

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: October 13, 1994

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Chair Rod Monroe, Jon Kvistad and Susan McLain, Metro Council; Earl Blumenauer, City of Portland; Gregory Green (alt.), DEQ; Roy Rogers, Washington County; Dave Lohman (alt.), Port of Portland; Royce Pollard, City of Vancouver; Bruce Warner, ODOT; Bob Post (alt.), Tri-Met; Bernie Giusto, Cities of Multnomah County; Rob Drake, Cities of Washington County; Gerry Smith, WSDOT; and Craig Lomnicki, Cities of Clackamas County

Guests: Steve Dotterer, City of Portland; Dean Lookingbill, Southwest Washington RTC; Rod Sandoz, Clackamas County; Molly O'Reilly, Citizen; Kathy Busse, Multnomah County; Richard Ross, Cities of Multnomah County; Dave Williams, ODOT; G.B. Arrington, Tri-Met; Deb Wallace, C-TRAN; Jennifer Ball, Conkling, Fiskum & McCormick; Pamela Reamer-Williams and James Bailey, Intermodal Transportation Council; Peter Fry, Central Eastside Industrial Council; and Tom Coffee, City of Lake Oswego

Staff: Andrew Cotugno, Richard Brandman, Mike Hogle, Tom Kloster, and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

SUMMARY:

The meeting was called to order by Chair Rod Monroe followed by an introduction and welcome for Commissioner Dick Thompson from Ellensburg, Washington.

Chair Monroe reported that Metro's Finance Committee had approved a resolution to refer the entire Construction Excise Tax package to the May ballot which will be considered by the full Metro Council at its October 13 meeting. This is intended to preempt any action by folks trying to refer only a portion of the package.

MEETING REPORTS

Councilor Kvistad moved, seconded by Councilmember Pollard, to approve the August 11 and September 8, 1994 Meeting Reports as written. The motion PASSED unanimously.

REGION 2040 RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE

Andy Cotugno noted that this meeting was dedicated to review of the 2040 Recommended Alternative that forms the framework and linkages relating to transportation policy. He reviewed the major transportation implications outlined in his memo.

Copies of the newsletter and the tabloid survey were distributed. Andy commented that distribution of the survey was made to everyone who participated in the 2040 process and everyone requesting to be on the mailing list.

The decision packet was included in two components: 1) a resolution acknowledging the overall description of the concept, the rationale behind it, and the analysis; and 2) the RUGGO amendments that contain a lesser amount of detail and will be adopted by ordinance.

The first goal being amended under RUGGO deals with process. The new requirements will be treated in the same manner as previous Metro plans. These represent objectives that Metro's plans must comply with and were brought about by the Metro Charter. Also discussed were implications of the map and background information relating to the Technical Appendix such as ridership and VMT/capita.

Also provided was a summary of the public information response to the tabloid and the open house. Andy noted that a JPACT amendment form was also included in the packet to help develop a set of positions following review and comment.

Commissioner Blumenauer noted that, at the last joint JPACT/MPAC meeting, a memo was distributed from six separate state agencies in the form of a position paper on the Concept Report and Preferred 2040 Alternative. The state agencies included: Housing and Community Services; Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD); Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT); Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ); Department of Energy (DOE); and the Economic Development Department (EDD). Commissioner Blumenauer felt that JPACT should take advantage of the opportunity to integrate the state's comments in a more formal response that would be incorporated in the Appendix or a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). He cited the importance of integrating what happens on the regional level with the state and pointed out that we would be helping the state, ourselves, and give the citizens a much more useful document if staff pursued linking that relationship. He felt it would foster better understanding and cooperation and would create a unique situation in the country. As part of the process, Commissioner Blumenauer

JPACT

October 13, 1994

Page 3

suggested incorporating the state's memo into the 2040 document to be ratified in addition to the signatories from the major state agencies. He wanted it formalized so that everyone could count on it.

John Fregonese provided an overview of the 2040 analysis. He noted that it began with RUGGOs and the decision of whether to grow up or out. He spoke of the process that involved the tabloid, the GIS system, and the analysis of the various growth concepts. He reviewed how Growth Concepts A, B and C were developed, how modeling was utilized, what we have learned from the models, and the public involvement process that followed. He spoke of a video that was available at Blockbuster Video, the ad campaign, and a mailer that drew 17,000 responses, 10,000 of which included additional comments. A summary of those comments is contained in the newsletter.

John reported that four specific questions were asked in the survey relating to: 1) a reduction of square footage of lots from 8,500 square feet to 7,000 square feet; 2) a reduction in parking; 3) higher density development where transit was provided; and 4) growth in centers. Using these four strategies, about 87 percent of future growth could be accommodated within the current Urban Growth Boundary and only 14,500 acres were added to the UGB, which he felt was rather conservative. A concept map summarizing the detailed analysis map was developed and population and jobs allocated.

John reviewed the elements of the Recommended Alternative which include neighbor cities; permanent greenbelts; greenspaces inside the UGB; 22,000 acres of urban reserves study area; higher density centers of employment; downtown Portland as the Central City (representing 20 percent of regional growth); Regional Centers (Milwaukie, Gresham, Beaverton, Washington Square and Clackamas Town Center, representing a tripling of density and 11 percent of new employment); Town Centers; corridors and nodes; and main streets.

Tom Kloster spoke of fine-tuning the Recommended Alternative as they applied it to the modeling. A basic network was put together based on Central City and Regional Centers, with an emphasis on transit, connectivity and creating a more dense network. He noted that some peak-hour congestion was tolerated. Through routes were emphasized on the highway system, minimizing access. Tom spoke of congested roadway miles (intra-UGB), a predominantly radial transit system, conserving the Central City and Regional Centers as hubs, parking factors, PEFs (pedestrian/environmental factors), transit vehicle hours, and total transit ridership. He emphasized that simply increasing transit service doesn't necessarily improve ridership. He noted that the

JPACT

October 13, 1994

Page 4

comparatively low congested roadway miles reflect the inclusion of major throughways, shorter trip lengths, and a jobs/housing balance. The Recommended Alternative has less transit service than the growth concepts but better ridership. Tom felt we did a better job of matching the system to the urban form we are trying to serve but it does not build more ridership.

Tom also noted that the effort focused on better connectivity for bike and pedestrian activities. He spoke of non-auto mode split and travel and that the VMT/capita total was one of the indicators in evaluating the system. He felt the results reflected what can be done with land use and costs associated with travel.

The regional decision timeline for Region 2040 includes: consideration of RUGGO amendments and a general description of the growth concept in December 1994; Urban Reserves in May 1995; The Regional Transportation Plan in summer 1995; Future Vision (the 50-year vision) in July 1995; and a draft Regional Framework Plan completed in summer of 1996 that would affect local government plans. John Fregonese noted that, over the next six months, decisions will be made over which areas should be defined as Town Centers or Regional Centers. He emphasized the importance of the land use pattern, noting that the Recommended Alternative is the most acceptable of all the concepts.

Mayor Drake suggested that the issue of accessibility to Gateway be investigated further in terms of it being considered a Regional Center. It was discussed that, when people go to work, they want to conduct the rest of their activities there as well, and the question was raised about whether that area could accommodate that kind of growth.

Councilor Giusto asked about the 30-minute commute and John Fregonese responded that most businesses locate based on auto accessibility.

In summary of the important transportation implications, Andy Cotugno stated that it is not a comprehensive transportation system being considered but there is need to recognize that the land use concept to be adopted will impact how transportation planning is done and how well it functions. He noted that land use decisions need to be added to the project decisions.

Andy Cotugno asked for feedback from Committee members as further guidance. Mayor Drake commented on the Western Bypass and accessing Sunset Corridor to I-5 and the issue of extending Murray Boulevard south to Tigard. He was curious whether Highway 217 could handle everything if the bypass wasn't put forward. Andy responded that a lot of streets would be impacted pending results of the bypass, that there will be further analysis, and

JPACT

October 13, 1994

Page 5

that those considerations will be addressed. He cited the importance of more street connectivity throughout the Murray area and the fact that there will be some controversial discussions about those segments.

Andy noted that TPAC is developing some comments for consideration at its October 28 meeting. Similarly, staff is asking for feedback from JPACT for guidance.

Metro Councilor Kvistad reported that the Planning Committee is going into its series of "Listening Post" public hearings and encouraged participation and involvement from Committee members.

Bruce Warner noted that ODOT will be interested in the neighboring cities issues and how the actions and reactions have impacts on those surrounding cities. He felt it will have major impacts. He cited the need for commitments on how they are going to grow in the future, of tying together the funding for improvements, and that it be done in a cooperative manner. Bruce cited the need for additional sources of revenue to be explored.

Also discussed was the possibility and impact of two construction projects being done simultaneously, expansion of Highway 217 and the addition of light rail. Traffic is seriously congested in the 217 corridor now and will be worse in the future. It was noted that other modes and transit are needed. Councilor Monroe felt that the addition of light rail along 217 could be planned for at the same time as its expansion. Molly O'Reilly felt that the biggest impact on 217 may be resolved by the connectivity of local streets nearby. To be addressed is whether you get more impact by improving connectivity due to local traffic. Molly cited the importance of first analyzing the kind of traffic before arriving at a solution.

Andy Cotugno encouraged attendance at the October 21 Oregon Progress Board-sponsored Willamette Valley Conference in Corvallis.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Rena Cusma
Dick Engstrom
JPACT Members

STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 94-2039 FOR THE PURPOSE OF AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) REGARDING CONFORMITY OF PORTIONS OF THE AIR QUALITY MAINTENANCE AREA OUTSIDE OF METRO'S BOUNDARIES

Date: October 13, 1994

Presented by: Andrew Cotugno

PROPOSED ACTION

Adoption of this Resolution would constitute Metro's approval of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) which describes the process of determining conformity with the State (Air Quality) Implementation Plan of transportation projects occurring outside Metro's boundaries but located inside the Oregon portion of the Portland/Vancouver Interstate Air Quality Maintenance Area (AQMA). To become effective, the MOU must also be approved by ODOT; DEQ; Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties; the Cities of Banks, Gaston, and North Plains; and then by the Governor.

TPAC has reviewed this Memorandum of Understanding and recommends approval of Resolution No. 94-2039.

BACKGROUND AND FACTUAL ANALYSIS

The federal Clean Air Act has long required federal officials to assure that no project which receives federal assistance will impede attainment and/or maintenance of federal air quality standards. This aspect of the Clean Air Act is especially directed at federally funded transportation projects. However, the Clean Air Act and implementing regulations also prohibit local agencies from approving non-federally funded projects unless assurance is provided that air quality standards will not be adversely affected. This assurance is provided in a qualitative and quantitative "Conformity Determination" prepared by Metro. The Determinations assess transportation projects recommended in the RTP, and which are allocated funding in the TIP or which are proposed by local agencies, for their consistency with goals and programs established in Oregon State (Air Quality) Implementation Plan (SIP). Metro prepares a Determination when either the RTP or the TIP is amended to include or to remove projects of regional air quality significance or when local agencies propose such projects.

The MOU that is the subject of this Resolution is made necessary by a discrepancy between boundaries of the Portland/Vancouver Interstate AQMA and Metro's boundary. The Interstate AQMA boundary was established in the 1970's by DEQ and EPA. Metro's boundary was established by ORS 268 as amended by the Metro Charter approved by the electorate in 1992. The Interstate AQMA boundary includes portions of rural Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties which lie outside Metro's boundary including the incorporated cities of Banks, Gaston and North Plains. The

issues addressed by the MOU are who is responsible for determining transportation project conformity in these rural Interstate AQMA areas and the procedures to be used for making the determination and for resolving any disputes.

The MOU is made necessary by a provision of the metropolitan planning regulations recently adopted by FHWA and FTA. Section 450.308(a) of the regulations specifies that, in the absence of an MOU resolving these issues, Metro will be responsible for carrying out all federal MPO planning requirements within the entirety of the larger Interstate AQMA boundary.

The MOU is included as Exhibit A of the Resolution. It clarifies that Metro already conducts most of the population, employment and transportation modeling work needed to conduct Conformity Determinations within the entirety of the Interstate AQMA. Metro performs these modeling tasks within the scope of work approved annually in the region's Unified Work Program (UWP). Metro will continue to perform the modeling tasks so long as the UWP continues to approve of such work and provide adequate funding for Metro's efforts.

The MOU would formally designate Metro as the entity responsible for determining whether emissions resulting from regionally significant projects occurring outside its boundary, but within the Interstate AQMA boundary, conform with emission budgets and other criteria established in the SIP. It specifies the procedures that would be used to prepare the Determination, including the definition of regionally significant projects requiring conformity analysis and importantly, new responsibilities of local governments and ODOT to report planned projects to Metro for analysis. Also addressed are consultation procedures and the mechanisms to be used in settling disputes, should any occur. Finally, it has a sunset provision and will expire at midnight, September 30, 1995, unless it is renewed by all signatories.

This MOU addresses only issues pertinent to the Oregon portion of the Portland/Vancouver Interstate AQMA. Transportation planning and air quality conformity in the Washington State portion of the Interstate AQMA are the responsibility of appropriate Washington State government entities.

Recommendation of the Executive Officer

The Executive Officer recommends adoption of Resolution No. 94-2039.