

## MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: August 14, 1997

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Chair Jon Kvistad, Susan McLain and Ed Washington, Metro Council; Roy Rogers, Washington County; Craig Lomnicki, Cities of Clackamas County; Charlie Hales, City of Portland; Jim Kight, Cities of Multnomah County; Tom Walsh, Tri-Met; Don Wagner (alt.), ODOT; Rob Drake, Cities of Washington County; Mary Legry (alt.), WSDOT; and Mel Gordon, Clark County

Guests: Karl Rohde (JPACT alt.), Cities of Clackamas County; Patricia McCaig, Metro Council; Meeky Blizzard, STOP; Howard Harris, DEQ; N. Kay Walker and Scott Rice, Cornelius City Council; Rod Sandoz, Clackamas County; Congressman Earl Blumenauer; Kathy Busse, Multnomah County; Lavinia Wihtol, Elsa Coleman, and Mark Lear, City of Portland; Phil Donovan, Office of Congressman Blumenauer; Mary Lou Hilliker, Oregon Trucking Association; Brian Boe, Oregon Petroleum Marketers Association; Kathy Lehtola, Washington County; Dave Williams, ODOT; Paul Silver, City of Wilsonville; and Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland

Staff: Mike Burton, Executive Officer  
Richard Brandman, Mike Hogle, Bridget Wieghart, Kim White, Larry Shaw, Tim Raphael, Pat Emmerson, Ruth Ann Steele, and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

### SUMMARY:

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

### MEETING REPORT

Mayor Lomnicki moved, seconded by Commissioner Rogers, to approve the July 10, 1997 JPACT minutes as submitted. The motion PASSED unanimously.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mike Hoglund announced that Andy Cotugno was on vacation and he would be providing staff support in his absence.

Shortly after the meeting convened, Presiding Officer Kvistad assumed chairmanship. During the course of the meeting, Chair Kvistad welcomed and introduced special guest and former member of JPACT, Congressman Earl Blumenauer.

RESOLUTION NO. 97-2546A - ENDORSING THE TRAFFIC RELIEF OPTIONS  
TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATION TO FURTHER EVALUATE PEAK PERIOD PRICING  
OPTIONS

Bridget Wieghart, Traffic Relief Options Study Project Manager, explained that Resolution No. 97-2546A confirms the primary goal of the Traffic Relief Options (TRO) Study which is to determine whether or not congestion pricing is a desirable traffic management tool or concept for use in this region. The TRO packet identifies nine options for detailed study which will evaluate specific types of strategies, locations, and whether they're feasible. In addition, a regional option will be developed for analytical purposes.

This resolution also adopts criteria which was previously reviewed by JPACT/Metro Council as defined on Exhibit B. Bridget reviewed the criteria which included the feasibility of implementation, transportation system performance, equity, conformity with land use and transportation plans and policies, societal and market effects, and public acceptance/political feasibility. She also spoke of the advisory task force of business and community leaders who will be responsible for providing direction for technical work and public outreach efforts during the study.

Bridget noted that public review will be sought at key milestones. At the conclusion of the study, a determination will be made as to the merit of any further consideration of these strategies.

The nine Traffic Relief Options depicted on Exhibit A were reviewed and the evaluation process discussed. Bridget reviewed the criteria used for screening as shown on Table 2 in the summary of Working Paper No. 6, attached to the Staff Report. Twenty options were eliminated up front because they didn't meet the minimum threshold for travel performance.

The remaining twenty options were evaluated on all of the criteria. Bridget reviewed the matrix and explained scoring on finance, travel performance, available transportation options and

diversion of traffic. She explained that public acceptance was based on public outreach to date. Bridget reported that the more comprehensive types of strategies have less acceptance than those that include only one lane or a spot. The quality of available alternatives, especially new capacity, also increased public acceptance. A combination of these factors was used by the task force in the public acceptance ranking. The task force selected those projects that performed better and represented a diversity of types and locations.

Councilor McLain asked whether the issue raised by the Transportation Planning Committee had been addressed. Bridget noted that the last "Whereas" had been incorporated to address their concern that the options not preclude consideration of peak period pricing or tolling elsewhere within the region.

Another question raised was whether the Interstate bridges were given consideration. Bridget responded that the study does not include Clark County and therefore the Interstate bridges are not included as an option. There is, however, an I-5 corridor alternative from I-405 to Hayden Island. The issue was discussed by the task force who felt, due to the large public involvement aspect to the study, it would be counter-productive to include areas not part of the study. She noted that WSDOT was not ready to participate as a full partner in this effort. Mike Hoglund pointed out that additional resources would be needed to cover that part of the region.

Mayor Drake reported that Bridget and Steve Clark had met with the Beaverton Downtown Task Force and, while there were no strong objections to Option 20 (Beaverton Regional Center Area - Cedar Hills Boulevard/Highway 217; Center/5th) expressed at the meeting, he'd heard from several people afterwards and felt it would be hard to implement. He said it would be interesting and informative to study due to the traffic problems in Beaverton. However, he was concerned because it would be difficult to implement from a technical perspective and there hasn't been much support expressed. He felt it would be impossible to segment downtown Beaverton in separating local traffic from people just driving through. Without some kind of complex system where only through traffic was changed which, in his opinion was infeasible, he didn't feel the support would be there.

Don Wagner commented that there is a lot to be learned about how congestion pricing might be applied to an area but he understood Mayor Drake's apprehension about Beaverton serving as a pilot project. He indicated that it would be worthwhile from an information perspective.

Discussion followed on whether or not the option should be studied if ultimately it might not be applied. Mayor Drake suggested that the strategy might be applicable at another regional center. A discussion followed on the need to meet the purpose of the grant which is for a pilot project. Mike Hoglund noted that, when the congestion pricing program was first put forward under ISTEA, the Federal Government was interested in seeing demonstration projects on the ground but had since revised its guidelines to allow for gathering of information about various options in a pre-implementation study. We could not guarantee this effort would result with a project. From a transportation research perspective, there was interest in learning how pricing applications might work in such an area.

The concern was also raised as to the potential public backlash that might result from study of the Beaverton option. There was a discussion as to whether it was worth the potential damage to the study given the small chance of this option proving viable. Mayor Drake commented on the public's recognition of the real benefits they see when a lane is added, such as on Highway 217; multi-modal improvements; or in advancing transit service, but felt that the impacts on the regional centers must also be addressed. He indicated that, while he is willing to proceed with study of the option, he would not be disappointed if the option were taken away.

Councilor McLain cited the need to obtain a lot of information about a variety of types and opportunities where these market-pricing options could be applied. She expressed concern about the time and effort devoted to study of the Beaverton option and questioned whether it was worth it if the option had little likelihood of implementation.

Bridget reported that this discussion was also held by the task force who concluded, after hearing all different perspectives, that they did not have enough information about area pricing to say that it could not work and wanted to carry the analysis forward into the next phase.

In the next round of analysis, there will be some conceptual design of the alternatives with entrances and exits and consideration given to whether just through trips should be priced, transit packages, and use of revenues (which might, for example, be dedicated to creating a grid system). The information would be modeled to determine how many people would choose to travel at a different time of day, travel on a different route, or use transit.

Mayor Drake indicated that the Beaverton Chamber Task Force did not express a strong opinion on the Regional Center Area option and agreed that not enough information is available at this time. He felt, however, that Option 20 wouldn't be implemented before some of the others. A discussion followed on whether the study should be applied to other regional centers that might have more viability. Bridget noted that other possible locations were looked at, including other regional centers, and Beaverton surfaced as the most suitable. Areas were looked at in terms of their level of congestion, good transit alternatives, and being viable regional centers.

Commissioner Washington expressed his support for the task force's work and process. He stated that it was important to respect its recommendation.

Mike Hogle indicated that the task force could be made aware of the committee's concerns. He also indicated that, as more is learned about the options, any that are found to be infeasible for engineering or other reasons could be eliminated at that point.

Action Taken: Commissioner Rogers moved, seconded by Mayor Lomnicki, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 97-2546A as submitted, endorsing the Traffic Relief Options Task Force recommendation to further evaluate peak period pricing options. The motion PASSED unanimously.

JPACT/MPAC REVIEW OF REGIONAL FRAMEWORK PLAN AND REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Mike Hogle cited the need to integrate the transportation plan components of the *Regional Transportation Plan* into the *Regional Framework Plan*. Mike reported that a JPACT/MPAC subcommittee is being formed to identify key issues that have transportation/land use implications and to formulate recommendations for consideration at a joint JPACT/MPAC meeting scheduled for September 17 at 5:00 p.m.

Participants on the subcommittee include the following:

Mayor Ogden, Chair  
Councilor Rohde  
Mayor Lomnicki  
Councilor Washington  
Councilor Kight  
Chuck Peterson

Components to be looked at include the Chapter 1 policies, the RTP system maps, the level-of-service standard as a direction for building the draft Preferred RTP, and appropriate policies relating to street design and connectivity in terms of providing

direction to local governments. JPACT members were asked to review the *Regional Framework Plan* in readiness for the joint September 17 JPACT/MPAC meeting.

Commissioner Hales asked how preliminary mode split targets would be developed. Mike Hoglund responded that mode splits were developed for driving, shared ride, transit, bicycle and pedestrian based on comparisons with areas within the region and in other cities where higher mode splits have been achieved. The mode splits are set in order to reach the 10 percent VMT/capita standard for the region.

Commissioner Hales commented that, from experience, when design types are built out in regional centers, there will be a change in travel behavior. He pointed out the importance of available transit service, wanted to know about the assumptions being used, whether transit level-of-service and multi-modal targets are factored in, and emphasized the importance of several options to choose from based on funding risk and goals. Mike noted that the JPACT choice for level-of-service will affect the ability to meet mode split targets.

Chair Kvistad noted that Metro is moving quickly toward finalizing the components of the *Regional Framework Plan* and urged the committee to review the document for comments.

#### TRANSPORTATION GROWTH MANAGEMENT PROGRAM - METROPOLITAN AREA APPLICATIONS

Mike Hoglund explained that ODOT/DLCD has initiated the grant process for Transportation Growth Management projects. ODOT Region 1 grant requests total \$6,382,063 with a preliminary allocation available of \$2,761,201. A matrix of the grant requests was included in the agenda packet.

Mike spoke of the tight timeline for review, noting that grants will be awarded in early September. In view of that, he asked whether the Metro comment on the program should be a letter of support, extended by Metro's Executive Officer, for those grants that would help implement the *Functional Plan* and the *Regional Framework Plan*. Review would take into consideration connectivity, boulevard design, multi-modal needs, and mode split targets. In the past, the process has allowed time for TPAC/JPACT/Transportation Planning Committee/Metro Council review. That time is not available during this cycle of grants.

Councilor McLain supported the concept that the TGM grant review would be based on the land use/transportation connection but also cited the importance of having time for that review. Chair Kvistad suggested that an overview be provided the Transportation Planning Committee in conjunction with the Executive Officer and staff.

Mike Hoglund asked the jurisdictions to communicate with ODOT and LCDC to identify their respective priority projects. Councilor Washington, chair of the Transportation Planning Committee, was asked to work with the Executive Officer in coordinating the TGM grant review.

#### I-5 BRIDGE CLOSURE

Chair Kvistad commented that the I-5 bridge closure represents a good opportunity to discuss long-term options in the I-5 corridor. He cited the need to request an informal discussion on what is next, how to proceed, and how to fund further bridge needs in the corridor.

#### TRANSPORTATION FINANCE ISSUES

At the July 10 JPACT meeting, Chair Kvistad had asked each jurisdiction to meet with their respective boards/councils to decide what role Metro should assume with regard to pursuit of a regional transportation tax measure. In meeting with the county commissions, and verified at the recent JPACT Finance Committee meeting, there was a conclusion that there was no consensus on a regional package sponsored by Metro and that each county would move ahead with its own measure.

Multnomah County is proceeding with a vehicle registration fee increase to be split 50 percent with the cities within the county. The measure is intended for safety needs and bridge preservation. Commissioner Collier indicated that sign-off is required from their regional partners in order to put the vehicle registration fee measure on the ballot. Mike Burton indicated that an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) is required under state statute that must be signed by Metro, Tri-Met, City of Portland, and Multnomah, Washington and Clackamas Counties prior to implementation. He felt it would be difficult to secure signatures by all parties prior to the September 4 deadline. Commissioner Collier commented on the tight deadlines to be met for submittal of the tax measure.

Commissioner Hales expressed support of Multnomah County's approach in that it stayed away from the gas or diesel tax. He felt it was a sound and responsible interim step and wasn't aware of any organized effort against a vehicle registration fee increase. If \$3-4 million in funds could be secured for asphalt maintenance during this process, he felt it would be worthwhile.

Washington County is pursuing a gas tax and a vehicle registration fee increase. The registration fee is targeted for safety kinds of improvements. Commissioner Rogers indicated Washington County may want to get to 3 cents in order to create equalization among the counties. Public hearings are scheduled for the last Tuesday in August.

Clackamas County is seeking a vehicle registration fee increase but keeping options open for a gas tax of around 3 cents that would create equalization with the other counties in this region over a period of five years. Clackamas County does not consider this an appropriate time to seek a diesel tax. The increase would be split 60 percent for the county, 40 percent to the cities within the county.

Dan Cooper, General Counsel for Metro, clarified that the IGA for the six governments is being drafted by Metro, that the document is required under state statute, and that it must be signed and in place before the vehicle registration fee has been imposed (collected). He didn't feel it would be possible to obtain all signatures prior to September 4 but felt that could occur prior to the ballots being counted in November. He cited the need for the issue to be on the Metro Council agenda around September 4. Chair Kvistad asked that Dan Cooper work with Commissioner Collier toward that end.

Metro Councilor McCaig commented that she understood the counties' plight but felt that their efforts represented a step backwards. She regarded their proposals as a precipitous move, noting that it was wrong because a comprehensive plan wasn't identified which dealt with a variety of transportation needs. She didn't feel the \$15.00 vehicle registration fee increase for Multnomah County dealt with transit, light rail or 2040 considerations and questioned why Metro would be preparing the IGA if the counties did not wish Metro involvement. She further questioned the lack of regional partnership.

Mayor Drake spoke of the failure of the Legislature to enact a transportation funding package. He felt that the counties are backtracking at a time the region should be moving forward. He didn't feel the counties' proposals dealt with the real needs of the region and it saddened him but he expressed the necessity to proceed.

Commissioner Collier indicated that the county chose to go its way because Metro was not prepared to do it at this time. The effort is regarded as a "step in time" rather than a backward one and the \$4.5 million/year that would be produced by the vehicle registration fee increase would help Multnomah County address its bridge needs. They have a list of projects in place and feel very prepared to undertake this effort. She asked for Metro's support as a regional partner and acknowledged that the effort will only partially provide a solution to the safety needs of the Willamette River bridges.

Mayor Lomnicki expressed agreement with Commissioner Collier but also agreed with the comments expressed by Councilor McCaig and Mayor Drake. He left the July 10 JPACT meeting with the understanding that a financial package was being developed that was of



a regional nature. He commented that we are Balkanizing this region, that he was concerned about its future, and cited the need to maintain our regional coalition.

Tom Walsh did not feel the region is in a crisis today even though he acknowledged real needs and real problems. Because the counties' tax proposals are not part of a comprehensive, long-range plan, he indicated that Tri-Met was not prepared to sign an Intergovernmental Agreement. In response, Commissioner Collier noted that Multnomah County is in a crisis with respect to its Willamette River bridges.

Councilor McLain spoke of levels of frustration experienced after the JPACT Finance Committee meeting. She felt the tax measures would merely serve as a bandaid and emphasized the need to be good regional partners in whatever coordination is required by the counties. She cited the need to be supportive in their effort and in educating the public. The other issue discussed dealt with breaking of rank and how to proceed so that Balkanization of the region does not occur. Issues to be discussed further are a ballot on crisis issues and how to proceed from here.

Mike Burton commented on the failure of the Oregon Legislature to enact a transportation funding package and the assumption that the JPACT/Metro position was a starting point for further discussions. At the July 10 JPACT meeting, each jurisdiction was asked to meet with their respective councils/boards and come back with a recommendation. He noted that there was no consensus at the JPACT Finance Committee meeting to proceed with a Metro measure. Rural road needs were discussed and the consensus was that a regional ballot measure could not be formed which would meet those needs. Mike also expressed concern that, if failure occurred in part of the region or if the measures passed in some counties, it would be difficult to achieve success on a regional package thereafter. He felt the best option would be to take the same package that went before the Legislature and submit it to the voters regionally.

Commissioner Hales disagreed and felt that people vote on perceived value and benefits at each election. He noted that local park measures passed following the regional open spaces measure and that a systems development charge was recently enacted that will collect approximately \$6 million for capital projects.

Commissioner Rogers felt that, when you define regionalism, it pertains to the urban area. Washington County didn't feel it would be appropriate to proceed with a Metro funding measure on the ballot because some of their need is outside the Metro boundary. Commissioner Rogers spoke of a unified relationship with Multnomah and Clackamas Counties and achieving a goal of

equalization among the counties. He was concerned that Metro may not be prepared to draft the IGA as he felt it sends the wrong signals, but indicated that Washington County was prepared to draft one. He also noted that Washington County has significant flooding issues and has waited four years to address those problems. In addition, maintenance has been deferred. In the spirit of cooperation, he pointed out that Washington County has been a participant in all light rail projects and will continue to be a regional partner.

Chair Kvistad assured Commissioner Rogers that an Intergovernmental Agreement was being drafted by Metro and that the comments expressed by Councilor McCaig in no way reflects the opinions of all the Metro Councilors. He indicated that Mike Burton, Councilor McCaig and he would help coordinate the counties' effort.

Councilor McCaig felt that an opportunity exists to proceed in a manner that would satisfy the needs of the individual counties. She questioned sacrificing the consensus built up for a regional package and cited the need to communicate those regional needs to the voters. Councilor McCaig appealed to the counties to hold off on their ballot measures and to focus on a more comprehensive regional proposal for the ballot in March. She agreed that there is a dire need to get on with a proposal and for some action to take place. She also noted that if the counties do proceed, the measures should be consistent so that a single, understandable package can be explained to the public.

Mike Burton felt the debate was a healthy one, recognizing the need for a regional solution. If something is on the ballot in November, it sends a signal to the voters that the Oregon Legislature was ineffectual and there is need to resolve the transportation funding problem. However, it also places a limitation on the part of our efforts to deal with regional needs.

Councilor McLain assured the committee that Metro will be available as a regional partner in this effort, whether it be for coordination or to help in the education process.

Commissioner Rogers spoke of the need of the rural areas in Washington County where roads are being ground up and returned to gravel. He noted that there are cities within the region considering drafting their own tax proposals and he wasn't sure how that would impact the counties' efforts. Discussion followed on how these measures will be coordinated into a plan for the region.

Councilor Rohde of Lake Oswego felt that the public does not feel the crisis is as great as being suggested. Lake Oswego felt that they were rushing toward some proposals in order to get them on the November ballot. Lake Oswego also felt there was need to

have broader discussions throughout the community and that there was not enough time to get a successful measure passed.

Mayor Lomnicki felt the counties' tax measures are merely a stop-gap measure until something else is in the works. He felt the three-county effort recognized the need to stabilize that foundation, to equalize the types of transportation funding within the region, to move forward with our arterials and transit program, and that it represents just one step of a coordinated effort that is moving forward.

Discussion continued regarding how the Legislature put the region at risk in terms of local road and transit needs. Chair Kvistad felt that the critical component is having a functional region.

Commissioner Collier noted that there wasn't consensus to go out for a regional package or go out past November. The counties reached consensus to address certain needs and decided to move forward with the revenue proposals in view of their agreement and momentum. She disagreed with the belief that there is no description of what is to follow and no specific plan. Commissioner Collier spoke of Multnomah County being supportive of three different Tri-Met measures for light rail, while putting their own needs aside, because they believed in the transit system. She couldn't understand Tri-Met withholding its signature on the IGA at a time when Multnomah County is seeking a stop-gap measure as an interim solution for their needs.

Chair Kvistad thanked the group for their comments and recognized that a lot of work needs to be done in the area of transportation finance.

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Mike Burton  
JPACT Members