

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: July 11, 1996

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Chair Rod Monroe, Don Morissette and Susan McLain, Metro Council; Grace Crunican, ODOT; Craig Lomnicki, Cities of Clackamas County; Tanya Collier, Multnomah County; Dave Lohman (alt.), Port of Portland; Royce Pollard, City of Vancouver; Dean Lookingbill, Southwest Washington RTC; Greg Green (alt.), DEQ; Gerry Smith, WSDOT; Roy Rogers, Washington County; Tom Walsh, Tri-Met; Rob Drake, Cities of Washington County; Claudiette LaVert, Cities of Multnomah County; and Charlie Hales, City of Portland

Guests: Rod Sandoz and John Rist, Clackamas County; Dave Williams, ODOT; Bernie Bottomly, Dick Feeney and G.B. Arrington, Tri-Met; Les White (JPACT alt.), C-TRAN; Steve Dotterer and Elsa Coleman, City of Portland; Kathy Busse, Multnomah County; Kathy Lehtola, Washington County; and Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland

Staff: Andy Cotugno, Richard Brandman, Rich Ledbetter, Pamela Peck, Kim White, Millie Brence and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

SUMMARY:

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

MEETING REPORT

Dave Lohman moved, seconded by Mayor Lomnicki, to approve the June 13 JPACT meeting report as written. The motion PASSED unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 96-2327 - APPROVING CHAPTER 1 OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Andy Cotugno explained that Chapter 1 of the RTP Update serves as a guide toward development of the next phase of the RTP that will define the transportation improvements necessary to implement the policies of the *Regional Framework Plan*. He reviewed the components of Exhibits A through D which included the CAC April 19

draft of Chapter 1 (Exhibit A); the CAC Addendum to the Chapter 1 draft (Exhibit B); the public and agency comments on the CAC draft of Chapter 1 (inclusive of TPAC responses and amendments, dated June 28, 1996 (Exhibit C)); and the engrossed version of Chapter 1 with TPAC-recommended amendments dated June 28, 1996 (Exhibit D).

Information distributed at the meeting included a memo from Councilor Morissette, Chair of Metro's Transportation Planning Committee (relating to seven issues), one from Commissioner Saltzman of Multnomah County (relating to recommendations governing bicycle networks), and one from the City of Portland pertaining to regional accessibility as it relates to the *Urban Growth Management Functional Plan*.

Andy noted that public comments received were divided into a "discussion" package and a "consent" package (Exhibit C). The "discussion" items represented comments identified by TPAC as needing further discussion by MPAC and JPACT prior to approval. The "consent" items represented comments identified by TPAC to be approved as a group with no detailed discussion by MPAC and JPACT.

In highlighting Exhibit C, Andy noted that Comments 1 through 5 dealt with urban-to-urban travel, which will be discouraged on most rural routes with exceptions identified in the RTP. These exceptions will be identified as part of the system component of the RTP update. Comments 6 and 7 related to intercity rail in order to acknowledge these functions within the region. In reference to Comment 9, Andy cited two elements of the regional bicycle network: 1) a focus on travel between regional centers through an interconnected regional system; and 2) a focus on short trips within and outside of higher density areas identified in 2040. Andy felt that more research needs to be done to increase our understanding of bicycle travel. The need for emphasis of alternative modes is noted under Comment No. 11.

Andy felt that he had emphasized the most significant comments for the committee but added that the issue relating to how we prioritize our modal transportation investments should be discussed further by JPACT.

Andy noted that Councilor Morissette's memo from the Transportation Planning Committee provides text for clarification of the multi-modal intent of the RTP and identifies a multi-modal emphasis that supports the 2040 land use designations. The intent is to emphasize the need to broaden transportation choices for modes of travel while also recognizing that the automobile will likely continue to be the primary mode of travel over the life of the RTP.

A discussion followed over Issue 6 (relating to the proposed recommendation that transportation projects include bicycle facilities) and the differences between the CAC recommendation and that of TPAC. The discussion recognized that the CAC recommendation emphasized where bicycle facilities are needed while the TPAC recommendation assumed there will be bicycle facilities and focused on how these facilities will be designed. The committee agreed with the Transportation Planning Committee's recommendation to re-examine this issue and its implications on private development as part of the system component of the RTP update.

Dave Lohman asked about the legal reasons behind the wording "discouraging the urban-to-urban travel with exceptions identified in the RTP" and the language relating to "provision of bike facilities." Specifically, he questioned whether the goal statements tie us down to the point that we can't make sense in a given situation. Andy clarified that Chapter 1 provides guidance for the remaining chapters of the RTP and that the proposed language in Chapter 1 will be subject to future review. Based on this review, changes will be made to Chapter 1 as necessary.

In addition, Andy cited the need to evaluate the RTP, upon completion of the update, to determine which elements are binding and which are advisory to local governments. Additional language will be provided in the RTP to describe these provisions. Andy also noted that facilities falling outside Metro's boundary won't be subject to the RTP.

Some committee members expressed concerns with the language suggested in Issue No. 2 of the Transportation Planning Committee memo, clarifying the continued role of the automobile. Tom Walsh acknowledged that American cities will continue to be built around the American automobile but questioned support of the language in terms of its relationship to ISTEA. In addition, he felt someone, such as Professor Kain, might use the language out of context to promote ideas contrary to what the RTP is attempting to achieve.

Councilor McLain cited the RTP's role in terms of function, design and connectivity and how it affects funding for rural roads in Washington County that don't have high volume. She noted that Metro has been asked to hold up road funds from counties that don't adequately address rural roads. She cited the importance of the ISTEA funds in terms of the flexibility they offer.

Commissioner Hales questioned how the proposed language would fit with the Transportation Planning Rule, emphasizing the need to reduce the per capita demand.

In response, Andy Cotugno noted that Chapter 1 strongly emphasizes increasing the alternative mode split. Councilor Morissette felt there is need to acknowledge that the automobile will be the dominant mode in the future and that the proposed language in Chapter 1 was vague about this point. He felt that his proposed language change did not exclude other alternative modes in this process.

Commissioner Collier expressed concern about the proposed language in Issue 2 of the memo, commenting that the region has worked hard to have a balanced multi-modal approach to transportation and that the proposed language change seemed contrary to that approach. She also felt the language might be taken out of context.

Action Taken: Commissioner Collier moved, seconded by Tom Walsh, to strike all underlined language proposed in Issue No. 2 of the Transportation Planning Committee memo, which included "and will likely be" and "and will continue to be."

In discussion on the motion, Mayor Drake questioned whether the proposed language change was linked to the movement of freight. He also felt that we need to recognize the concern raised by committee members about there being any connection to Professor Kain's position. He would like the language to acknowledge that the car will continue to be the dominant mode of travel but was also comfortable in not including the proposed language.

The committee discussed differences between counties in terms of availability and reliance on transit. The committee agreed that, in reality, 90 percent of the population in Washington and Clackamas Counties will continue to depend on the auto as the primary form of transportation.

Commissioner Hales suggested changing the word "dominant" to "primary."

Chair Monroe suggested a statement that would read: "although we recognize that the automobile will continue to be a primary way of getting around, we hope it will be a diminished percentage of getting around."

One of the changes made by MPAC's recommendation is that the key criterion for transportation decision-making in the future should be mode split as opposed to the level of congestion.

Grace Crunican pointed out that the state has goals to reduce VMT at the state level. She cited the need to plan for the future,

to acknowledge what our goals are and, at the state level, to preserve what we have while reducing VMT.

Dave Lohman suggested replacing the word "However" in the second line of Issue 2 with "In addition", which committee members supported, but no action was taken.

Councilor McLain emphasized that the RTP is supposed to be a "vision" document in support of increasing mode splits. She indicated, however, she could support a change of language from "dominant" to "primary" and a substitution of the word "However" to In addition.

Mayor Lomnicki indicated he supported Commissioner Collier's motion to strike the underlined text proposed in Issue No. 2.

Dave Lohman felt the statement should be neutral in terms of how the system performs. He also expressed concern that the proposed language might be taken out of context.

In calling for the question, the motion PASSED unanimously to remove the proposed underlined language for page 1-22, which included "and will likely be" and "and will continue to be." The text will read as follows:

"Traditionally, the automobile has been the dominant form of passenger travel, and much of the region's roadway system has been designed to accommodate growing automobile demands. However, the motor vehicle system also plays an important role in the movement of freight, providing the backbone for commerce in the region."

Action Taken: Councilor LaVert moved, seconded by Commissioner Hales, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 96-2327, approving Chapter 1 of the *Regional Transportation Plan Update*, including supplements from Commissioner Saltzman (relating to the regional bicycle network) and the Transportation Planning Committee (as amended), and all the recommended changes in the discussion and consent package (Exhibit C). The motion PASSED unanimously.

Grace Crunican referred the committee to Page 1-19 of the RTP relating to the Advanced Traffic Management System (ATMS), which includes incident management. She noted that the concept will require local jurisdiction commitments relating to transportation policies that increase investments in managing facilities rather than adding capacity.

RESOLUTION NO. 96-2356 - AMENDING THE FY 1996 METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO UPDATE THE REGIONAL TRANSIT
PROGRAM

Andy Cotugno reported that this resolution would amend the FY 96 MTIP to allocate \$1.2 million of Section 9 funds for an added light rail station in the Gresham Civic Neighborhood. Tom Walsh explained that this is the old Project Breakeven site and the request has been triggered by the level of permits for residential starts and commercial square footage. He assured the committee that it does not affect the Westside or South/North light rail funds but that it will add riders to the system.

Action Taken: Mayor Lomnicki moved, seconded by Councilor McLain, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 96-2356, amending the FY 1996 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) to update the regional transit system. The motion PASSED unanimously.

STIP/MTIP SCHEDULE

Andy Cotugno noted that we are approaching the start of the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) update process and it is not a pretty picture. He felt that we may need to go through a cut process. The 1998 program will get bigger because the 1997 program is slipping.

Categories of funds that the STIP deals with include the Modernization Program (\$71 million, of which 30-40 percent is already committed); pavement preservation; and bridge preservation.

This allocation does not include Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) or Transportation Enhancement funds which are only programmed through 1997.

In November 1996, a first draft of projects will be identified for review by the Oregon Transportation Commission. The second cut will take place in March 1997. Andy noted that the process will be a joint venture with ODOT.

Grace Crunican reminded committee members that the way we reached the last STIP did not allow for big-ticket items such as the climbing lanes on Highway 26 and the deletion of the Kruse Way project. At the staff level, expectations are for the current commitments and the two projects (Highway 26 climbing lane and the Kruse Way project) as future commitments. Andy asked whether ODOT had any new funding commitments that they want to entertain against the old commitments.

JPACT
July 11, 1996
Page 7

Commissioner Hales felt that projects which advance the 2040 Growth Concept and reduce VMT should be supported.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Monroe announced that the next JPACT meeting will be held on August 8.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Mike Burton
JPACT Members