

## MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: November 12, 1992

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Chair Richard Devlin, Jim Gardner and Susan McLain, Metro Council; Earl Blumenauer, City of Portland; Larry Cole, Cities of Washington County; Marge Schmunk, Cities of Multnomah County; David Lohman, Port of Portland; Gerry Smith, WSDOT; Don Adams, ODOT; Steve Greenwood (alt.), DEQ; Tom Walsh, Tri-Met; Pauline Anderson, Multnomah County; Roy Rogers, Washington County; Ed Lindquist, Clackamas County; and Bob Liddell, Cities of Clackamas County

Guests: Craig Lomnicki (JPACT alt.), Cities of Clackamas County; Molly O'Reilly, citizen; Tim Rutten, Office of Senator Hatfield; Steve Dotterer, City of Portland; Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland; Dean Lookingbill, Southwest Washington RTC; Kim Chin, C-TRAN; Ted Spence, Dave Williams, Mike Wert and Bill Ciz, ODOT; Keith Bartholomew, 1000 Friends of Oregon; Rod Sandoz, Clackamas County; G.B. Arrington, Tri-Met; John Rosenberger, Washington County; Meeky Blizzard, STOP; Jim Beard and John Charles, OEC; Eric Stachon, Policy Initiatives Group; and Bob Brannan, PBQ&D

Staff: Andrew Cotugno, Richard Brandman, Cathy Thomas, Mark Turpel, Keith Lawton, Ken Gervais and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

MEDIA: Jim Mayer, The Oregonian

### SUMMARY:

The JPACT meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Chair Richard Devlin.

### MEETING REPORT

Mayor Lomnicki asked that the second paragraph on page 2 of the October 8, 1992 JPACT Meeting Report be amended for clarification purposes as follows: "Under the heading of LRT Corridors, Andy noted that seed money has been established for the next corridor in Milwaukie/I-205. The issue of whether the Clark County project should be included as part of the Milwaukie/I-205 budget is being discussed." The Meeting Report was approved as amended.

JPACT

November 12, 1992

Page 2

RESOLUTION NO. 92-1706 - ENDORSING ALTERNATIVES FOR EVALUATION IN THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (DEIS) PHASE OF THE WESTERN BYPASS STUDY

Andy Cotugno explained that this step in the Western Bypass study process is to approve alternatives that are to proceed into the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) phase. He highlighted the resolution and emphasized that light rail transit is not precluded as part of the long-range solution and could be selected as one component of the Preferred Alternative. He cited concerns raised in the past: that we shouldn't drop LRT as an alternative (noting that it is included in the LUTRAQ alternative) and that the OTC should clarify its financing responsibilities for elements of the Preferred Alternative.

Mike Wert, ODOT, reviewed the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) process that involves the policymakers. She pointed out that, as decisions are reached, every effort is being made to ensure regional consensus and that the issues and concerns should be addressed in a timely manner. She noted that none of the proposed alternatives require any amendments to the Regional Transportation Plan. She spoke of involvement at the citizen, technical, advisory and steering committee levels. Mike reviewed the alternatives selected by ODOT for forwarding through the DEIS process.

Mike indicated concerns raised by Tualatin regarding expansion of the study area at the southern end of the Bypass and Tigard's request to make recommendations prior to conclusion of the study. The City of Sherwood has expressed concern about the LUTRAQ alternative in terms of transit-oriented developments. Mike indicated that TPAC/JPACT/Metro Council approvals are needed to proceed to the DEIS. Following approval of this resolution, the cities and counties must respond to Metro's action within 90 days or it will be considered a rejection of the proposed alternatives. Mike noted that it will take a year's effort to publish the DEIS. Committee recommendations and TPAC/JPACT/Metro Council actions will be forwarded to the OTC regarding financing issues. She pointed out that ODOT may elect to stop the IGA process if there are major jurisdictional problems.

A request from the Oregon Environmental Council (OEC) was distributed asking that the Western Bypass alternatives be modified to include language for discussion and modeling of a marginal cost-pricing system (i.e., congestion/road pricing) and a mileage-based smog fee.

Andy Cotugno pointed out that this step in the study process has all the jurisdictions participating. Once the resolution is passed by Metro, a letter of recommendation will go forward to

JPACT

November 12, 1992

Page 3

the other jurisdictions. Andy asked whether a full presentation of the alternatives is needed. With respect to the OEC request, he indicated that, after close study of the five alternatives, there is no intention of looking at marginal cost pricing issues. At the policy level, it was found to be inadequate.

During further discussion, OEC representatives (John Charles and James Beard) pointed out that the OTP, the Oregon Roads Finance Committee, and DEQ and the Governor's Task Force on Motor Vehicle Emissions Reductions suggest that congestion pricing should be considered and evaluated as to its impact on the region. Because it will have an impact on long-term regional transportation issues and because it may be the least-cost method to meet mobility needs, OEC representatives feel the concept should also be examined.

Bob Brannan, consultant from Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, reported that the congestion pricing concept was considered as a first step in the study process in line with other TDM implementing strategies. Parking charges and transit subsidies were also examined in relation to work trips. Mike Wert pointed out that this is not a systems study but a regional corridor-level study and did not feel the Western Bypass study is the forum to discuss these TDM strategies. She didn't feel this issue should be debated at a project level. If a Build alternative is adopted, each one of the Build components (such as widening of Highway 217 and TDM components) will have to be defined further. She felt the issue would be taken up at the design level.

Don Adams reported that ODOT is interested in making application for two congestion pricing pilot projects. He questioned whether a limited study could be done in the metro area that doesn't impact the downtown and still come up with any significant conclusions. He felt that a congestion pricing study would need to include the entire metropolitan area and further questioned how it would be implemented. Molly O'Reilly pointed out that, while the Western Bypass study is a corridor level study, the study area includes most of the urbanized area of Washington County. She felt it is an appropriate component to be studied.

Mike Wert noted that the alternatives have been developing over the last three years. If they are to be revised, ODOT would need to go back through all committees. There is a formal process for making major changes.

Meeky Blizzard, STOP and Sierra Club, noted that throughout the Bypass study, these broader policy issues have been raised. STOP and the Sierra Club support OEC's argument that these things should be addressed now. Councilor Gardner felt the argument

would be more persuasive if parking fees were included as well. He was uneasy that both congestion pricing and the smog fee were together and indicated that all these factors, including environmental and highway interests, were considered by the Governor's Task Force on Vehicle Emissions Reductions.

Bob Brannan enlightened the Committee on how the TDM strategies were developed. They first reviewed the comprehensive plans and researched nationally what types of TDM programs have been developed. A consensus was then developed on the contribution of the TDM measures. 1000 Friends's LUTRAQ study analyzed the same situations and came to the same conclusions. Mike Wert stated that parking charges are not as widely accepted in the suburban areas as they are in the downtown area.

Questions were raised on whether the congestion pricing issue would have to go back to the Steering Committee if the OEC recommendation was passed.

Commissioner Rogers noted that the Western Bypass effort has gone on for three years and cited the need to go forward in the process.

Keith Lawton, Metro's Technical Manager, felt that it is important to realize that congestion pricing is highly speculative and is different from road pricing. He noted that we do not completely understand it and that one of the dangers about doing a serious analysis without more research is that we will come up with a lot of results we don't have confidence in.

Steve Greenwood wasn't completely convinced that this concept shouldn't be addressed as a policy issue. It is clear that the OEC deals with ways to affect the demand side of travel behavior but it was unclear to Mr. Greenwood as to what different kinds of analysis should be done.

Action Taken: Mayor Cole moved, seconded by Commissioner Rogers, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 92-1706, endorsing alternatives for evaluation in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) phase of the Western Bypass study.

In discussion on the motion, Steve Greenwood wanted clarification about potential effects of each alternative on reducing demand for single-occupant vehicles. John Charles indicated that the effects are all indirect. He noted that parking does not cause congestion; driving does. The most direct method to combat congestion is pricing. Steve Greenwood asked what the assumptions of the TDM measures are, noting that he didn't have a good understanding of what the relative impacts might be. Bob Brannan spoke of parking charges for single-occupant vehicle drivers. He

indicated that they modeled one of the alternatives with and without the TDM component to see what effect it would have on vehicle hours of travel and vehicle hours of delay which are used to indicate a decrease in congestion and an increase in mode split.

Commissioner Blumenauer stated that he has a great deal of sympathy in making the infrastructure work but felt there is a great difference between congestion pricing and some of the other elements mentioned. He felt more information was needed in order to make the right policy choices and was supportive of developing information on the various characteristics of these concepts and impacts in order to guide the policies. He felt that each of these initiatives would carry controversy.

Motion to amend: Commissioner Blumenauer moved, seconded by Commissioner Anderson, to amend the resolution to also consider the congestion pricing component as an added suboption as proposed by the Oregon Environmental Council.

In discussion on the proposed amendment, Councilor McLain supported the amendment, did not feel we should overlook any technique that might reduce traffic congestion, did not feel it would slow the process down, and felt the strategy should be looked at.

Don Adams noted that the OTC has proposed some short-range targets. Pilot project studies are proposed, and he questioned adding the congestion pricing component into a broader study before the modeling and results are known on the pilot studies. He also expressed concern about the progress of the Western Bypass study. He viewed congestion pricing as dealing with greater issues than a corridor would involve.

Councilor Gardner spoke of a mileage-based motor fee as a specific recommendation of the Governor's Task Force. He felt that was more doable than congestion pricing.

Andy Cotugno clarified that, if a smog tax is adopted by the Legislature, all new requirements must be complied with and included.

Councilor Devlin questioned how much a reduction would be realized if congestion pricing were implemented based on the assumptions. He spoke of the importance of the end result, whether it would affect the cost of travel, and of the 2010 horizon, hoping to make it something understandable. He felt that we can bring into the DEIS a focus of how the TDM program can be implemented. He spoke of the potential to model the congestion pricing concept and the fact that the numbers won't

JPACT

November 12, 1992

Page 6

mean much. He did not feel that we should focus on the technical side of the project.

Steve Greenwood felt he came out of the discussion less clear about the relative impact of congestion pricing and other demand management measures. He felt it was unclear whether there is a potential for modeling the range of demand management strategies or the impacts of whatever group of strategies are adopted. He wondered about the impact of parking fees on this area. Bob Brannan noted that the parking fee recommendation was considered when it was first modeled as to what you get incrementally. He pointed out this was not a TDM study. It represented a reasonable component of demand reduction. The potential was there but the decision was otherwise. Mike Wert noted that this concept was discussed and debated.

In calling for the question on the proposed amendment, the motion PASSED by a vote of 7-6. Those voting for included: Commissioner Blumenauer, Councilor McLain, Steve Greenwood, Councilor Gardner, Commissioner Anderson, Councilor Schmunk and Councilor Devlin. Those voting against: Mayor Cole, Mayor Liddell, Commissioner Rogers, Don Adams, Commissioner Lindquist and Tom Walsh.

Andy Cotugno clarified that the amendment added congestion pricing in lieu of parking pricing as a suboption for the "Planned Projects/TSM" alternative.

The amended motion PASSED unanimously.

#### ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Devlin announced that Metro will host a Congestion Pricing Symposium in the Vanport Room of Smith Memorial Center at Portland State University on Monday, November 23, 1992, at 1:00 p.m.

On Wednesday, November 25, at noon at the Convention Center, Metro will provide an overview on Metro Charter Impacts for elected officials. An introduction on the Metro Charter and its implications was distributed for informational purposes. Three counties, 24 cities and special districts will comprise the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC).

Andy Cotugno announced that nominations are in order for new JPACT representatives from the cities of each county. He asked that the largest city in each county convene a forum to develop a slate of nominees.

JPACT

November 12, 1992

Page 7

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 92-1712 - DESIGNATING THE REGIONAL GROWTH CONCEPTS TO BE EVALUATED IN PHASE II OF THE REGION 2040 PROJECT

Andy Cotugno reported that staff has been meeting with a number of groups in the 2040 process. The recommendations to conclude Phase I of the 2040 project will be considered at JPACT'S December 10 meeting. Andy noted that staff is still soliciting input into the process.

Andy pointed out that this has been reviewed by TPAC, RTAC and RPAC as to which alternatives should be studied further in Phase II of Region 2040. He indicated there is a large range of alternatives, there could be more variations of these alternatives, and that other possibilities shouldn't be excluded.

Andy reviewed the resolution and elaborated on Concepts A through C. Concept A was described as a continuation of current policies with implementation through adopted comprehensive plans and expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary; Concept B limited growth within the UGB with an emphasis on transit; and Concept C described satellite communities for growth occurring outside the UGB. Andy indicated that a Concept D has been suggested that would hold the growth in the metropolitan area to the UGB, would allow no new growth or densities, and would accommodate further growth outside that area and in the satellite areas outside our jurisdiction. Another option that has been discussed (Concept E) is to focus on the no-growth/slow-growth issue. He reviewed the three approaches relating to the no-growth/slow-growth option (described on Attachment 2). Andy noted that we need a base case that deals with current trends. He indicated that the Port favors Option 2 regarding the slow/no-growth concerns.

Tom Walsh commended Andy Cotugno on this effort and felt that the 2040 process is seriously underfunded, encouraging Metro to have JPACT review use of flexible funds for this purpose. He spoke of benefits to be realized in the future and the fact that the project is eligible for flexible funds.

Andy Cotugno responded that the TIP Subcommittee has considered recommendations for allocation of two years of the region's STP funds. Staff has held up the process while discussions are ongoing on a variety of recommendations for allocation of STP funds. He indicated there are more detailed discussions on this subject at RPAC meetings. Andy asked whether an RPAC/JPACT meeting should be scheduled and Committee members indicated it would be very useful. The next RPAC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, December 9; JPACT members will be invited.

Andy pointed out that the 2040 process is compatible with the new Metro Charter, citing the charter's "future vision."

JPACT  
November 12, 1992  
Page 8

JPACT MEETING TIME

Chair Devlin noted there have been some requests to move the JPACT meeting time back to 7:30 a.m. (from 7:15 a.m.).

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to move the JPACT meeting time to 7:30 a.m. effective December 10. Motion PASSED by a vote of 5-4.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Rena Cusma  
Dick Engstrom  
JPACT Members