

**METRO POLICY ADVISORY (MPAC)/JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON
TRANSPORTATION (JPACT) WORK SESSION**

April 28, 1999 Meeting 5:00 PM

Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

MPAC Members Present: Chair Lou Ogden, Bill Atherton, Charles Becker, Dick Benner, Andy Duyck, Gordon Faber, Carol Gearin, Jeff Grover, Charlie Hales, Delna Jones, Michael Jordan, Richard Kidd (alt.), Chris Lassen (alt.), Scott Leeding, Tom Lowrey, Susan McLain, Lisa Naito, Doug Neeley, Rod Park, Rebecca Read, David Ripma, Dan Saltzman, Jill Thorn, Jim Zehren.

JPACT Members Present: David Bragdon, Fred Hansen, Bill Kennemer, Jim Kight, Dean Lookingbill (alt.), Craig Pridemore, Karl Rohde, Bob Stacey (alt.), Kay Van Sickel, Ed Washington.

Also Present: GB Arrington, Tri-Met; Jim Crumley, City of Happy Valley; Brent Curtis, Washington County; Norm Eder, Conkling, Fiskum, McCormick; John Gillam, City of Portland; Jessica Hamilton, Representative Wu's Office; Jim Howell, Aorta; Rob Kappa, City of Milwaukie; John Leeper, Washington County Citizen; Mike McKeever, McKeever/Morris; Fred Nussbaum, Aorta; John Rist, Clackamas County; Richard Ross, City of Gresham; Rod Sandoz, Clackamas County; Karen Schilling, Multnomah County; Paul Silver, City of Wilsonville; Ted Spence, Citizen; Thane Tienson, Copeland, Landye; Tom Vander Zanden, Clackamas County; Marc Zolten, City of Portland. Metro Staff Present: Dan Cooper, Andy Cotugno, Tom Kloster, Lisa Lister, Mark Turpel, Kim White, Elaine Wilkerson. Other visitors were present.

1. CALL TO ORDER

MPAC Chair Lou Ogden called the meeting to order at 5:00 PM.

2. CONSENT AGENDA - 8/12/98 MPAC/JPACT MINUTES

Motion #1	Gordon Faber moved approval of the consent agenda. Scott Leeding seconded the motion
Discussion	none
Vote #1	The motion passed unanimously.

3. INTRODUCTION

Andy Cotugno presented a brief overview of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), including summarizing the Quick Facts from the agenda packet and the adoption timeline (see yellow hand-out).

4. ROUND 2 RTP ANALYSIS

Tom Kloster provided a brief overview of Round 2 modeling and analysis. He commented that one of the 2040 lessons learned in Round 1 was that congestion is caused by sprawl, the cost of sprawl, the value of building compact centers throughout the region, and protecting both industry and nature. He said they applied these basic principles in their policy update. He said the Systems Developments are based upon the following criteria: consensus based, all roads multi-modal, serve centers first, add capacity last. He then said the different parts of the region have different issues and needs and summarized some of the major issues and conclusions for each subarea, as taken from the two rounds of analysis (below).

Portland:

- Radial urban freeways congested
- SE streets congested
- Transit a critical need
- Traffic calming important

East Multnomah County

- Mt. Hood Parkway (interim plan)
- Gateway congestion
- Impacts from urban reserves
- Powell Blvd. upgrades

Clackamas County:

- Impact of urban reserves
- I-205 corridor
- 99E-Hwy 224 corridor
- Beaver Creek urban reserves

Washington County

- TV Hwy
- Hwy 217 improvements and commuter rail
- I-5 South and the valley
- Tualatin-Sherwood connection

State and Regional Access to Ports

- I-205 improvements
- NE Portland Hwy
- Connections to Rivergate and PDX

Scott Leeding said one of the slides noted that they looked at urban sprawl and congestion in their analysis. He asked for more specific information. Tom Kloster said they had different scenarios for 2040 and one was to spread out as far as needed at current density to accommodate growth. He said that scenario had the most congestion on the system overall, trying to get workers to jobs and services. He said one of the key points of 2040 was does sprawl increase or reduce congestion and their analysis says it increases congestion. Scott Leeding said that seems to invite the need and desire for more employment closer to the new urban reserves. Tom

Kloster said they have assumed that and many of the town and regional centers are in those areas. He said the projects are heavily aimed at centers and employment areas.

Gordon Faber said there was no reference to a western bypass in the RTP. Andy Cotugno said there is no western bypass in this RTP analysis. He said there is however, based on the recommendations that came out of the western bypass study, a very important role that Highway 217 plays. He said they are calling for consideration of a variety of options in that corridor, e.g. HOV lanes, express lanes, or paid lanes. He said the main point is that without a western bypass, major upgrades in that corridor are important.

5. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Tom Kloster said some of the policy recommendations they were making would be quite a change for the region. He said possibly the most controversial is to propose a more congested peak period level of service (LOS) than the free flowing LOS D, in some areas. He said there are a series of radial freeways coming out of the central city that are very congested during peak hours. He said they would all have six lanes and high capacity transit and they are, therefore, proposing the same standard as for the central city itself, rather than further widening the highways. He said the congestion proposed is a realistic condition during peak hours. He reviewed the proposed regional highways LOS, as well as other policy considerations (below).

Proposed for F/E

- I-5 N to the Interstate Bridge
- Banfield to I-205
- Sunset to Sylvan
- McLoughlin to Milwaukie

Proposed for E/E

- I-5 S to Terwilliger
- Hwy 224 to I-205

Tom Kloster said the following transit expansions are part of their plan proposal:

- Critical along congested regional highway corridors
- Aggressive solutions along McLoughlin, I-5 N and I-5/Barbur
- Rapid and frequent busses needed in several corridors
- Expanded coverage needed

He said there are two additional sets of policy issues to be considered:

Leveraging 2040

- RTP relies on local plans to implement 2040 (state transportation planning rule will require local jurisdictions to incorporate RTP policies and projects within a year of adoption this fall)
- Continued emphasis on centers including parking, non-auto modes, financial priorities
- Balancing reinvestment in urban areas with new investment in urban reserves

Land Use Implications

- Need for additional coordination where transportation can help shape future growth
- More detailed planning requirements for urban reserves to ensure orderly development
- Jobs/housing imbalance in Clark and Clackamas counties continue to affect land use and transportation in Oregon
- Willamette Valley growth increasingly affecting transportation in southern portion of Metro area

Bill Atherton asked if they analyzed lane limitations and HOV lanes. Tom Kloster said they analyzed express lanes on Highway 217 and I-205 that could only be accessed and exited at certain points. He said they looked at adding two additional lanes to Highway 217 that could only be accessed from Highway 213, the Sunrise interchange, or just north of I-84. He said the idea was to design capacity to move a longer distance. Bill Atherton asked if the same type of analysis was done for SE streets. Tom Kloster said they did not try it in the SE streets, with the exception of Foster going out to Damascus and Powell out to 52nd. He said in that case they proposed rapid bus, a bus with its own right-of-way.

Bill Kennemer said there may be a problem when they talk about the housing imbalance in Clackamas County and a policy to increase congestion and are making an assumption that all those people have to travel across the region to work. He said he doesn't think those things fit.

Michael Jordan asked if they had done any modeling other than the current boundary and reserves. He asked if they had done more free-thinking about where the growth would occur and how it would impact these systems. Tom Kloster said no, not since they did the 2040 modeling.

Tom Kloster said he wanted to address the issue of the jobs/housing balance. He said they mostly focused on peak hour congestion, in terms of looking at the congestion impact. He said there is an issue about how far into the day the congestion is spread. Michael Jordan asked for clarification as to whether he was making a policy suggestion that the realities of transportation might drive the decisions around 2040. Tom Kloster said the model is not policy, it is just a tool to look at how things are working. He said they are saying they have done a lot of modeling of I-205, 99E and the 224 corridor and they think the improvements proposed for I-205 work but 99E and 224 have to rely on transit improvements and there is only so much you can do during the peak periods. He said the policy issue there is whether that is acceptable or do you try to build an eight-lane freeway along McLoughlin. Andy Cotugno said they don't have a policy to encourage congestion, but have a policy issue to acknowledge that we can't build our way out of congestion without ten lane freeways. He said the plan they propose acknowledges growth in Clackamas County would result in an hour of congestion. He said we have a dilemma of adding capacity to the I-205 corridor that makes it easier to live in Clackamas County and work in other counties. He said we need I-205 to work for other broader economic reasons for the region as a whole, but this may make it harder to attract jobs to Clackamas County. He said they need to double up other efforts to attract jobs to Clackamas County to counter that imbalance.

Chris Lassen asked if there has been any consideration given to reversing lanes. Andy Cotugno said they looked at that in detail on I-5 South but have found that it causes more congestion in

the opposite direction than it fixes in the peak direction. Tom Kloster said you don't really see one directional commuting until you get to the edge.

Jim Zehren asked what the modeling assumes about demand management. Andy Cotugno said it assumes a lot. He said they have parking limitations throughout the region based on the parking ratios adopted, a high level of transit accompanied with reduced transit fares and have assumed better mixed use and higher density street connections in the center that increases the pedestrian component. Jim Zehren asked if they did any modeling with freeway congestion pricing. Andy Cotugno said not in this, but they are wrapping up a congestion pricing study where they have examined many options in the major freeway corridors. He said the best option for public acceptance is to add a lane and price it rather than pricing existing freeway lanes.

Dick Benner asked what effect the model would show on congestion if it were possible to reallocate 20,000 housing units from Clackamas County to Washington County and 20,000 jobs from Washington County to Clackamas County. Tom Kloster said he thinks they are already caught up on the housing side, but to catch up with employment in Clackamas County is harder and would have a greater impact. Dick Benner asked if they think there is anything they can do from a land use perspective to redress the jobs imbalance in Clackamas County. Tom Kloster said they have done a lot. He said they have assumed substantial town centers, a substantial industrial area and a substantial amount of industry in the Beavercreek area. He said they are at a very small base and can only add so much and even then it does not keep up with the expected employment growth that will happen in the other two counties. He said he believes the Growth Management Department's recommendation is that we've maxed out the flat land that would be attractive to industry in Clackamas County, as far as what is in the urban reserves and urban area.

Delna Jones asked what the current congestion level is on 217 and 26. Andy Cotugno said they are at the F/E level on 217 and past that level on the Sunset. Gene Grant asked what the F/E goal translates into for average speed. Andy Cotugno said F is stop and go traffic during an hour and E is an average of 20-30 MPH. Delna Jones asked what that does to our air quality. Tom Kloster said more congestion is worse for air quality. Chair Ogden asked how that level of service policy impacts our air quality maintenance plan. Andy Cotugno said the air quality attainment work done to date is for a ten-year period and they are forecasted to maintain that plan with this congestion level, although it stays close to the edge.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Andy Cotugno presented the following information regarding financial issues affecting the RTP:

Operations and Maintenance

- Includes larger system to maintain (first priority for transportation dollars has to be maintenance of existing systems)
- System is aging; 1960s and 70s highways approaching design life
- Revenue is losing ground to inflation, fuel efficiency
- Transit revenue keeps pace with inflation, but not growth

Costs of Growth

- Drives need to expand system
- Managing growth requires new revenue and new funding sources
- Quality of life threatened by growth

Leveraging 2040

- Compact growth maximizes transportation benefits
- Need added resources to accomplish 2040

Existing Resources

- Existing infrastructure not maintained or deteriorating
- Unacceptable levels of congestion
- 2040 implemented only in select areas with existing infrastructure
- Growth pressure outside Metro area increases

Andy Cotugno said they have identified two different levels to shoot for (below).

Strategic Plan (priorities and accomplishable)

- A system we can "live with"
- Meets intent of most federal, state and local requirements, performance measures
- Requires additional funds

Preferred Plan

- Maintains current quality
- Meets all requirements, measures
- Requires more additional funds

He said the other option is the current path strategy.

Current Path Strategy

- Relies on existing funding sources
- Reduces tax burden over time (because of erosion due to inflation)
- Virtually all funds eventually required for operations and maintenance

7. NEXT STEPS: FUNDING SCENARIOS AND DISCUSSION

Andy Cotugno referred the committee to the What You Do chart (see white hand-out) and summarized the information. He said the preferred plan requires the equivalent of an approximately five cents tax increase per year.

Financial Choices

- Increase transportation to meet need
 - broad-based sources
 - user-based sources

- growth-based sources
- Don't increase revenue and scale back strategic system

Andy Cotugno said the crux of the issue is do we want to live with what we have or try to move forward and raise the funds to get us there; and, if so, what is the right mix of sources.

Doug Neeley asked if they considered assessing a tax on people from outside the state who are employed in the Metro area. Andy Cotugno answered no.

Carl Rohde asked if the modeling has considered a consistent or scaled back level of fuel consumption. He also asked if they have modeled or considered what a VMT tax would generate. Andy Cotugno said the revenue base is based on forecasted statewide vehicle miles traveled, which is expected to grow at a rate roughly equal to population. Fred Hansen said VMT generally grows faster than growth. Andy Cotugno said they have not modeled a VMT tax. Fred Hansen said he believes DEQ has done the equivalent.

Delna Jones asked if the gas tax amount is the amount of money that comes to the region or an amount statewide, using the current formula, that would come to the region. Andy Cotugno said it is the latter. Delna Jones said it is not then purely four cents for the region. She said they are talking about 1.5 cents of the four cents. Andy Cotugno said the amount of tax would be approximately the same if we take our percentage from the state or do it ourselves. He said what we would lose doing it on our own is the truck component.

Bill Atherton asked if they modeled what would happen to the forecast of need if growth paid its own way. Andy Cotugno said they don't know what SDCs would have to be to finance this. Lisa Naito said a smarter way is to look at vehicle use, perhaps through vehicle registration fees, because growth does not cause all needed improvements to the transportation plan.

Chair Ogden said the concept of 4 cents per year for twenty years is not likely and asked if there are reasonable expectations for funding sources modeled? Andy Cotugno said no. Michael Jordan said the scenarios are simply that and are intended to give us the idea of the scale of need in understandable terms. He said a much more free-thinking look at revenue is called for and he thinks that is part of the task of the funding subcommittee.

Chris Lassen suggested they consider delivery charges; e.g. collect a 1% use fee dedicated to transportation on delivered products.

Susan McLain said the preferred system meets all regional and state performance goals and would require about 4.7 billion in road funds. She said it could go as high as 15 billion. She said one of the things she hopes to get out of this conversation is to know if there is still a commitment to 2040 from the people who sit in these seats today. Chair Ogden said that is critical. Chair Ogden said it is important that they revisit the assumptions that went into the RTP, in light of the 10 billion dollar difference. Susan McLain said the only way they are going to be able to have a conversation with the public about funding is to be able to say this is what you have said you want in the way of service.

Rod Monroe said the gas tax will become obsolete as a funding mechanism for highways; it's just a matter of when. He said they need to anticipate that now and try to put pressure on alternate ways of funding highways. Chair Ogden said not only will the gas tax become obsolete, but this is too heavy of a burden for one funding source to bear.

Lisa Naito said it is critical to start thinking about ways of funding that capture the growth concept they are trying to promote, through such things as VMT charges.

Chair Ogden said his concern is what do the areas in the region look like in ten years if they are unable to accomplish the RTP. He asked at what point you put some conditions on it.

Bill Kennemer said they aren't functioning in Clackamas County as it is and asked why they would make it worse. He said it is a regional question.

Kay Van Sickle said they aren't even keeping up with maintenance and preservation right now and doesn't know how they transition that into the policies they are talking about here. She said she is concerned about the ground we are losing right now and how we keep up and then go forward with these plans.

Chair Ogden said maybe there is a policy decision that needs to say the limited dollars we have are prioritized to go to the areas in which we are forcing growth to occur.

Gene Grant said the public in the Rock Creek area is very anxious to not have development occur until transportation and infrastructure are accounted for. He said it needs to be written into the comprehensive plan for the area that no permits will be allowed until the public facilities funding strategy is in place.

Fred Hansen said they need to split apart the inflation factor from the additional costs. He said at least part of the problem would go away if whatever the funding mechanism is would be able to at least get to inflation. He said accounting for inflation should automatically be built in and then it would seem less daunting to tackle the rest.

Susan McLain asked when we are going to stop waiting for a state solution and start putting together new, creative, innovative ideas. She said they need to be bold and acknowledge that this region can't wait any longer.

Charles Becker said he does not hear any solution that says let economic development help pay for this since that is why the demand is occurring. He asked why they aren't going to industry to get solutions or revenue to build the infrastructure that is so important for us to maintain economic vitality. Lisa Naito said they can't just limit that conversation to new growth. She said we may be looking at a declining economic impact in our region.

Dick Benner said we need to look at what we have done to ourselves to make our financial situation much more difficult than other states.

Gordon Faber said transportation will always lag behind growth. He said they have to become courageous and inventive enough to try and solve transportation problems. He said he does not understand why electors keep electing the same people that have not dealt with these issues. Delna Jones said people need to see the correlation between what they pay and what they get.

Kay Van Sickel said she is concerned because she is starting to see an anti-transit sentiment in the Legislature.

Chair Ogden said he is at a loss to know what policy decisions this group is able to bring to bear to help solve the problems they have addressed. He asked how they drive their existing funding decisions, with what little money they do have, relative to 2040. He said he does not see the connection very well and has not heard any conversation about where in the region to direct the money, based upon suggested growth. He also asked how they prioritize the money they have on transit versus roads. He asked which one they advance faster and at what rate. He said those are the types of policy discussions they need to have. He said that is what he would like to see the joint meetings get towards at some point in time.

Andy Cotugno said he needs help knowing how to proceed. He asked if there is stuff they need to be bringing back to advance this discussion and if they want to have another joint meeting in the future.

Susan McLain said the one thing she tried to forward is that this group should reassess that this is the way they want to go with the transportation/land use connection. She also asked where in the last \$75 million did they forward that land use/transportation connection and how do they do more of it.

Dick Benner said he would like to see a comparison of transportation costs of the base case and the growth concept for each possible element. He suggested doing a chart or matrix so a person could see that the growth concept probably turns out to be far less expensive. He said that does not get the money but it at least conveys the message that the vision they have been working on is the right choice for a lot of reasons, not the least of which is that it costs much less.

Bill Atherton suggested they use growth-based revenue sources to pay for the costs associated with growth, use the user-based sources for broad projects and big system expansions and the broad-based sources for maintenance.

Fred Hansen said we have to be able to connect the dots in relationship to our citizens about what the problem is, what the elements are of that problem and why it relates to them. He said once they have done that, the ability to be able to talk about revenue sources will come. He said they have to be able to connect this to people's long-term livability, economic activity and quality of life.

Rod Monroe said they must go forward with the RTP with determination of what needs to be done, what will work, and balancing a transportation system that will meet the needs of a growing region. He said they have to go forward with it and do the planning, even though they

do not know how they will pay for it. He said ultimately the voters will have to pay in some way for the transportation needs of this region.

Chair Ogden asked if there is a need for a future joint meeting and, if so, what are the issues they want to get out of that meeting and what do they want to accomplish.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:10 PM.