

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: May 14, 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; Les White, (alt.) C-TRAN; Steve Greenwood (alt.), DEQ; Larry Cole, Cities of Washington County; Bob Post (alt.), Tri-Met; Don Forbes, ODOT; Gerry Smith, WSDOT; Bob Liddell, Cities of Clackamas County; Marjorie Schmunk, Cities of Multnomah County; Roy Rogers, Washington County; Ed Lindquist, Clackamas County; Pauline Anderson, Multnomah County; and Mike Thorne, Port of Portland

Guests: Don Adams (JPACT alt.), John Rist, Dave Williams, and Ted Spence, ODOT; Kim Chin and Mark Landers, C-TRAN; Rod Sandoz, Clackamas County; Rick Root, City of Beaverton; G.B. Arrington, Tri-Met; Craig Lomnicki (JPACT alt.), Cities of Clackamas County; Steve Dotterer, City of Portland; Susie Lahsene and Kathy Busse, Multnomah County; Keith Ahola, WSDOT; Molly O'Reilly, Citizen; Jim Ferner, Bicycle Transportation Alliance; and Howard Harris, DEQ

Staff: Andrew Cotugno, Gail Ryder, Cathy Thomas and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

SUMMARY:

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

MEETING REPORT

The April 9 JPACT Meeting Report was approved as written.

RESOLUTION NO. 92-1610 - ESTABLISHING THE TPAC TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE

Andy Cotugno explained that the purpose of the resolution is to establish a staff committee (accountable to TPAC) to focus on Transportation Demand Management (TDM) activities that address the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, ISTEA, Rule 12, the Oregon

Transportation Plan (OTP), the Governor's Task Force on Automobile Emissions, RUGGO/Region 2040, the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Metro's TDM Study. Staff feels there should be an ongoing group to deal with such matters and the interrelationships between those programs and has recommended that ODOT's TDM Work Group be expanded into the TPAC TDM Subcommittee. The jurisdictions, however, will have responsibility for implementing the different aspects of these activities.

Action Taken: Mayor Cole moved, seconded by Bob Liddell, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 92-1610, establishing the TPAC Transportation Demand Management Subcommittee. Motion PASSED unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 92-1617 - ENDORSING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR HIGHWAY BRIDGE REPLACEMENT FUNDING

Andy Cotugno explained that this resolution was initiated to address funding concerns over allocation of Highway Bridge Replacement (HBR) funds. He noted that replacement or rehabilitation costs for the Willamette River bridges are significant because of the lift spans, age of the structures, and size. He pointed out that the bridges are high in traffic volume (in addition to bike and pedestrian traffic), that the Willamette River is a navigable stream, and that 11 percent of the HBR funds received by the state is attributable to the Willamette River bridges.

Andy reported that JPACT previously approved comments calling for a consolidated (state/local) bridge program as part of ODOT's Six-Year Program. ODOT, however, is continuing to pursue separate state and local components of the HBR Program.

Presently, HBR funds are distributed to each state on the basis of that state's needs. Andy suggested that there be state recognition of different kinds of bridge needs and a funding base for each one. Because of limited resources, he spoke of the trade-offs in selecting many small bridge needs over the needs of one large bridge. TPAC proposes that the state work with the AOC/LOC Bridge Committee to develop criteria for a revised bridge ranking system to meet the needs of all statewide bridges (including high-cost local bridges) and to discuss those policy implications. Through federal mandate (ISTEA requirements), ODOT must assess bridge needs and revenues and establish funding categories for bridge management.

Commissioner Anderson felt that the resolution should be reinforced, citing her concerns. After further discussion, she proposed the following be included as a new resolve: "Request the Oregon Transportation Commission to consider the high cost of rehabilitating the Willamette River bridges compared with other

local government bridges, and allow these large movable bridges to compete in the prioritization for the HBR allocation with similar high-cost bridges at the state level, rather than competing in the HBR allocation for local governments."

Action Taken: Councilor Gardner moved, seconded by Commissioner Lindquist, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 92-1617, adopting a position on Highway Bridge Replacement funds.

Don Forbes indicated that bridges are a particular problem to the state in view of past history of declining funds and a tremendous backlog of projects. Over the past two years, the state has recognized the need for, and instituted, a good bridge inspection program as many local governments don't inspect on a two-year basis as Portland does. He felt that federal legislative language needs to be sought for earmarking of funds for significant high-cost bridges. Don added that discretionary funds on a national basis are less and didn't feel large bridge needs would be met through the regular HBR Program, suggesting that another source of funds be sought.

1st motion to amend: Commissioner Anderson moved, seconded by Mayor Cole, to add a new resolve (following Resolve No. 4) to read as follows: "5. Request the Oregon Transportation Commission to consider the high cost of rehabilitating the Willamette River bridges compared with other local government bridges, and allow these large movable bridges to compete in the prioritization for the HBR allocation with similar high-cost bridges at the state level rather than competing in the HBR allocation for local governments."

Commissioner Blumenauer questioned why this region's bridge funding allocation doesn't reflect the funding attributed to the region, which is an 11 percent contribution. He asked why the region shouldn't expect that as a reasonable distribution of funds. Commissioner Anderson concurred and felt that amount should be allocated to the Willamette River bridges.

2nd motion to amend: In view of agreement that the 11 percent issue should be addressed in Resolve No. 4 with recognition of the dollar return, Commissioner Anderson moved, seconded by Commissioner Blumenauer, that Andy Cotugno be assigned the task of refining the resolution to reflect that issue. (The revision to Resolve 4 was later amended as follows: "4. Request that the Oregon Transportation Commission work with the AOC/LOC Bridge Committee to consider policy options in developing a ranking system, criteria and process that addresses statewide bridge needs, including large unfunded local bridges, that ensures a distribution of bridge funds to the Willamette River bridges by the State of Oregon attributable to these bridges.")

Councilor McLain felt there was committee concurrence that bridges need to be considered as a whole, that criteria must be developed to address statewide bridge needs in a different way, and that bridges should be categorized. She was supportive of the resolution, the issue on criteria and the need to look at all bridges.

In further discussion, Steve Greenwood asked what the policy basis was behind the new ranking system. Don Forbes responded that structural sufficiency, functional obsolescence, whether the bridge is too narrow, whether the alignment is bad, and how the bridge functions as part of the roadway system are considerations. High-volume bridges and lifelines are also considerations.

In the best interests of the metropolitan area and as it addresses the equity issue, Commissioner Blumenauer emphasized the need to establish the principle that the region is part of the funding program and that we should be able to count on that percentage as a cornerstone of our funding strategy.

There was committee concurrence that the Willamette River bridges should be competing for HBR funds with other high-cost bridges in the state and that the region should receive its equitable share of funds. Commissioner Anderson felt the region should request the administrators of the Bridge Program to ensure that dollars are provided to fund the Willamette River bridges at a level consistent with funding allocated to the State of Oregon and attributable to the Willamette River bridges.

Andy Cotugno acknowledged that \$42 million for the Sellwood Bridge represents a big "bite" out of the Bridge Program and felt that perhaps it wouldn't need to be replaced within the life of the Six-Year Program but that it is a good candidate for Congressional earmarking in the next STA. He suggested, however, that there be incremental allocations for the other bridge needs according to the dollars available and in the context of the HBR Program.

Commissioner Blumenauer understood the problem dealing with limited funding sources and dealing with it on an incremental basis but didn't feel it addresses the longer term need for change by laying a foundation to address the problem. He spoke of the bridge structures having a life span of 20-80 years and hoped there would be mention of that fact.

Andy Cotugno noted that we are unsure of the regionwide bridge requirements and that we need to recognize that there is a bridge management issue in the metro area. Also to be addressed is to determine which bridges are important, how you can invest money on a regular basis, and to approach the bridge management requirement in the ISTEA as an investment management program rather than a technical exercise.

Mayor Liddell asked whether issues such as expansion of bridges, replacement or exclusion, or being retrofitted to meet earthquake-proof requirements are being addressed in the Region 2040 process.

The 2nd motion to amend (addition to Resolve 4) PASSED unanimously.

The 1st motion to amend (new Resolve 5) PASSED unanimously.

The main motion, as amended, PASSED unanimously.

OREGON TRANSPORTATION PLAN SYSTEM ELEMENT

Don Forbes spoke briefly on the Policy Element of the Oregon Transportation Plan in that the vision and goals contained in that document present a comprehensive approach to transportation decision-making. He commented on the need for a balanced transportation system that is efficient, accessible, offers modal choices, provides urban mobility, rural access, freight productivity, safety, financial stability and environmental responsibility.

Don explained that the System Element defines what the transportation system will look like in 20 years in compliance with the Clean Air Act Amendments, ISTEA and the Oregon Benchmarks. Its purpose is to implement the goals and policies of the Policy Element.

Don spoke of minimum levels of service for intercity passengers, intercity bus use, rail passengers, air passenger and freight service, statewide freight, highway and rail freight, interstate and statewide highways, regional and local transit needs, and urban transit service. The System Element inventories existing facilities, forecasts trends, and contains an implementation strategy. He spoke of greater use of telecommunications, IVHS networks, intermodal hubs or terminals for freight, as well as transit in the high-capacity corridors.

Don pointed out the state's capability for stronger rail service with a possibility of high-speed rail. He also cited the need for intercity bus service in the State of Oregon.

The Oregon Transportation Commission is expected to adopt the Policy Element of the Plan in June and the System Element in September. After consensus is obtained on the Policy Element, the state will be looking for a way to get it implemented. Transportation '93 will be exploring transportation packages and strategies.

Andy Cotugno stated that, from a process standpoint, it's been suggested that TPAC prepare its recommendation on the OTP for the purpose of clarification, concerns to be addressed, or additions

for submittal at the August OTC hearing. He hoped that TPAC could be supportive of the document and that adoption of the comments could take place in June followed by a supportive resolution adopted in July.

Andy noted the implications and substantive aspects of the OTP. He felt it is encouraging that it is a multi-modal plan (especially in view of past conversations about inner-city modes and relationships between the modes); there is more attention paid to freight than in the past; and this is the first evaluation of the implications to Rule 12 (noting that the RTP does not currently comply with Rule 12). Andy spoke of future changes to the RTP and to the OTP with regard to those requirements. With regard to VMT, ODOT has an analysis on what the VMT will be although there is weak data available. It is estimated there will be an 11 percent increase in VMT/capita. To meet the Rule 12 requirement for a 10 percent decrease, a total of 21 percent decrease will therefore be needed. This will include a 5 percent reduction through land use, 1 percent through telecommuting, and 11 percent through a combination of congestion pricing, demand management and transit. The OTP sets up a framework toward that direction.

Mike Thorne cited the need to establish, through the hearing process, the implementation aspects. He spoke of the need to design a transportation system with long-term controls for the region's economy, questioning whether there is a guiding principle setting that direction. Don Forbes responded that the state's mission is to provide a safe, efficient transportation system that provides access and enhances the economy and environment. The issues being discussed include urban mobility, rural access, freight and transportation safety. In terms of the multi-modal aspect of the OTP, Mike Thorne pointed out that there isn't a general aviation airport in the state that is self-supporting and expressed concern about the economics of some of the recommendations. He spoke of some of the dynamics outside of the Plan and the need to address some of those issues, citing the challenge to JPACT.

Don Forbes pointed out that this document is only the first step and sets the direction. The next step is to implement the Plan, and they believe they have a strong partnership at the federal and local level.

Jim Ferner, Bike Transportation Alliance, questioned whether the plan was in fact multi-modal in view of the fact that 77 percent of the base funds are used for highways. He suggested that the focus be changed to multi-modal and noted that there are no minimum levels-of-service noted for bicyclists. He acknowledged there is mention of bicycling in the programs but not in the funding. Eugene has 10 percent bicycle usage while 5 percent is projected. In terms of the system that ODOT controls and envisions, pedestrians play a very small part. It was noted that

biking needs fall under the planning responsibility of the cities and counties.

Molly O'Reilly, President of STOP and a TPAC citizen member, asked whether the same committees that reviewed the Policy Element had reviewed the System Element and suggested that there be the same involvement with regard to the funding level and spending strategy. She spoke of the need for a range of spending strategies at any funding level. She felt that, by not changing the spending authorization, the "highway mentality" remains in place.

Don Forbes responded by noting that, within two years in the Highway Program, the state can only preserve or maintain roadways and that is not a new investment strategy. Without an additional source of funds, the state can only try to maintain what is theirs. As such, alternatives involving reprogramming a status-quo level resource are impractical.

In discussion preparation for the June JPACT meeting, agenda items proposed included: comments on the OTP; presentation on the Strategic Plan; and decision points on one of the Western Bypass strategies (from the perspective of whether or not to drop an alternative). It was suggested that the June 11 JPACT meeting be scheduled in the Council Chamber. It was agreed that comments on the OTP be submitted through TPAC for consideration at the June 11 JPACT meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Rena Cusma
Dick Engstrom
JPACT Members

lmk