

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: May 14, 1998

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Chair Ed Washington and Susan McLain, Metro Council; Roy Rogers, Washington County; Dean Lookingbill (alt.), Southwest Washington RTC; Mary Legry (alt.), WSDOT; Greg Green (alt.), DEQ; David Lohman (alt.), Port of Portland; Karl Rohde, Cities in Clackamas County; Bob Stacey (alt.), Tri-Met; Gary Hansen (alt.), Multnomah County; Charlie Hales, City of Portland; Rob Drake, Cities of Washington County; Ed Lindquist, Clackamas County; and Jim Kight, Cities of Multnomah County

Guests: Lou Ogden (JPACT alt.), Cities of Washington County, Rod Sandoz, Clackamas County; Ed Immel, ODOT - Rail Division; Kate Deane, ODOT - Region 1; G.B. Arrington and Laurie Garrett, Tri-Met; Kay Walker and Scott Rice, City of Cornelius; John Charles, Cascade Policy Institute; Ron Papsdorf, City of Gresham; Gary Katsion, Kittelson & Associates, Inc.; Elsa Coleman and Steve Dotterer, City of Portland; Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland; and Howard Harris, DEQ

Staff: Andy Cotugno, Larry Shaw, Mike Hoglund, Chris Deffebach, Mike Morrissey, and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

SUMMARY:

The meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Chair Ed Washington.

MEETING REPORT

Commissioner Rogers moved, seconded by Bob Stacey, to approve the April 9, 1998 JPACT meeting report as submitted. The motion PASSED unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 98-2648 - AMENDING THE MTIP TO AUTHORIZE CMAQ FUNDS FOR EUGENE TO PORTLAND HIGH-SPEED RAIL IMPROVEMENTS

Approval of this resolution would help ODOT implement standby power at Union Station and purchase two cab-cars in support of passenger rail service improvements. With this installation and

purchase, there would be a reduction in idling power and emissions and would allow for another round trip by rail between Portland and Seattle. This MTIP amendment involves the use of \$1,082,000 of CMAQ funds and does not affect the allocation of any other CMAQ funds in the region.

Ed Immel explained the process under which the trains currently operate, reporting that the diesels would not be running during standby power. The objective behind use of the cab-cars on the corridor trains is to reduce the number of locomotives entering the Portland airshed, reduce emissions, shorten the idling process and dwell time at Union Station required for trains changing direction, and allow better times out of Portland and Eugene. It would take one-half hour off the travel time.

John Charles of the Cascade Policy Institute asked whether any analysis had been done of alternative use of those transportation dollars. He questioned whether there were congestion benefits and felt there were minimum air quality benefits. He commented that "above-average" income riders on AMTRAK don't need to be subsidized.

Discussion followed on the emissions raised from a diesel running over a 12-hour period. It was noted that the numbers are relatively large as it represents a large power source. Howard Harris commented that it was a worthwhile purchase and represented a considerable emission reduction. Greg Green noted that diesel smoke emits a known carcinogen and this action would lessen the toxins.

Mary Legry reported that WSDOT believes the high-speed train will relieve traffic congestion in the I-5 corridor, that traffic between Vancouver and Portland has increased, and that this action is appropriate.

Commissioner Lindquist felt that, by not adding a lane on I-5 each way, this project represents an alternative that results in cost savings for the economy.

Action Taken: Commissioner Hales moved, seconded by Commissioner Lindquist, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 98-2648, amending the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program to authorize \$1,082,000 of Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) funds in federal Fiscal Year 1998 for the purchase and installation of standby power at Union Station and purchase of two cab-cars for the Pacific Northwest Passenger Rail Program. The motion PASSED unanimously.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING RULE

Mike Hogle, Metro Transportation Planning Manager, explained that the Transportation Planning Rule is reviewed every five years for consistency with transportation/land use guidelines, and that process is currently underway. A consultant report prepared for the Department of Land Conservation and Development raised certain issues that DLCD staff has tried to address in a number of proposed rule revisions.

Mike distributed and reviewed a summary of the Portland Metro area comments on the proposed TPR revisions. The proposed revisions reflect changes that have occurred over the last seven years with respect to regional and local planning regulations.

Mike Hogle also reviewed the proposed draft letter, dated May 21, 1998, on Portland Metro area comments for revisions to the TPR and submittal to LCDC. He noted that the proposed letter has received approval by MTAC/TPAC but that MPAC lacked time for adequate review of the materials and were uncomfortable in making their deliberation. They deferred to JPACT.

Commissioner Hales wanted to ensure their critique on Section 060(2) wouldn't cause a side effect. In response, Mike indicated that the issue is more related to how you define the term "significant" (Recommendation 9).

A discussion followed on how to make the land use/transportation connection work. It was noted that ODOT is struggling with that issue for the whole state. Before a bypass is built, an Inter-governmental Agreement would be signed requiring that they could not change their land use plan. Commissioner Hales didn't want to make the situation worse for ODOT.

Bob Stacey reported that DLCD staff have proposed some changes for plan amendments. Tri-Met is not comfortable with the mechanisms they're talking about. He felt that the TPR letter under consideration represents a responsible set of comments. Mike Hogle noted that there is alternative language being proposed that staff could also support but it is not up for review at this time. Commissioner Hales emphasized the need for the land use/transportation connection to be sound.

Councilor McLain was uncomfortable with Recommendation 9. She cited the importance of the transportation/land use connection and indicated that MPAC wanted the language to be more emphatic. They didn't feel there was clarity in the language. They are supportive of wanting LCDC to continue to talk about the specifics of the connection between land use/transportation --

capacity, access, and the spin-off effect on land use. The issue was that the governments in our area felt they are adequately addressing the issue. There is a problem with the approach taken elsewhere in the state, resulting in ODOT needing to syphon off funds to fix those problems.

Chair Washington noted that LCDC will take testimony on proposed TPR changes on May 27-28. That testimony and the proposed new language will then be reviewed on July 16-17.

Commissioner Hales suggested that language capturing the JPACT discussion be incorporated into the letter. Text relating to the need for reinforcing the land use/transportation connection and not letting local governments off the hook should be included. Mayor Ogden raised questions relating to the existing language, suggesting that we not add the language at this time and let the process come back to JPACT.

Councilor McLain was not convinced that this letter would have any more effect. She felt the letter should also emphasize commitment and that this region would be backing away from its goal if the language offered something less.

Mayor Drake raised concerns about sending too big a "hammer" outside the tri-county area. He cited the existing split between urban/rural issues and didn't want to create a wider margin by telling people outside the Valley how to conduct their business.

Commissioner Hales felt that the existing language should be left as is, acknowledging that it doesn't solve the problem. Steve Dotterer noted that the multi-use language doesn't work well for the region either. A discussion followed on DLCD staff and how they must respond to problems of development on state highways. Commissioner Lindquist indicated that Clackamas County has also tried to work with ODOT on this issue.

JPACT members agreed on the need to work on additional language for the LCDC letter on the Transportation Planning Rule that would incorporate JPACT discussion points. They suggested incorporating comments relating to the outstanding issue on mixed use, the need for commitment with regard to the transportation/land use connection, and not to address any downstate issues.

Action Taken: Mayor Drake moved, seconded by Commissioner Lindquist, to forward the comment letter on the Transportation Planning Rule to LCDC after it has been further developed to reflect JPACT's comments. The motion PASSED unanimously. Mike Hoglund was asked to incorporate those comments.

STIP/MTIP CRITERIA

Andy Cotugno reviewed the historical actions relating to the STIP/MTIP allocation process and its criteria. The update of the STIP/MTIP takes place every two years. This year, there will be a single integrated process that reviews flexible funds for Metro along with funds available for ODOT's highway program. Investment criteria is based on safety, effectiveness, cost-effectiveness and 2040 considerations.

Andy explained that the upcoming process begins with establishing the criteria upon which projects are to be funded. He reviewed the criteria used in the past, explained how that criteria was applied, and pointed out the projects that resulted from that application.

JPACT will be asked to consider draft MTIP criteria at its June 11 meeting. Issues to be further discussed include where emphasis should be placed, how to incorporate ISTEA dollars, the proper mix of projects, whether to include the bike/pedestrian-to-school program, whether street design requirements should be tied to funding, and whether there should be a funding formula based on modes. In addition, there are administrative considerations that include geographical equity, whether there is a minimum first phase of the project, whether the project is tied to other projects, whether there is local or private overmatch, whether the project is supportive of 2040 objectives, whether it represents a multi-modal mix, whether a project supports regional affordable housing goals, and whether the project meets requirements for air quality conformity.

Following selection of MTIP criteria, projects will be solicited from local governments during the summer, will then be technically and administratively ranked, and a staff-recommended program developed. This program is reviewed and defined and gets adopted by JPACT and the Metro Council subject to air quality conformity.

Criteria were then reviewed in terms of points assigned in support of 2040, effectiveness, cost-effectiveness and safety. 2040 considerations were discussed reflecting affordable housing, accessibility, circulation, 2040 target densities and street design. Andy asked JPACT members for comments while staff is still in a development mode. A discussion followed on whether the high points are assigned because of the numbers of people involved. Andy noted that the most intensive requirements are placed on those reflecting the highest density, the most mixed use, and the strongest SOV targets as they are the most important to the economic base.

JPACT

May 14, 1998

Page 6

Commissioner Hales commented that he felt the MTIP criteria was headed in the right direction. He suggested a couple of case studies be undertaken to see whether they apply, citing conversion of farm-to-market roads to urban streets (some identified as Main Streets) and ODOT's struggle in the urban area on state facilities with respect to full boulevard treatment. Commissioner Hales wanted to know how such projects would fare under the proposed scenario.

Commissioner Rogers raised Washington County concerns about being penalized for efforts they have undertaken locally. He noted that growth has been phenomenal in Washington County and it is evident there is a lack of connectivity in their road system. A number of initiatives have successfully passed and \$350 million has been spent on their road system. He noted that the City of Beaverton is also doing a number of projects out of their own funds.

Another issue raised by Commissioner Rogers concerned areas in the Sunset corridor that lie outside the town centers or a regional center but drive a lot of the economy of the region. Washington County is experiencing difficulties with traffic congestion in the area.

In addition, Washington County is also concerned about the major dollars invested in the system. Many recognize their local responsibility but others fail to understand, appreciate or agree to tax themselves. Washington County spends its dollars on immediate needs. Commissioner Rogers asked whether Washington County should not step in with local dollars. Regarding the issue of ranking projects by mode, he felt there should be further discussion on connectivity. He felt that the only way to get to that point is to support projects that don't get ranked at all.

Bob Stacey addressed the issue of the Washington County road network and its challenges. He noted there is a major expansion of bus service planned for Washington County to improve that situation. He hoped that the criteria would have cross-mode consideration and that the criteria would allow for opportunities having multiple reinforcement of RTP objectives. Bob felt the criteria should balance and weigh how we spend regional funds.

Bob further noted that there are strong arguments for not supporting Issue 3 (relating to a formula basis for making allocations between modes). Tri-Met is trying to define a 10-year strategy for transit's part of the 2040 Growth Concept. He felt it would be helpful to know what initial commitment there

would be to such a plan. He was supportive of appropriate considerations, as defined in the RTP.

Mayor Drake felt that the real issue is one of limited funds. He spoke of JPACT's responsibility to support legislative candidates that are committed to balancing the dollars, keeping the region livable and maintaining the infrastructure.

A discussion followed on whether or not the criteria should be revised and whether or not old projects will be revisited. Committee members agreed that the Highway 217/I-5 project has only been half solved. Commissioner Rogers pointed out the climbing issues on Sunset Highway, noting that Washington County is trying to understand how they should view that and whether they should back away from regional problems.

Issues to discuss further include whether the criteria is still legitimate, whether the committee understands how it's applied, whether the points fit, and whether there has been good use of the criteria.

Councilor McLain felt there were three issues at hand: what criteria should or should not be added to the existing criteria, how it affects commitments, and how the criteria is used. She concurred with Commissioner Hales' suggestion for case studies to be conducted as a test of the criteria being applied.

Dave Lohman noted that the Port of Portland has suggested some changes in the freight category, citing an example of points being given for housing built next to employment areas. He also spoke of special consideration being given in assigning points for projects that not only create connectivity but do it on portions of the regional freight network.

Commissioner Lindquist appreciated the proposals developed to date.

Chair Washington felt it would be helpful to have applicable case studies done for a large city, a medium city and a small city. Also, he asked that the text referencing "assisted housing" on the Expanded 2040 Consideration chart be changed to read "affordable housing."

Andy Cotugno wanted to underscore the "underfunded" discussion. He noted that ISTEPA must first be adopted before the OTC decides how they will spend their funds, which already have been targeted toward preservation projects.

FHWA/FTA CERTIFICATION

Andy Cotugno explained the certification process that takes place every three years. The process involves FTA/FHWA review on how we are meeting planning requirements. Andy asked for JPACT volunteers to participate with their testimony during the planning review. Those volunteering included Commissioner Lindquist, Councilor Rohde, Commissioner Hales and Bob Stacey. (Commissioner Hales subsequently canceled due to a conflict.) Councilor Rohde felt it would be helpful if bulleted comments were provided. Andy indicated that a one-page summary on issues would be FAXed to those volunteers.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Mike Burton
JPACT Members