

JPACT/MPAC JOINT COMMITTEE MEETING RECORD
August 12, 1998
5:00 p.m.

*This has not
been distributed
yet (for next
joint JPACT/
MPAC mtg.)*

JPACT/MPAC Members Present: Chair Ed Washington and Susan McLain, Metro Council; Lisa Naito, Multnomah County Commission; Gordon Faber, Washington County's Second Largest City; Gussie McRobert, Multnomah County's Second Largest City; Kay Van Sickel, ODOT; Rob Drake and Lou Ogden, Cities of Washington County; Kathy Christy, Washington County Commission; Karl Rohde, Cities in Clackamas County; Ed Lindquist, Clackamas County; Chuck Petersen and John Hartsock, Clackamas County Special Districts; Duane Robinson, Multnomah County's Special Districts; David Ripma, Multnomah County's Other Cities; Bob Stacey, Tri-Met; Jill Thorn, Clackamas County's Other Cities; Kathy Christy, Washington County Commission; Scott Leeding, Clackamas County Citizen; Sharron Kelley, Multnomah County; Tom Lowrey, Clackamas County's Largest City; Carol Gearin, Washington County's Special Districts; Jim Kight, Cities of Multnomah County; Jim Sitzman, State Agency Growth Council (DLCD); Becky Read, Washington County Citizen; Richard Kidd, Washington County's Other Cities; Doug Neeley, Clackamas County's Second Largest City; Dean Lookingbill, Southwest Washington RTC; Rose Besserman, City of Vancouver;

Guests: Judith Ure, City of Gresham; Carolyn Tomei, Mayor of Milwaukie; Karen Schilling, Multnomah County; Dave Frechette, Forest Grove Planning Commission, Jim Peterson, Multnomah Neighborhood Association; G.B. Arrington, Tri-Met; Steve Dotterrer, City of Portland; Kate Deane, ODOT; and Rod Sandoz and John Rist, Clackamas County

Staff: Mike Burton, Metro Executive Officer; Andy Cotugno; Elaine Wilkerson; Mike Hoglund; Mark Turpel; Dan Cooper; Larry Shaw; Tom Kloster; Pamela Peck; Rich Ledbetter; Mary Weber and Lois Kaplan, Recording Secretary

Media: Gordon Oliver, The Oregonian

SUMMARY:

Chair Ed Washington opened the joint JPACT/MPAC meeting by thanking everyone for their support, expressions of sympathy, prayers and encouragement during the recent loss of his wife. He then turned the meeting over to Mayor Ogden. The first segment of the meeting dealt with an MPAC consideration relating to Urban Growth Boundary additions.

OVERVIEW OF ORDINANCES TO AMEND THE METRO CODE RELATING TO URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY ADDITIONS

Dan Cooper provided an overview on two ordinances that have been introduced before Metro Council at first reading pertaining to

possible changes in Metro requirements for amendments to the Metro Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). The ordinances in question were Ordinance No. 98-770 (amending the first tier and Urban Reserve planning requirements for UGB amendments) and Ordinance No. 98-772 (amending the first tier and Urban Reserve planning requirements for UGB amendments and establishing priorities for including land in the UGB). He highlighted the ordinances and asked for their review prior to a vote on the ordinances at the next MPAC meeting.

Councilor McLain explained the major issues surrounding the two ordinances regarding priorities for inclusion of land in the UGB and proposed changes to the first tier and Urban Reserve planning requirements in the *Framework Plan*. The proposed changes would provide more clarification and detail.

Discussed at the meeting was the fact that the protective measures in the two ordinances were the same. Councilor McLain noted that there is some refinement needed on language in the ordinances but the intent will remain the same. A discussion on these ordinances is scheduled for the August 13 Metro Council meeting. The ordinances will also be addressed at the September 3, 10, and 17 Metro Council meetings. Any further ideas for amendments should be presented at the August 26 MPAC meeting.

Chair Washington then resumed chairmanship, had all participants introduce themselves, and opened the joint JPACT/MPAC worksession relating to the *Regional Transportation Plan*.

MINUTES OF JOINT JPACT/MPAC MEETING

Mayor Drake moved, seconded by Commissioner Lindquist, to approve the April 15, 1998 joint JPACT/MPAC meeting record. The motion PASSED and the minutes were approved as submitted.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Andy Cotugno distributed a memo announcing the September 15-16 Cascadia Metropolitan Forum at the Hilton Hotel in Portland. He cited the opportunity to meet, learn and collaborate with our colleagues from Seattle and Vancouver, B.C. Andy encouraged committee members to participate in this information-sharing event. He noted that the Rail-Volution conference also takes place that week and that brochures are available upon request.

RTP UPDATE SCHEDULE AND STATUS

Andy Cotugno noted that the *Regional Transportation Plan* (RTP) Update was reviewed jointly by JPACT and MPAC three months ago and an overview provided on the alternatives and scenarios to be evaluated. Transportation performance, the cost of the alternatives, how well the system works, locating the problem areas, and defining areas where nothing needs to be done were part of the evaluation process.

Discussion followed on the differences between the Preferred RTP and the Strategic RTP. The Preferred RTP network would fully implement the 2040 Growth Concept and meet the current performance standards and measures as they relate to congestion, level-of-service and access needs. Andy noted that the Strategic RTP attempts to balance priorities with potential revenues that would address critical problems but leave many needs unresolved. It will be the component of the RTP that the state land use process is tied to through the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) and must be balanced with the rest of the transportation system. The Strategic RTP would become the document where legal TPR findings are made and is the focus for regional transportation financing strategies.

This meeting is to share the results of the initial analysis in terms of system performance, costs, and comparison of revenues.

Tom Kloster, Senior Program Supervisor at Metro, reported on the various TPAC/JPACT/MPAC workshops held at which Round 1 modeling assumptions were discussed. He commented on the year 2020 as the year forecast, the differences in population/employment, the significant growth in Clackamas County, the forecast by subarea, the 2020 jobs/housing balance, and project source and type.

Systems modeled included the Preferred 2020 scenario and two different Strategic 2020 scenarios. The analysis evaluated roadway performance congestion in terms of level of service, regional highway performance, modal performance, regional transit, LRT and bus performance, access to centers, boulevard design, rural reserves (capacity improvements), and operations within the Portland Central City.

Materials were distributed on the findings and results of the alternatives analysis for the Portland Central City, North Clackamas County, East Multnomah County, North Washington County, South Washington County, West Columbia Corridor and Damascus Urban Reserve.

Discussion followed on the impact the metropolitan area has on some of the rural roads. Mayor McRobert questioned the accuracy of the growth-related numbers used. Andy Cotugno explained that all of the growth-related numbers will be moving targets inasmuch as the comprehensive plans will be reacting to *Functional Plan* requirements, moving growth from one place to another as growth patterns evolve. Mayor McRobert also asked whether Urban Reserves are being looked at, and Tom Kloster reported that the findings assume a certain percent of the Urban Reserves will be developed. She felt that Clackamas County would look different and totals would change if the area had the ability to have more jobs. She hoped there would be a way to keep this flexible in the Strategic Plan. Andy Cotugno cited the need of the Strategic Plan to be adaptable.

Mayor Thorn commented that West Linn has been attempting to move their projects up the ladder for the past 10 years and felt they were losing ground. She also questioned the designation and separation of North Clackamas County from the remainder of Clackamas County in the tabloid distributed. Chair Washington felt it should be designated Urban Clackamas County.

Tom Kloster then reviewed the specific findings as outlined on the distributed tabloids for each corridor. He noted that the Strategic system is being refined. The next step will include the second round of modeling for the revised Preferred system and the refined 2020 Strategic system.

Metro Council adoption is tentatively scheduled for December, with open houses to be held in September. Public involvement will also include the mailing of an RTP newsletter to 65,000 households. MILT, Metro's Transportation Infomobile, will be operating through September, and will participate in the *East Meets West* light rail opening on September 12 at the Oregon Convention Center.

Andy Cotugno distributed mock-ups of a newsletter that will be distributed to the general public. He also noted that the project listings for the RTP indicate whether the projects are included on the Preferred or Strategic system and the sponsor of the project. He spoke of the close working relationship with ODOT on projects, definition, and cost. An attempt was made to call out the exceptions, but the Strategic systems worked well. I-205 and T.V. Highway were cited as examples where more work is needed to address congestion.

Questions were raised as to the status of the maps. Andy Cotugno indicated they have not been finalized.

Chair Washington asked committee members to help get the public motivated and interested in participating at the four public workshops.

Other materials distributed at the meeting included data on RTP needs versus revenues and an order of magnitude for filling the gaps. Andy Cotugno noted that the RTP does not deal with preservation costs but focuses on city/county/ODOT road-related modernization projects and major transit capital. This only reflects the regional system and the pricetag for the RTP capital improvements. However, RTP needs outlined included the following: city/county operations, maintenance and preservation; ODOT operations, maintenance and preservation; transit operations/routine capital; city/county ODOT road-related modernization; and major transit capital.

In review of the charts, Andy noted that, in order to maintain a status quo situation, everything that goes into maintenance and preservation is accounted for and there is a funding shortfall now. He indicated that the gas tax is flat due to continuing fuel efficiency and won't keep pace with inflation, causing the funding gap to grow over time. He clarified once again that the RTP does not cover a maintenance plan but does include the financial implication of funding maintenance.

Andy reported that ODOT's share of the gas tax and TEA-21 funds reveals a gap in funding operations, maintenance and preservation after five years.

Under transit operations and routine capital (capital utilized for expansion of the fleet), a gap of \$50 million to \$120 million would be experienced over time.

A discussion followed on what the improvements cost and their relationship to existing resources. The traditional transportation funding sources include the state and local gas taxes and vehicle fees; federal funds and Tri-Met fares and payroll taxes. Development-related sources include system development charges; traffic impact fees and urban renewal districts. Other types of funds are general obligation bonds; property tax levies; tolls and pricing; and special levies, such as the MSTIP in Washington County. The third category of funds includes the special levies, the general obligation bond for light rail, and the I-5/99W connector toll project.

The bad news was that, over a 20-year time period, only one-third of the Strategic network was fundable -- not assuming increases over time. The 2040 Preferred network would cost \$13.5 billion just to meet the old level-of-service standard of D.

Andy explained that the major transit capital figure includes construction of the South/North light rail project, bus corridor improvements, and the Portland Central City streetcar. Fifty percent funding was assumed in the New Start category. He noted that we don't use the term concurrency in Oregon. However, the land use plans must be matched to a transportation plan that is adequate. The level-of-service standards have already been reduced and the Strategic network is the primary component to balance land use and transportation. Andy spoke of the substantial gap, its implications and the challenge to fill those gaps. To help fill that gap, Andy illustrated the effect of potential funding tools: a one-cent state gas tax plus a diesel tax on trucks would produce \$6.7 million/year; a one-cent regional gas tax would produce \$4.5 million/year; a \$15.00/year regional vehicle registration fee would produce \$18 million/year; and one-tenth of a percent increase in the payroll tax would produce \$21 million/year.

The Transit Choices for Livability recommendations include regional STP funds at \$3 million/year; Special Needs Transportation funds at \$8 million/year; bus priorities at \$2-5 million/year; fare increases at \$1.5 million/year; and new sources at \$5-24 million/year.

Discussion followed on the proper mix of funding, how much should be pursued from users of the system, how much emphasis should be placed on maintenance and special levies, and strategies for financing.

Mayor McRobert noted that there is an MPAC Infrastructure Finance Committee and asked whether the two committees should be joined. Discussion revealed that there is no diesel tax collected in the state at this time, that a regional truck sticker is hard to administer, and that it might be plausible to discuss a gas tax. Councilor Rohde spoke of the futility of the gas tax and the fact that we continue to strive for a replacement source. It was felt that more effort should be concentrated on public outreach.

Commissioner Naito raised the idea of tolls, questioning whether there is need to seek state authority in that regard. Andy reported that state legislation allows for the I-5/99W connector and one other toll project in the Metro region. Comments centered on the need for jurisdictional review of the assumptions used to handle the land use of the 2040 Growth Concept. Major points included the importance of ensuring that the right infrastructure is in place, determining where the transportation plan is falling short, getting a clear message to the public for an understanding of why our roads are all torn up, and explaining what our dollar actually buys.

The success of the MSTIP levies was discussed. Committee members felt the levies have been successful in Washington County because there is public recognition that the promised projects will be built. It's a matter of public trust. Further discussion questioned gaining that trust for a gas tax when the state's administration of funds hasn't gone well. Mayor Ogden cited the need to enlist the business community in taking the message to the public. He viewed them as having more credibility.

Commissioner Naito was encouraged that the Portland Chamber of Commerce and the Association of Oregon Industries are very interested in the freight and economic development issues. She was also encouraged that ODOT has made significant steps to work with the Legislature.

Tom Lowrey didn't feel it was a question of the public not understanding what is needed but rather resisting more taxes because it will simply generate more growth and won't improve their situation. He felt the system will just get bigger and more expensive to maintain and didn't feel the solution was just to ask for more money. He cited the need to offer more solutions to address the problems. He spoke of the region's growth and the fear of people to control that growth.

Jim Whitty of the Portland Chamber spoke of its efforts to pursue a road financing legislative agenda. He noted that transportation dollars go for more than new lane miles, citing the improvement of traffic flow through interchanges, road upgrades, and improvement of air pollution. He noted that the public might think that any miles added might affect growth. On August 19, other Chambers of Commerce and Economic Development Associations will meet to discuss transportation improvements in the Metro area and the consequences to not making those improvements. Mr. Whitty informed the committee that the business community plans to be more active in this effort. They want to see not only road dollars but non-road dollars spent for transportation. Mr. Whitty wanted to assemble a list of businesses impacted by the condition of the road system.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Mike Burton
JPACT/MPAC Members