of that, then you need to engage us, and we're now awakened, and we're a mighty giant. We're not saying that we are not willing to participate." Some of the members of this committee participated in a Transportation Summit back in January, there's another in October – many of these people are involved in that and want to continue to be involved, and come up with some ideas. Commissioner Rogers commended the Metro staff and TPAC for their recommendations. Unfortunately, he said, he was here to vote no on the RTP approval as those were his Commission's instructions. The Commission had not seen the set of recommendations provided today, but the business community they spoke with was concerned that instead of just giving lip service and saying that things will be addressed, they want to see an implementation plan. TPAC recommended that there be some sort of specific timeline, and the business community said specificity was what it was all about. That's what they want – when it will be done, when it will happen, how they will be involved. They are completely convinced and want assurance from this group, or a group of this stature, that it will be seriously revisited with a review, with a serious, defined implementation period, and that they will seriously be engaged in the discussion. That's the bottom line. Commissioner Rogers said if today's TPAC recommendation had been available earlier to the business community and the Washington County Board of Commissioners, perhaps a no vote from him could have been avoided. He said he hoped that even with a no vote, that this committee might be able to craft something to take back to them that says they have been heard and that something is being done about it.

Chair Kvistad asked if Commissioner Rogers wanted to move the six-month delay. Commissioner Rogers said he would like to hear some discussion. Mayor Drake echoed Commissioner Rogers' comments, and said his interest in a delay was not a lack of support for 2040, which he felt he'd made very clear at MPAC the previous evening. He commended Metro's Presiding Officer and Executive Officer in offering to meet with the Washington County business group, and was pleased that the leadership at Metro was willing to meet with all the groups, especially in Washington County.

He said he thought all regional employers felt as the Washington County employers did, and said he'd rather have the major employers on our side. Mayor Drake used an analogy of going to a bank for a loan. If he were to set up a business after he became Mayor, he wouldn't go to the bank and say, Listen, I've got this great plan and I plan to have a service level of FFF for my customers. The bank would laugh at him and not give him any money. We don't loan money on that basis. He thinks this is what the employers are saying. Late or not, he thinks their point is well taken. The good news and the bad news of, for example, an Intel with a research and development facility – the good news is I'd rather deal with a hot economy and the positives to that; the bad news is that they're talking about another 6,000 jobs in Washington County and

things are already pressed. He thinks we're smart enough to deal with it and he doesn't want to turn that down. Listening to these employers is critical, and he shares Commissioner Rogers' viewpoint that if there's a way of doing it that's positive, what he's looking for and what he thinks they're looking for is a very specific timeline without mandating how Metro does its work programs, what he'd look for from the Council would be a very specific timeline. This is a critical priority. When at some time in the future we have to come back to the region and say, here's what we need, he'd rather have these major employers on our side as opposed to being in opposition and saying we're not listening to them.

Mr. Hansen said he found himself agreeing with both Commissioner Rogers' and Mayor Drake's comments, yet he reached a different conclusion in that it is appropriate to move ahead with the RTP. Using Mayor Drake's analogy of going to the bank for a loan to operate a business at an "F" standard, he said it seemed that the analogy would be more accurate to say, if I don't get the loan from that bank, I will only operate at "F." What we are really asking is to engage that business community and the whole community, to say not moving ahead is unacceptable to everyone around this table, and what we need to do is to be able to move that forward. Although he said he would vote yes on moving ahead with the RTP, he said this committee ought to ask staff to draft a letter on behalf of JPACT, not just to the Washington County business community but to a broader business community and the whole community, as well, making very clear that all the members of this committee do not find the constrained plan acceptable, and what we are doing, and there are a number of forums underway to address that, is we need to be able to further engage them. We are sympathetic – we hear them very loudly and clearly – and, in fact, agree with much of what they say, but we have to find ways to be able to move this forward.

Commissioner Hales agreed with Mr. Hansen's comment, and addressed another to Commissioner Rogers, saying that the regional land use plan had been adopted and the regional transportation plan that is connected to it required a certain level of investment in order to make it work. The concern Commissioner Rogers said he was hearing from the business community seemed to Commissioner Hales a concern about the implementation of that plan. Rather can it be done, not should it be done. He then asked why that led Commissioner Rogers to the conclusion that he should vote no, because this was the plan JPACT supported. He said he understood the implementation concern, he appreciated the report from Washington County's business community and he was glad Commissioner Rogers had had those conversations with them, and he agreed with Mr. Hansen that there should be more of those conversations and that they should be expanded, but that he didn't understand the connection between that concern and the Commissioner's conclusion that he had to vote no. He asked Commissioner Rogers if he would elaborate. Commissioner Rogers said his vote was a County vote. The main issue was not only implementation but did the plan make a great deal of sense on 2040 regarding housing/jobs imbalance, which was a major issue. He said Commissioner Kennemer had stated it well: housing in one area, jobs in another area. Washington County was not delighted about that nor is Clackamas County. Washington County, he said, was looking at how those investments might best be made, how they can link those two. He asked if it made sense to plan urban reserves and urban growth areas that may not have the regional support for the infrastructure, that may not have a great deal of commercial ability to attract the jobs to those areas where housing is being replaced, and did the plan at this point make a lot of sense in regard

to how those investments might be spent. Frankly, he said, taking off his County hat and putting on his Roy Rogers hat, he was comfortable with the TPAC recommendation other than the specificity of what the timeline would be and some specificity as to the engagement of the business community. He didn't think it had been said well. He said he understood it's in there, but it doesn't say what's really going to be done and there's nothing that says when. He said he's caught, and wished he'd seen the one-page synopsis before today's meeting.

Mr. Cotugno said TPAC was uncomfortable agreeing to a six-month period without having had the opportunity to sit down and talk with this committee. The attitude out of TPAC was that this engagement with the business community should be a top priority, it should be pursued aggressively, but they were uneasy about saying that it needs six months without knowing what the scope of activity would entail. How much work would it be? Would it be work that could get done in six months? One could talk about these things, one could do research on them. How would they be paid for? Could these businesses pay for some of the things that might be researched if they want to accelerate that work activity that we don't have staff to carry out, or pay for it if there's a need for an independent third party rather than our staff or local government staff doing some of the research. An action that clarifies that it's a priority and addresses that it should be done expeditiously, he said, is certainly in the vein of the TPAC recommendation.

Dave Lohman said he found himself very torn on the issue of delay. The questions that have been raised were good questions that needed to be addressed, and he believed that not only the business community but the general public didn't understand the 2040 Plan very well or the RTP. Now that people are interested in pursuing that was a big plus. That will help in the future, he said. On the other hand, he said he would hate to delay this further. He said he needed to weigh three "fact" questions to help him decide: 1) What are the tangible/intangibles consequences of a delay? 2) What ability is there to modify the RTP six months from now? 3) Is there any reason, as a part of this motion, this committee couldn't commit to come back to put this RTP back on their agenda six months from now, after a period of examination with this group and others as well?

Chair Kvistad said this committee does have the ability to bring back changes to the RTP at any time and if the region decided that that is a priority. Mr. Cotugno commented that it had recently been done for the Washington County Commuter Rail project. He also cited what he felt were three consequences to delay. 1) Confusion. The same thing happened in December, he said. A document went out and there was a flood of comments that represented changes to the document. It's a continuous, moving target. Now there's a document that incorporates what was done in December, and there's another flood of comments that would change the document again. It continues to be a moving target. 2) Local governments have been pushing to get done with this because they're being held up. 3) Two interim amendments to the federal plan have now been done and Metro has convinced them that a comprehensive amendment is coming, and this was done last September, telling them we're on track for December to adopt the update to the RTP and they approved that interim and they approved the air quality conformity on the 1995 RTP. Metro is losing faith with their federal partners that this update will be done. It's now air quality

conformed, they have approved it, and it's farther and farther away from meeting their requirements. Regarding modifications, Chair Kvistad is correct, amendments can be done as they become necessary.

Chair Kvistad said this body also has the option to implement the TPAC recommendations, even though they're not endorsed by Washington County, as an interim step.

Councilor Rohde said he appreciated Mr. Lohman's evaluation "fact" questions which answered his own questions. At some point, he said, you have to stop and have a document. Again he said he's troubled by comments on the LOS question because he remembered the discussion when JPACT moved it to "F," during the p.m. peak hour. It's not going to be level of service "F," at 2:00 p.m., only during the p.m. peak hour. You would not get a loan from your bank if your business plan was to have all of your customers coming in during one hour of the day. He thinks that same thing is what we're looking at here. He said he felt the LOS question was settled and that it would be wise to acknowledge that we should not be expending immense resources in this region in order to facilitate a travel pattern that is geared toward achieving some sort of comfort during one hour of the day. Commissioner Rogers, for clarification, said it was a four-hour period, a.m. and p.m. Councilor Rohde said it was important to keep the LOS in mind, and he was sorry the voters don't want to pay for anything more than that. As far as the public understanding the RTP, he agreed more public outreach needed to be done and yet he said great public outreach was being done now, short of holding people down and forcing them to read the plan. It's nice to know that Washington County businesses have woken up to the fact that there is government going on around them that might affect them, and that they want to participate and be aware of it. He said he was prepared to move forward on the RTP today and to implement the TPAC recommendations.

Commissioner Kelley said she was sympathetic with Commissioner Rogers' dilemma, but she also thought the committee needed to move on. Approaching it from a different aspect, she didn't think the energy or the funds were there to put into it. The reality of the plan is daunting, she said. She said she had a concern with the issue of the recommendation of staff to postpone any consideration of requesting a regional gas tax. Mr. Cotugno said that was not a recommendation, but a request from the group. Commissioner Kelley said Multnomah County is already discussing that tax, and would be more comfortable if the phrase "any consideration of" could be eliminated. She had hoped that at least it could be discussed, and that it be softened. Chair Kvistad said he would, at the end of the discussion, ask for motions to amend the TPAC recommendations.

To clarify, Mr. Cotugno pointed out that on the TPAC recommendations, Items 1 through 4 in the TPAC recommendation simply report the issues this group requested TPAC address, are not necessarily topics TPAC recommended this body adopt.

Kay Van Sickel said she agreed with many of the earlier comments and she agreed to move forward with adopting the RTP. The concern she wanted to voice was that she was hearing a message from the business community in Washington County that they want to be more involved in the decision making process. She would like to support that, because she thinks that until they

do get into some of the tough issues and have an understanding of what goes into putting in interchanges and other kinds of things, that they'll have difficulty understanding the struggles, so she appreciates that. There will be some effects on interchanges and freeways and things like that in Washington County now, what with the development that's going on there. When they understand the problems, they may be more committed to getting involved. She thought Commissioner Rogers' comments were very positive and showed that interest, so felt this committee should try to use that to gain their support and involvement. She would prefer moving forward and adopting the RTP.

Mayor Ogden, invited to speak, said that MPAC had had a great conversation the night before. Of their concerns registered in the letter's four items (Westside Business Coalition on Transportation), one was accepting the LOS and planning for it. Putting this in the document as a goal or an objective causes the business community to think this is not necessarily good planning. Another conversation from their meeting was that there was concern that this was not only a Washington County concern but also one of Clackamas County. He pointed out that not all the names listed as coalition members were from Washington County. The MPAC vote to accept the TPAC recommendation was defeated narrowly, 10 to 8, and the vote to postpone was 10 to 7. Obviously, there was some interest that there be some time allowed to address this issue, and the question of did it have to be done now. A personal comment Mayor Ogden made was that not everyone in the region was a great supporter of 2040 or of Metro and this process. He felt the RTP needed to move forward, and that the facts weren't going to change significantly. He cautioned, however, that JPACT look at the other side, if people want to contribute, please include them, don't kill something critical by not delaying it.

Councilor Monroe said they all knew that transportation planning and land use planning were on the same side of the coin, and this region is ahead of most of the country. He then said he applauded the Westside Business Alliance for positively getting involved in this process. This is progressive business leadership here who looking to the future of this region 10, 20 & 40 years from now. They are one of the great assets of this region. We need to accept that they want more dialog and participation. He then had a question for Washington County regarding infrastructure and finding a regional solution for transportation funding. Citing TPAC's recommendation that gas tax and motor vehicle registration not be looked at, which made sense to him, he asked if Washington County was still looking for a regional transportation funding solution of some nature. He said he's gotten some hints from some folks that they're not, that Washington County wanted to go their own way and continue the tremendous success they've had in funding their own transportation needs apart from the possibility of a regional solution.

Commissioner Rogers said he thought it safe to say that Washington County was probably not interested in a regional solution unless there was a specificity of projects. He said that's been said at this table before, and he will continue to say it. If it's not specific or identifiable, Washington County will not support it. All they want is specificity. As far as the gas tax, all signs point to that being a dead-on-arrival issue. The Washington County business community was not devoid of public attention or involvement and so they're asking as well if there aren't more creative sources to look at. He mentioned the upcoming October Transportation Summit in which there will be discussion on funding sources, and added that a month or two ago Metro

staff mentioned finding other funding sources. It's time that other alternatives be looked at, he said. Washington County supports their neighbors, knowing they have needs and Washington County would certainly want to be a part of the regional solution, with specificity.

Mayor Drake expressed agreement with Commissioner Rogers' comments, adding a suggestion that might move the logjam on the RTP without delaying it significantly. Metro's Presiding Officer and Executive Officer indicated at MPAC that they were having a conversation soon with this Coalition. Mayor Drake suggested that the RTP vote be delayed for 30 days. In the interim, these two gentlemen will meet with the business coalition and assure them that Metro is serious about addressing their issues and yet will explain the need to get the RTP moving for all the reasons described. The Coalition will have heard first-hand both from the policy and the executive branches that there's every intention of dealing with those issues. In 30 days, the RTP vote will be taken. That may take care of the need to move it along and also address the Coalition's concerns.

Commissioner Kennemer had a few items he wanted the committee to look at. In the RTP June 29<sup>th</sup> Public Comment Report document, p. 94-95 contained comments from one of Clackamas County's business groups. He said the Washington County business people are not the only business people who have concerns and who needed to be met with. He harkened back to what he'd said earlier about mode splits, that they were overly optimistic and he chided the committee about that. Clackamas County just completed their Concurrency Task Force, with a series of about five recommendations put on the Commissioners' desks for review, trying to figure out what to do. Clackamas County clearly has a transportation funding crisis. They have identified lots of needs but haven't identified the funding. He, too, referred to the October Transportation Summit saying he hoped something would emanate from that group. He liked Mr. Hansen's idea of revisiting this in the not too distant future. He said he thought none of the committee disagreed that there was a crisis, and none agreed that there was a resolution yet. Obviously, something needed to be done and this would be an adequate response. He said he needed to leave, but he felt that this would give the committee at least a target to start working from instead of a moving target.

Councilor Washington said there was a strong commitment to revisit the plan, so it should be done, but he felt there was a larger message that he wanted this committee to listen to. Perhaps the business community had been on board all along and no one here listened to them, so they're reminding this committee of that. He said there was an obvious concern with both Clackamas and Washington counties that they needed to be listened to, and he thought they were, but things change, processes change. This may be a wakeup call. Perhaps they need to be listened to better. He thought that was a greater issue than what had been discussed this morning.

Action taken: Commissioner Rogers moved, with a second by Mayor Drake, to delay adoption of the RTP for six months. Voting for the motion: Roy Rogers, Rob Drake. Voting against the motion: Fred Hansen, Don Wagner, Charlie Hales, Jim Kight, Andy Ginsburg, Sharron Kelley, Karl Rohde, Rod Monroe, Ed Washington, Rob Drake, Kay Van Sickel, Dave Lohman, Jim Kight. Absent for the vote: Bill Kennemer, Royce Pollard. The motion failed (13-2).

Councilor Rohde suggested that if Commissioner Rogers and Mayor Drake took 30 days to review the latest TPAC information, perhaps in 30 days there could be a unanimous vote to adopt the RTP. Commissioner Rogers said it would be good for his Commission to review the one-page TPAC synopsis, and that two of the questions that probably will be asked of him will be what the timeline would be and how would it be proposed to effectively engage the business community, possibly on a broader scale than just in Washington County. He thought, however, that he should take this back to his Commission where he could argue for, and hopefully come back with, a favorable position.

Action taken: Commissioner Rogers moved, with a second by Mayor Drake, for a 30-day delay on the RTP. The motion passed unanimously. The committee agreed to meet on August 10<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Lohman stated his amendment to add to the RTP resolution, as after BE IT RESOLVED, add: 3. That Metro will undertake with the Westside Business Coalition and others within the next year additional analyses of the region's transportation problems and potential solutions, and will place the Regional Transportation Plan on the agendas of MPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council within one year for consideration of modifications or refinements suggested in that process.

Chair Kvistad said this will be formalized as the next potential amendment at the next JPACT meeting on August 10<sup>th</sup>.

The TPAC Recommended Proposed Discussion Item, Comment 2, will also be on the August 10<sup>th</sup> agenda for discussion. That meeting's agenda will be solely RTP. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:20 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rooney Barker  
Recording Secretary