

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: August 8, 1996

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Chair Rod Monroe and Susan McLain, Metro Council; Roy Rogers, Washington County; Dean Lookingbill (alt.), Southwest Washington RTC; Claudiette LaVert, Cities of Multnomah County; David Lohman (alt.), Port of Portland; Craig Lomnicki, Cities of Clackamas County; Gerry Smith, WSDOT; Greg Green (alt.), DEQ; Charlie Hales, City of Portland; Rob Drake, Cities of Washington County; Dave Yaden (alt.), Tri-Met; and Les White (alt.), C-TRAN

Guests: Kate Deane and Steve Dotterer, City of Portland; Brent Curtis and Kathy Lehtola, and John Rosenberger, Washington County; Tom VanderZanden, Rod Sandoz and John Rist, Clackamas County; Pat Collmeyer, Office of Neil Goldschmidt; Richard Ross, Cities of Multnomah County; Leo Huff and Dave Williams, ODOT; and Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland

Staff: Andrew Cotugno and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

MEDIA: Gordon Oliver, The Oregonian
K.D. Norris, Valley Times Newspaper

SUMMARY:

The meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Chair Rod Monroe.

MEETING REPORT

Councilor LaVert noted two corrections in the July 11 JPACT meeting report, with changes to be made as follows:

- . Substitution of Mayor Lomnicki for "Councilor LaVert" under "Action Taken" on page 5; and
- . Substitution of Councilor LaVert for "Mayor Lomnicki" under "Action Taken" on page 6.

The meeting report was approved as amended.

TITLES 2 AND 6 OF THE URBAN GROWTH MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONAL PLAN

Andy Cotugno explained that the *Urban Growth Management Functional Plan* has undergone intensive review by local governments. The document, as submitted, is complete and ready for consideration by the Metro Council, comprising the full text of the UGM functional plan.

In highlighting the July 26 memo from TPAC to JPACT on Titles 2 and 6 of the document, Andy noted that TPAC has suggested a few small amendments along with some clarifying language to accompany the plan. He then elaborated on the proposed amendments to Title 6 relating to accessibility under Section 4.B.2, *Transportation Performance Standards*, and Section 4.C relating to congestion management under the same heading. Andy explained the intent behind the proposed amendments and the need for further discussion on issues brought to the table in the clarifying language.

Andy reviewed the three-step process pertaining to the level-of-service standard and the CMS series of approaches to solve that problem.

Commissioner Hales spoke of the roles of MTAC/TPAC with respect to MPAC/JPACT and the need for a clear separation between that which is technical rather than policy driven. He felt it was a procedural issue and expressed concern that TPAC would propose policy to JPACT.

Commissioner Hales cited MPAC's responsibility with the Regional Framework Plan and its role as an advisory body. He acknowledged that it was evident that the language very carefully crafted by MPAC would make some transportation planners uncomfortable. He further noted that the goal of this region is different in that a land use plan has been developed that creates a different kind of environment. Mode splits are different, and transportation investments are geared to support the mode split rather than the congestion. He felt that MPAC's direction was a philosophical change; could not support the proposed amendment, and felt that land use should be the foundation of that decision.

To alleviate Commissioner Hales' concerns, Andy Cotugno noted the differences in MPAC's role created by Charter to the advisory role JPACT assumes in complying with federal MPO and conformity requirements with respect to the *Regional Transportation Plan*. He cited the need for JPACT to act on the transportation elements of the *Urban Growth Management Functional Plan*, emphasizing that, in order to have a set of plans and requirements that affect transportation, the region also needs to meet the federal side of the requirements. He spoke of the procedural issue in terms of

the mechanics of the framework plan and the importance of MPAC working with JPACT to meet those MPO requirements.

Further discussion centered on process. Commissioner Hales elaborated on the amount of time and effort MPAC spent on the UGM functional plan, that TPAC's recommendation was being submitted at a late date, and felt the proposed changes "watered down" the text.

In further discussion on the impact of these changes, Andy noted that the functional plan calls for local jurisdictions to change densities. He gave as an example a jurisdiction that changed its densities and, as a result, created congestion. They would be allowed to use these proposed standards that permit a certain amount of congestion. If the standards were exceeded, a determination would then have to be made on whether the congestion limits accessibility. If they choose to live with the congestion, consideration should also be given to the impact on the neighboring community. Commissioner Hales felt it gives local governments the excuse that they can figure out what mode split is needed to serve that congestion level.

Mayor Drake commented that he has served on MPAC and JPACT for four years, noting the differences in the charges of the two committees. He acknowledged that, while they have different perspectives, their recommendations needn't be of one accord and that any differences would be resolved by the Metro Council. He was not uncomfortable with some of the differences.

Mayor Drake noted that some of the cities in Washington County still share concerns over the minimum and maximum parking requirements. He cited the importance of being respectful of those differences that would eventually be evaluated by Metro Council.

Dave Yaden didn't feel that either amendment undermined MPAC's recommendations for Titles 2 and 6 and felt the proposed changes were appropriate. He felt neither amendment was a substantive "watering down" of MPAC's recommendation.

Commissioner Rogers felt that a lot of local jurisdictions would rather have the original language as it offered more flexibility. The proposed language actually offers some arbitration and he didn't have a problem with those changes.

Commissioner Rogers noted a memo received from Washington County transportation planners, expressing concerns relating to meeting the level-of-service and congestion/accessibility standards in Washington County and how those standards interrelate at the

local level. The letter indicated the need for clarification to be provided on those issues. Commissioner Rogers urged Metro to work with Washington County planners in application of those standards. In response, Andy Cotugno reported that Metro is involved in an effort with Washington County to do a pilot study in the Peterkort area to sort out technical procedures and apply the new method to the level-of-service standards. The process for evaluating accessibility is relatively new. The technical people need to develop methods on how to conclude their accessibility and mode split targets. Andy assured the Committee that JPACT would be involved in any changes to the RTP.

Councilor McLain clarified that any disputes arising on land use matters would be referred to MPAC while transportation issues would be referred to JPACT.

Action Taken: Mayor Drake moved, seconded by Councilor LaVert, to approve the two TPAC changes to the *Urban Growth Management Functional Plan* proposed in its July 26, 1996 memo to JPACT. The motion PASSED. Commissioner Hales voted against.

STIP/MTIP UPDATE

Andy Cotugno explained that ODOT and Metro will soon start the process for updating the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP).

A revised version of the STIP/MTIP calendar was distributed. The first key benchmark falls in September/October 1996, when TPAC must approve its draft program of projects for submittal and consideration by JPACT on October 10 and Metro Council on October 17, 1996, respectively. The next important milestone is for JPACT/Metro Council adoption of the draft final MTIP/STIP in March-April 1997. Final adoption, contingent on air quality conformity analysis, is expected by Metro in August. The Oregon Transportation Commission will consider approval of the joint MTIP/STIP in September 1997.

Andy reviewed the discouraging funding outlook and the factors influencing that forecast, which included: estimated lower federal revenue; a decline in state net gas tax receipts based on inflation and increased fuel efficiency; inability to keep up with present commitments, creating a build-up of carryover projects; inability to spend carryover funds; the state's No. 1 priority of operations and maintenance being up 18 percent on an annualized basis relative to FY 96-98 expenditures, creating a smaller budget for Modernization projects; and the first year of the STIP (FY 98) having already being committed, representing draw-down of the available resources.

Andy explained that inflation has been factored in considering revenue available to the year 2001 on the funding charts.

The state is proposing to program projects up to the level of 90 percent of appropriated funds. Metro staff is proposing that projects be programmed up to the 100 percent level to allow for some project slippage. Andy noted that the \$57 million of revenue represents a four-year resource. A discussion ensued over concerns about project slippage (from FY 97 to FY 98+), its impact on the MTIP/STIP, and the need to prevent it from occurring. There is a total of \$95 million of programmed commitments through FY 98, which includes carryover from FY 97 and estimated cost increases needed to complete construction of projects authorized to obligate more limited funding commitments, against available state and regional resources totaling \$90 million. Funds have only been allocated through 1997.

Mayor Drake asked whether the U.S. 26-Camelot - Sylvan (Phase 2) project will be stretched out an additional year. Andy Cotugno noted that there are two phases that involve the Sylvan interchange that are not slipping. He cited the importance of the project staying on track. The \$4 million phase won't make it in 1997.

Councilor McLain emphasized the importance of making decisions on the level of commitment and whether that commitment is still appropriate. She felt it would be a difficult process.

Commissioner Rogers cited the need for a cash flow analysis. Andy indicated that approximately \$15 million a year will be available in terms of cash flow. The carryover is set in the hope that Congress will give spending authority to permit 105 percent of the appropriation. Carryover is about \$100 million statewide.

To clarify matters, Andy explained that in preparation for the year 2001 and beyond, there are a lot of projects under development that don't have commitments for construction. There is need to determine how much money should be spent on developing projects as opposed to construction of projects.

Andy noted that cuts from the last construction program included eastbound Camelot/U.S. Highway 217 and Camelot-Sylvan/U.S. 26 (Phase 3). Those projects have special status as they were approved through a prior resolution. Decisions on priorities are part of the process and all of this is predicated on existing or forecasted resources. None of this is based on the recommendations of the Governor's Transportation Initiative. If there are increases through the legislative process, there will need to be firm decisions made on priorities as new resources become available.

Andy highlighted the process which included:

- . A 45-day public notification process beginning in August 1996;
- . A public comment workshop to be held in September 1996;
- . TPAC and JPACT's draft recommendation in September/October 1996;
- . Project solicitation, if necessary, by jurisdictions by November 15, 1996;
- . Technical ranking of projects in January 1997;
- . Adoption of final State Modernization Program and flexible funding allocation by TPAC, JPACT and Metro Council in February/March 1997;
- . An air quality conformity analysis conducted in April-June 1997;
- . JPACT/Metro Council adoption of the final MTIP/STIP, including conformity, in August 1997; and
- . Adoption by the OTC of the joint MTIP/STIP in September 1997.

Andy pointed out that the final recommendation will be contingent upon the results of the air quality conformity analysis, indicating that some of the decisions may have to be revisited if there are problems with conformity. He cited the need to adhere to the key steps in the process and that the program is to be funded within the \$57 million state Modernization funds. Also, a decision must be made as to whether any of the flexible funds (CMAQ and Transportation Enhancement) should go toward the Modernization projects or whether any of those funds are available for flex purposes. After selection criteria has been adopted, the solicitation process will begin.

Dave Lohman asked whether there would be an impact on 1998 funds if the State Legislature provided any additional funds. In response, Andy Cotugno indicated that it would probably go toward projects in 1999. The Legislature will probably refer something to the voters such as a gas tax measure.

Andy indicated that the MTIP/STIP commitments, criteria to follow for selection, and whether there will be a flex fund to draw from will be reviewed at the September 12 JPACT meeting. Andy also spoke of air quality conformity compliance with the series of benchmark years forecast for vehicle emissions. Forecasted

JPACT
August 8, 1996
Page 7

emissions must stay within the Environmental Quality Commission (EQC) budget for the Portland Area Quality Maintenance Area.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Mike Burton
JPACT Members