



JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION RETREAT  
April 2, 2010  
Oregon Convention Center, Rooms F150-151

MEMBERS PRESENT

Carlotta Collette, Chair  
Rex Burkholder  
Jack Burkman  
Nina DeConcini  
Craig Dirksen  
Fred Hansen  
Kathryn Harrington  
Donna Jordan  
Deborah Kafoury  
Lynn Peterson  
Roy Rogers  
Jason Tell  
Don Wagner

AFFILIATION

Metro Council  
Metro Council  
City of Vancouver  
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality  
City of Tigard, representing Cities of Washington County  
TriMet  
Metro Council  
City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas Co.  
Multnomah County  
Clackamas County  
Washington County  
Oregon Department of Transportation, Region 1  
Washington State Department of Transportation

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Sam Adams  
Shane Bemis  
Bill Wyatt

AFFILIATION

City of Portland  
City of Gresham, representing Cities of Multnomah County  
Port of Portland

ALTERNATES PRESENT

Jeffrey Dalin  
Ann Lininger  
Neil McFarlane  
Troy Rayburn  
Rian Windsheimer

AFFILIATION

City of Cornelius, representing Cities of Multnomah Co.  
City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas Co.  
TriMet  
Clark County  
Oregon Department of Transportation, Region 1

MPAC MEMBERS PRESENT

Jody Carson  
Nathalie Darcy  
Denny Doyle  
Keith Mays  
Alice Norris  
Charlynn Newton  
Rod Park

AFFILIATION

City of West Linn, Clackamas County Other Cities  
Washington County Citizen  
City of Beaverton, Washington County 2<sup>nd</sup> Largest City  
City of Sherwood, Washington County Other Cities  
City of Oregon City, Clackamas County 2<sup>nd</sup> Largest City  
City of North Plains, City in Washington Co. Outside UGB  
Metro Council

ELECTED OFFICIALS

David Bragdon

AFFILIATION

Metro Council

**1. OPENING COMMENTS**

Mr. Michael Jordan, Metro Chief Operating Officer, welcomed attendees and overviewed the objective of the meeting. Committee members were charged with discussing the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) policy framework and providing direction on funding targets, outcomes and transportation modes for allocation of local funds through the 2014-15 Regional Flexible Fund allocation process. The direction will help shape the policy report that will be presented at the May 13<sup>th</sup> JPACT meeting.

**2. PRESENTATION ON 2012-15 MTIP POLICY FRAMEWORK**

Mr. Ted Leybold of Metro presented on the 2012-15 MTIP policy framework. The presentation provided context for JPACT to direct the creation of funding categories for the allocation of regional flexible funds to locally administered projects. The funding categories should provide direction on desired performance outcomes, transportation modes to be utilized to achieve those outcomes, and target funding levels for each funding category created. Additional topics covered included:

- Transportation funding administrations in the Portland metropolitan region;
- Federal and state capital investments in the Portland metropolitan region;
- MTIP policy inputs: Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) outcomes, goals and objectives; RTP performance targets; RTP modal finance approach; opportunities;
- Regional Flexible Fund allocation process; and
- Proposed funding categories and general policy direction.

**3. DISCUSSION OF POLICY QUESTIONS**

Mr. Jordan facilitated a discussion on the 2012-15 MTIP policy framework that centered on the following four policy questions and corresponding conversations:

Question 1: Are the proposed funding categories a helpful framework for soliciting local project nominations? Topics discussed included:

- Placing a higher priority on cost-effectiveness and safety as performance targets and criteria for project nominations;
- Improving the ability to leverage transportation projects regional of regional significance with the funding available;
- Investing in large projects versus investing in small projects or startups to get the best return on investment; and
- Further specifying the performance targets.

Question 2: Are the historical allocation levels to these funding categories appropriate for the next allocation? Topics discussed included:

- In addition to the listed performance targets, including broader policy considerations, such as economic development opportunities;
- Local projects ability to leverage other regional projects;
- Divvying up regional funding categorically versus proactively seeking to focus funding towards filling the missing pieces to achieve local aspirations and regional goals, and doing so in a cost-effective way so as to increase return on investment; and
- Using funds to encourage economic development – specifically a green economy strategy.

Question 3: In anticipation of new federal Metropolitan Mobility, Active Transportation, and Freight Improvement grant programs or other new state funding, should the region direct funding for the development of projects and applications to leverage construction funding? Topics discussed included:

- The importance of shovel-ready projects;
- Prioritize projects on their ability to obtain Federal and State dollars; and
- Making progress on preparing the region for upgrading to high-speed rail.

Question 4: Should policies be developed to more precisely define how regional flexible funds should be utilized to advance freight mobility? Are there any specific options you want to consider? Topics discussed included:

- Exercise the regional freight plan and freight mobility priorities to begin project development work, even in the absence of adequate funding, to become better prepared to obtain Federal and State dollars;
- Freight improvements will potentially reduce traffic congestion and improve connectivity, and thus should be seen as a critical component of the region's transportation system;
- Other transportation projects may keep congestion off the freight system and therefore should be recognized as having a freight benefit;
- Improving the freight mobility dialogue across jurisdictional lines; and
- Need to advance JPACT dialogue with freight stakeholders on appropriate strategies and priorities for use of regional flexible funds.

The MTIP discussion has been transcribed and included as Attachment A to these minutes.

#### **4. WRAP UP**

Mr. Jordan summarized that the discussion leaned towards striving to integrate content with process. The committee discussed focusing investments to guarantee an improved return on investment rather putting regional funds towards each category. Mr. Jordan wrapped up the discussion by urging regional policymakers to continue discussing regional investments, deliberate the meaning of infrastructure and achieving efficient growth within the urban growth boundary, and ultimately develop a regional consensus on these issues.

**5. ADJOURN**

Mr. Jordan adjourned the meeting at 2:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Tom Matney  
Recording Secretary

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR APRIL 2, 2010**

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

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>DOCUMENT TYPE</b>	<b>DOC DATE</b>	<b>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>DOCUMENT No.</b>
	Agenda	4/2/10	Revised 4/2/10 JPACT Retreat Agenda	040210j-01
2	PowerPoint	4/2/10	2010-15 MTIP Policy	040210j-02
2	Memo	4/2/10	Revised Memo: 2012-15 MTIP Policy and 2014-15 Regional Flexible Fund Allocation update	040210j-03
2	Handout	4/2/10	Step 2: 2014-15 RFFA, Local Funding Category Options	040210j-04
2	Report	4/2/10	Regional Program Summaries	040210j-05
2	Graph	4/2/10	Federal and state capital investments in the Portland metropolitan area	040210j-06

**2012-15 MTIP Policy Direction**  
**JPACT Retreat**  
**April 2, 2010**

- 1. Are the proposed funding categories a helpful framework for soliciting local project nominations?**
  - Why is safety not applied in all categories? Specifically Arterial System Completion
  - Cost Effectiveness is not included as a factor – disconnect from national policy
  - Safety should be included
  - Set aside for bike/pedestrian should be included
  - What are we trying to achieve on the ground for achieving outcomes?
  - Many outcomes are not included
  - This program needs to move us toward outcomes like climate change
  - Step back from process and access larger strategy
  - Focus on areas that enable leveraging funds/outcomes
  - Arterial System category - modes and activities don't get at performance targets and outcomes
  - Not clear how performance targets would be achieved across the region
  
- 2. Are the historical allocation levels to these funding categories appropriate for the next allocation?**
  - Setting limits has some drawbacks – sets false limitations on categories
  - Average for arterials is not reasonable. Perhaps minimums?
  - Last category is hard to set a cost target
  - Are there broader policy considerations for considering what to fund – such as economic development?
  - Tie in leveraging Regional Programs in Step 2
  - Group is suggesting a different approach – How do Regional Flexible Funds get used to leverage investments for meeting goals?
  - Make investment in economic development – funds can be used to encourage economic development (green economy).
  - Take advantage of opportunities
  - Freight mobility has been underfunded – should be prioritized
  
- 3. In anticipation of new federal Metropolitan Mobility, Active Transportation, and Freight Improvement grant programs or other new state funding, should the region direct funding for the development of projects and applications to leverage construction funding?**
  - Money could be spend that doesn't result in anything

- American Recovery and Reinvestment Act demonstrates the importance of “shovel-ready”
- These programs are similar to “New Starts’ process
- Not clear that these activities would be as well defined as New Starts
- Funds would have to be shifted to take advantage of opportunities
- Previous discussions of project development investments have not gone far – lead to missed opportunities
- If priorities are set on anticipated funding sources we can take advantage of opportunities – should be ready
- Discuss high speed rail opportunities – what do we want out of freight? - Leverage large opportunity
- Already covered for project development
- As a region we should be prioritizing readiness for additional opportunities

**4. Should policies be developed to more precisely define how regional flexible funds should be utilized to advance freight mobility? Are there any specific options you want to consider?**

- Differentiate policy vs. technical considerations – what level?
- Two categories – individual projects vs. advancing regional freight system goals
- District highways – link funds to job access in areas that have no funding – expand eligibility
- Support funding for individual projects, but funds are limited for supporting these projects – more should be spent.
- Many types of projects help freight movement – not necessarily always specifically freight projects

**5. Other questions?**

- Corridor work for High Capacity Transit – possible focus area for funds
- What about bridges?
- Funding for transportation needs in new urban areas
- Better planning across jurisdictions

**6. Wrap-up**

- Higher level question – Where can region invest funds to achieve broader goals, not just spread thinly across projects
- Recommendations from staff:
  - Alternatives for allocating funds
  - Suburban jurisdictions can’t compete well in existing system – issue to address
- Want to see impacts of not funding Regional Programs
- May need to discuss relative importance of performance targets

- Climate change may warrant additional emphasis
- Climate change should be present in how we do all of this – underlying factor