

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: February 9, 1995

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Acting Chair Susan McLain and Don Morissette, Metro Council; Earl Blumenauer, City of Portland; Roy Rogers, Washington County; Dean Lookingbill (alt.), Southwest Washington RTC; Bruce Warner, ODOT; Bob Post (alt), Tri-Met; Mary Legry (alt.), WSDOT; Craig Lomnicki, Cities of Clackamas County; Tanya Collier, Multnomah County; Ed Lindquist, Clackamas County; Claudiette LaVert, Cities of Multnomah County; Mike Thorne, Port of Portland; and Gregory Green (alt.), DEQ

Guests: Rod Sandoz and John Rist, Clackamas County; Darin Atteberry, City of Vancouver; Kathy Busse, Multnomah County; Kate Deane and Steve Dotterrer, and Meeky Blizzard, City of Portland; Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland; Linda Peters (JPACT alt.), Washington County; Patricia McCaig (JPACT alt.), Metro Council; Debra Downey, MCCI; David Yaden, Consultant; David Calver and Dick Feeney, Tri-Met; Tom Coffee, City of Lake Oswego; Sandra Doubleday, City of Gresham; and Rex Burkholder, Citizen member on TPAC

Staff: Mike Burton, Executive Officer; Andrew Cotugno, Richard Brandman, Mike Hogle, Larry Shaw, Casey Short and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

SUMMARY:

The meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Acting Chair Susan McLain. She welcomed and introduced newly appointed member Mary Legry as alternate to Gerry Smith of WSDOT.

Chair McLain announced that Agenda item No. 6 relating to the Greenspaces program and bond measure was being deferred to the March 9 JPACT meeting at the request of Councilor McCaig.

MEETING REPORT

Bruce Warner moved, seconded by Mayor Lomnicki, to approve the January 12, 1995 JPACT meeting report as written. The motion PASSED unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 95-2089 - AMENDING THE TRANSPORTATION POLICY
ALTERNATIVES COMMITTEE (TPAC) BYLAWS

Andy Cotugno explained that the proposed amendments to the TPAC Bylaws include reference of the 2040 Growth Concept in development of the RTP; an updated reference to the Federal Transit Administration rather than the Urban Mass Transportation Administration; removal of references of the Metro Council Planning Committee; and the ability of citizen members to appoint their own alternate.

Introduced at the meeting was a proposed amendment to Article III, Section 2c, offered by Councilor Kvistad as follows (proposed changes underlined):

Citizen representatives and their alternates will be nominated by the jurisdictions and through a public application process, confirmed by the Metro Council, and appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Metro Council. Alternates shall be selected from the list of nominees submitted by the jurisdictions for appointment as citizen members.

Andy clarified that it is the intent of the proposed amendment that alternates also be appointed by Metro Council. Councilor Morissette indicated it was Councilor Kvistad's concern that there be fair representation from each district and he proposed the amendment to ensure a balance in representation for citizens on TPAC.

Rex Burkholder, a citizen member on TPAC, felt that his purpose on TPAC is to represent a point of view. For logistic reasons, he felt he should be able to communicate with the alternate and update him/her on TPAC matters and that they should share an interest area. He noted that a nominee from the application pool may share a different viewpoint. The language in the proposed Bylaws, as submitted in the agenda packet, would allow the citizen member to select their own alternate.

Action Taken: Bob Post moved, seconded by Bruce Warner, that Resolution No. 95-2089 be referred back to TPAC for further discussion. The motion PASSED unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 95-2090 - ESTABLISHING A FINANCING PLAN FOR THE
SOUTH/NORTH LIGHT RAIL PROJECT

Andy Cotugno explained that Exhibit A to the Resolution represents the proposed financing plan for the South/North light rail project. If approved, this Resolution would endorse the financing plan which identifies the various sources of funds that must come together, the participating jurisdictions, and when

JPACT

February 9, 1995

Page 3

those funds are needed. It includes one-third share from the Tri-Met bond measure passed in November; a proposal for another third through the State of Oregon; pursuit of a minimum 50 percent federal funding share; and one-third of the local share from the State of Washington (to be provided equally by C-TRAN and the Washington Legislature). Because Clark County's ballot measure failed, we would continue to pursue the South/North LRT project and ask the Clark County voters once again for their support.

Discussion followed on the timing issue concerning the next Reauthorization Bill and the possibility that it could take two years before it's reissued in view of the President's budget and process. Emphasis was placed on the importance of being part of that debate.

Dick Feeney reported that the JPACT Finance Committee has met several times prior to formulating its recommendation for a financing plan for the South/North LRT project. He clarified that this recommendation does not contemplate using any State Highway funds in financing the local share of the project. Options considered in previous drafts included those as possibilities. This proposal includes: the need to execute a Full-Funding Grant Agreement; request to Congress for 50 percent funding for construction of the first segment of the South/North LRT project (downtown Milwaukie to downtown Vancouver) at a cost of \$2.10 billion; a \$475 million commitment of Tri-Met and the local voters derived from the recent bond measure; a \$475 million commitment from the State of Washington and C-TRAN to be shared equally; appointment of a task force to look into private sector investments; and C-TRAN and Tri-Met embarking on a bi-state compact for uniform decision-making on construction.

Dick Feeney elaborated on the proposal for paying off the lottery funds over time. The proposal does not contemplate that lottery funds go into the project nor sale of those bonds until the year 2000. Dick noted that the federal share would likely be obtained over the life of two authorization bills.

Mike Thorne raised questions relating to the potential inability of the lottery to pay the bond. Dick Feeney responded that, as a back-up, these funds would be paid from the state General Fund if the lottery were to fail.

Discussion also centered on what happens to the plan if the state of Washington is not a participant. It was noted that alignment considerations would have to be re-examined to fit into the overall strategy. Mike Thorne expressed some concern over the Washington funds not being in place and needed for the entire project. There is need to demonstrate that all funds requested

JPACT

February 9, 1995

Page 4

from the Federal Government will be spent upon completion of the project even though this is a phased project.

Dick Feeney felt that the first segment, between downtown Milwaukie and downtown Vancouver, is a realistic goal to move forward along with segmentation and its funding through the next ISTEA.

Another question raised concerned the length of time the state of Washington has before those funds are jeopardized.

Dick spoke of the urgency of seeking federal availability before the next ISTEA. He cited the need to be realistic in terms of federal authority in the next ISTEA in view of nationwide competition. \$775 million is being sought in the next ISTEA. That would have to be matched by 50 percent funds here in order to build the proposed project.

Commissioner Blumenauer commented on the need for the federal commitment, the local match, the unsuccessful election in the state of Washington, and the tight timetable. He cited the need for regional consensus, a better response on why the legislators should continue to move forward on this project, and to convey that things could be altered on the Washington side. He felt Senator Hatfield could make a big difference in the outcome.

Mike Thorne didn't see a compelling reasons for the Legislature to make this commitment. He felt the goal was laudable but that the plan was inadequate to meet the challenge, suggesting that it should be altered.

Mike Burton asked whether the ability to go forward was dependent at all on the Washington Legislature and what message should be conveyed to the Oregon delegation.

Andy Cotugno stated that the project originally was to go to Clackamas County. The vote passed by the public demonstrated current support for the addition of light rail on this side of the river. Andy noted that funding is available for the Environmental Impact Statement that will provide information on the outstanding issues raised in Clark County prior to sale of any bonds. The federal timeline is critical if the region is to pursue 50 percent federal funds and would be a windfall to the state of Oregon. Washington State funds could be committed to building a shorter project and the project could be phased for a later extension vote. If we don't have a Clark County project, there will still be a need for state and local funds for the Oregon portion. If there are state funds, you could still build to Clackamas County. If you knew you were going to obtain Clark County funds at some time, the Oregon funds could fill the 50

percent federal participation requirement for a segment into North Portland.

Commissioner Rogers felt there is a lot of confusion and asked for clarification on the need for this regional project. He also wanted to know how and when the project would be re-evaluated if the State of Washington does not become a participant.

Mike Thorne emphasized the need for projects that build infrastructure. He felt the message to policymakers is that the wise use of lottery dollars is to package them in terms of key transportation projects.

Andy Cotugno explained that a resolution was supported by JPACT in January 1995 for a \$50 million statewide transportation funding package for infrastructure needs from the lottery. This would draw from that but not for five years.

Councilor Morissette felt the Committee was not in a position to move forward without an alternative proposal. It was noted that a contingency plan is being formulated that 1) Vancouver comes up with the money somehow; or 2) that we continue with an Oregon only project.

Dick Feeney indicated that Tri-Met's Bond Counsel and financial advisors feel it has a chance at the Legislature. They feel the opportunity is still there and we need to push for it. A number of members from the business community have come to the Legislature in support.

Commissioner Blumenauer noted that Washington's Governor has a personal commitment to this project and there is indication that the funds will be approved. He cited the need to affirm this financing approach but acknowledged the difficulty in determining how much to go forward with. He felt that nothing was to be gained by retreating from this endeavor. There is \$20 million funded in the pipeline for EIS work to give stronger support for the work for Clark County.

Action Taken: Commissioner Blumenauer moved, seconded by Commissioner Lindquist, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 95-2090, establishing a financing plan for the South/North light rail project.

In discussion on the motion, there was agreement that, if for some reason there are no lottery dollars available, plans be developed for a shorter project.

As a friendly amendment, the motion was changed to add language stating "and that staff be directed to develop for JPACT and

Metro Council consideration of alternative phasing plans depending on what happens with the different funding resources."

The motion, as amended, passed unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 95-2094 - AMENDING THE TIP TO INCLUDE A \$1.6 MILLION SECTION 3 "LIVABLE COMMUNITIES" PROJECT IN CLACKAMAS COUNTY

Andy Cotugno noted that the resolution has not yet been drafted. It would allow Clackamas County to compete nationwide for federal Discretionary funds for the transit aspects of the Sunnyside Village project. In order for Clackamas County to seek the Discretionary funds, the TIP must first be amended to include the \$1.6 million project.

Commissioner Lindquist noted that Clackamas County was encouraged to seek Section 3 funds for the project by the Federal Transit Administration. He was unaware of any competition within Region 10. The Sunnyside Village Plan would entail transit and pedestrian/bikeway considerations.

Action Taken: Commissioner Lindquist moved, seconded by Commissioner Collier, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 95-2094 (to be drafted by Metro staff) amending the Transportation Improvement Program to include a \$1.6 million Section 3 "Livable Communities" project in Clackamas County. The motion PASSED unanimously.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR RTP, ARTERIAL FUND, AND \$27 MILLION ALLOCATION

Andy Cotugno explained that this relates to follow-up in discussion at the last JPACT meeting and concerns allocation of the \$27 million reserve; adoption of a financially constrained RTP; and development of an Arterial Fund to be financed over the fiscally constrained RTP. Information is provided for discussion purposes only. A schedule, ranking of projects, and a recommendation need to be finalized by the end of April. He cited the need for concurrence with that schedule and noted that the solicitation period is open for allocation of the \$27 million reserve.

Andy Cotugno reviewed the handout on the RTP, defining the modes and means of implementation. It included modes relating to light rail, freeways, arterials, bridges, transit capital, transit operations, TSM, TDM, intermodal, bike, pedestrian and TOD improvements. Also reviewed was the relationship of the RTP update to analysis of the modes and means of implementation and the draft recommended administrative criteria and its weighting.

JPACT

February 9, 1995

Page 7

Bruce Warner expressed concern that the date for adoption of the criteria was the same as the submittal date. His concern stemmed from the fact that projects are being put together between now and March based on a criteria that is not finalized. Andy Cotugno explained that there can't be a longer submittal time-frame and was concerned that it not be extended too long as May is the federal deadline for a financially constrained RTP. He indicated that the region could comply with the RTP and not allocate the funds.

Mike Burton felt there should be further discussion on the criteria by the jurisdictions.

The pool of projects need to meet the targets and to strive for a 10 percent VMT/capita traffic reduction. Technical ranking factors include: measure of usage, safety measures, implementation of 2040, multi-modal consideration, and cost-effectiveness.

Andy Cotugno spoke of the need for feedback from JPACT on the transportation improvement priorities survey. Criteria is developed that follows these basic factors and projects will then be ranked accordingly.

Andy asked for input on what the emphasis area should be for allocation of funds and weighting of factors. He reviewed the survey questionnaire and asked that JPACT members complete them, note the JPACT affiliation, and turn them in. He noted that, in the past, criteria was geared to economic development and that emphasis has now been placed on 2040.

Mike Hoglund pointed out that, if the thought is that everything should be ranked equally, mark the form in that manner.

Mike Thorne commented that, in view of the approach being changed from economic development to an emphasis on 2040, Intel has expressed concern about moving their products to shipment via planes. They want to know what's going to happen. Mike wanted to know how the criteria reflects that priority. In response, it was noted that it is reflected through usage and the 10 percent reduction in VMT/capita applies to person travel, not freight. It is also covered in the highest priority locations in the 2040 Growth Concept. Mike Thorne noted that industrial sanctuaries will provide for that economic base and we need to have that land to provide for that economic base. He noted that cargo growth is becoming a serious problem.

Bruce Warner commented that, in terms of funding criteria and weight, ranking of projects is done to achieve a score, and other criteria may also apply. He noted there is no way to build viable links on the freeway system with the amount of available

funds. There are, however, low-cost measures that would help the transportation system and felt that an "X" should be applicable rather than a "questionmark" on the matrix.

Bob Post asked why transit operations wasn't included on the matrix. It was explained that, in the state "cutting" process of \$34 million, \$27 million was committed to transit and it was felt the rest should be considered after 2040 was in place. Bob noted Tri-Met's immediate concern about the \$27 million allocation and felt that transit needs should be included. It was agreed that transit should be eligible for the \$11 million "Regional STP" portion of the allocation.

It was agreed that March 16 will be the deadline for submittal of projects. Mike Burton asked the jurisdictions to get back to Metro staff with their recommended projects following consultation with their staff.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan
COPIES TO: Mike Burton
JPACT Members

lmk