

AREAS OF CONSENSUS

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDING PROPOSAL

I. General Principles

- A. There is general consensus on the funding target for the next 10 years in the following major categories (see Attachment A):

Regional Highway Corridors
Urban Arterials
LRT Corridors
Transit Operations and Routine Capital

Note: Project costs need updating

- B. The region should link together the planning for the funding of highway and transit improvements in order to equitably balance where revenues are collected and spent.

II. Regional Highway Corridors

- A. The region should seek state highway funding for the full cost of priority interstate and regional highway corridors (from IA above).
- B. Increase in state and federal funding programs will be required in order to obtain the improvements being sought.

III. Urban Arterials

- A. A vehicle registration fee is generally favored as the first source of funding for urban arterial preservation and improvement. In general, there is support for imposing the fee at the regional level with a minimum allocation guaranteed to local governments and the balance allocated on the basis of regional priorities through the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT). Once established, consideration will be given to funding transit capital from the arterial fund.
- B. If a vehicle registration fee is imposed, there should be a truck fee to maintain cost responsibility.
- C. The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) arterials have the least likelihood of being funded with state funds due to the higher state priority and very high statewide funding requests for corridors of state significance. If ODOT arterials are included in a regional arterial program, sufficient revenues should be sought to fund the extra cost.

IV. LRT

- A. The next priority for UMTA Section 3 funding is Westside LRT; thereafter, Milwaukie LRT. Up to 75 percent UMTA funding should be sought. Federal funding toward I-205 LRT should be from the Interstate buslane funds and, if possible, from UMTA for vehicles.
- B. Local matching funds for LRT should come from the following sources.
1. A new regional transit funding source should be adopted to provide the regional share toward all three corridors.
 2. State matching funds should be sought for all three corridors over a 3-4 biennium period.
 3. Private sector funding should be committed toward construction commensurate with benefits received. A greater than typical share of private funding will be required for I-205 LRT due to the minor level of federal funding than can be obtained.
- C. LRT construction will not proceed without an increased source of operating funds.
- D. Development should be well integrated around LRT stations to maximize ridership and minimize required operating subsidy.

V. Transit Operations and Routine Capital

- A. An increased source of operating funds should be established for routine capital, LRT operations and bus service expansion. Preliminary costs (as of March 1) are as follows:

	<u>Pre-LRT</u>	<u>Post-LRT</u>
Routine Capital	\$ 8 m.	\$ 9.6 m.
Operating		
Westside LRT	--	.5
I-205 LRT	--	1.73
Milwaukie LRT	--	.54
LRT Feeders	--	2.60
Other Bus Services	1.2	3.44
Debt Payment	1.5	1.5
TOTAL	<u>\$10.7 m.</u>	<u>\$19.91 m.</u>

- B. State funding should be sought as follows:
1. Continuation of funding toward routine capital at \$3.3m./year.
 2. Increase cigarette tax of 1¢ toward special needs transit.
- C. After implementation of a \$10 m./year arterial fund (such as through a vehicle registration fee), \$3 million in FAU funds will be dedicated to transit capital.

VI. Outstanding Issues

- A. Should the region plan on a vote or pursue alternatives that don't require a vote?
- B. Should a registration fee be imposed on the basis of value, weight or some other measure of impact?
- C. How should ODOT arterials be funded? Via state or regional funds?
- D. Can a case be made for state contribution for LRT local match in excess of 10 percent?
- E. What source of new regional funds should be sought for LRT match and operations?
- wage/payroll tax
 - payroll tax increase
 - income tax
 - property tax
 - payroll tax on local government
- F. Further policies on private funding toward LRT will be required.

AC/sm
9482C/534
5-25-88

- DRAFT -

To: Gil Mallery, Director
IRC of Clark County

From: Andrew C. Cotugno, Transportation Director

Date: May 31, 1988

Re: Proposed Bi-state Study

As we have discussed, Clark County IRC is developing a proposed scope of work for a Bi-state Transportation Study at the request of the Washington Legislature. The following are some comments and concerns that should be taken into consideration:

A. Purpose of Study

It is unclear how the study being sought by the Washington Legislature will relate to Oregon jurisdictions. Particularly, how extensive will the study address travel patterns on the Oregon side and what are the intended roles of Metro, ODOT and the affected Oregon jurisdictions? What is the proposed timeframe and funding for conducting the study? If we are to be involved, we need to establish work plans and priorities for affected agencies.

In addition, it is unclear how the study relates to recently completed studies for the area. Have conditions changed sufficiently to invalidate the conclusions of the last third bridge study?

B. A clear definition of the study objectives should be established; is it:

1. To supplement traffic capacity on I-5; or
2. To promote development in the Camas/Washougal area; or
3. To serve travel between Columbia South Shore and East Clark County; or County; or
4. To serve travel between I-5, North Vancouver, Rivergate and Washington County; or

5. All of the above?
- C. The study should be done using updated 2010 population and employment forecasts and should take into consideration transit and highway improvements previously identified for implementation in the Regional Transportation Plan. In addition, Metro's travel forecasts should be used including upcoming revisions to the model to reflect LRT ridership patterns.
- D. The study should carefully consider the interrelationship between new highway bridges and the proposed LRT in the I-5 corridor between Portland and Vancouver and in the I-205 corridor between Portland International Airport and the Clackamas Town Center. Would a new bridge impact the viability of LRT or should LRT be implemented before a new bridge? Would additional LRT alternatives, such as an extension of the I-5 LRT north of downtown Vancouver or extension of I-205 LRT into Clackamas County, compare favorably to new highway bridge alternatives?
- E. Highway bridge alternatives to consider should include:
1. A new bridge between I-84 and Camas with a connection to the proposed I-84/U.S. 26 Connector.
 2. A new bridge as part of an extension of the Western Bypass from the Sunset Highway to I-5.
 3. A new bridge in close proximity to I-5 (such as in the vicinity of North Portland Road).

Each of these alternatives should be fully defined to include specification of freeway and/or arterial facilities to connect to the new bridge.

- F. The study should take into consideration potential positive and negative land use and environmental impacts, including:
1. Improved transportation service to encourage development of areas planned for urban development;
 2. Decreased pressure to expand urban development into rural farm and forest areas (outside the Urban Growth Boundary);

Mr. Gil Mallery
May 31, 1988
Page 3

3. Impact on environmentally sensitive areas such as wetland/wildlife areas; and
4. Impact on residential neighborhoods.

ACC:lmk
a:\3rdBR



METRO

2000 S.W. First Avenue
Portland, OR 97201-5396
503/221-1646

Memorandum

- DRAFT -

To: Gil Mallery, Director
IRC of Clark County

From: Andrew C. Cotugno, Transportation Director

Date: May 31, 1988

Re: Proposed Bi-state Study

As we have discussed, Clark County IRC is developing a proposed scope of work for a Bi-state Transportation Study at the request of the Washington Legislature. The following are some comments and concerns that should be taken into consideration:

A. Purpose of Study

It is unclear how the study being sought by the Washington Legislature will relate to Oregon jurisdictions. Particularly, how extensive will the study address travel patterns on the Oregon side and what are the intended roles of Metro, ODOT and the affected Oregon jurisdictions? What is the proposed timeframe and funding for conducting the study? If we are to be involved, we need to establish work plans and priorities for affected agencies.

In addition, it is unclear how the study relates to recently completed studies for the area. Have conditions changed sufficiently to invalidate the conclusions of the last third bridge study?

B. A clear definition of the study objectives should be established; is it:

1. To supplement traffic capacity on I-5; or
2. To promote development in the Camas/Washougal area; or
3. To serve travel between Columbia South Shore and East Clark County; or County; or
4. To serve travel between I-5, North Vancouver, Rivergate and Washington County; or



METRO

Memorandum

2000 S.W. First Avenue
Portland, OR 97201-5398
503/221-1646

Date: May 12, 1988

To: Gary Spanovich, Clackamas County
Bebe Rucker, Port of Portland
Ted Spence, ODOT
Dick Feeney, Tri-Met
Susie Lahsene, Multnomah County
Steve Dotterrer, City of Portland

From: Richard Brandman, ^{RB} Senior Analyst

Re: I-205 Withdrawal Resolution

Attached is a draft resolution which your jurisdiction/ agency should adopt, as modified in the coming weeks, to get the ball rolling on substituting light rail in the I-205 corridor. I think this resolution contains the basics needed to trigger the process. Your jurisdiction may wish to embellish it with other statements.

The withdrawal process requires the support of affected local jurisdictions with concurrence from Metro. Metro's resolution will be similar to the one attached; however, it will also add findings that the I-205 bus lanes are not essential to the completion of the Interstate system and that we do not intend to construct a toll road in the corridor.

Please give me your comments and an anticipated adoption date by your governing body by May 26. If we need to schedule a meeting to resolve issues, I'll schedule one at that time.

RB:lmk

Attachment

CC: Andrew Cotugno
Grace Crunican
Tom VanderZanden

FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBSTITUTING LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT
IN THE I-205 FREEWAY

WHEREAS, Title 23, U.S.C., Section 103 (e) (4) as amended by the Surface Transportation Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-599) authorizes the withdrawal of segments from the Interstate highway system; and

WHEREAS, Section 142 of the 1987 Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act permits withdrawal of proposed bus lanes and substitution of light rail transit on a portion of I-205 in Portland and Multnomah County, Oregon; and

WHEREAS, the substitute transit project must be under contract for construction by September 30, 1989 or the Secretary of Transportation will immediately withdraw approval of the project; and

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Service District's Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation has recommended that an I-205 light rail line be a priority for construction in the next 10 years; and

WHEREAS the Metropolitan Service District, as the government designated to perform regional transportation planning under the provisions of Section 137, 23 U.S.C. must concur in this request for withdrawal in order for the Governor of the State of Oregon to submit the request to the U.S. Department of Transportation;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That the (your jurisdiction) does hereby ask the Governor of the State of Oregon to request the United States Department

of Transportation to withdraw the proposed I-205 bus lanes in Portland and Multnomah County from the federal Interstate highway system;

2. That this withdrawal be conditioned on the U.S. Department of Transportation's authorization to substitute light rail transit as an eligible project in portions of the I-205 corridor under the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 103 (e) (4);
3. That the (your jurisdiction) hereby requests that the Council of the Metropolitan Service District (Metro) concur in the request to substitute the light rail transit project and that Metro offer every assistance required to submit the request to the U.S. Department of Transportation; and
4. That (your jurisdiction) will cooperate as fully as possible with the City of Portland, Multnomah County, Clackamas County, the Port of Portland, the Oregon Department of Transportation, Tri-Met, and Metro to take full advantage of the new opportunities offered by this project.

RB:lmk
a:\I-205LRT
5-12-88



METRO

2000 S.W. First Avenue
Portland, OR 97201-5398
503/221-1646

Memorandum

TO: JPACT

FROM: Dick Bolen, Senior Data Analyst *REB*

SUBJECT: Regional Growth Forum 1995 and 2010 Forecast

DATE: June 1, 1988

Enclosed for your review are the results of the Regional Growth Forums held in April. The enclosed document is the third and final draft.

The big question is, of course, how this new work compares to the forecast currently in use. The following table provides a quick comparison of the projections:

	Population		Employment	
	Current	New Forecast	Current	New Forecast
1995	1,515,300	1,489,900	762,800	723,700
2000	-----	1,569,100	836,100	790,200
2005	1,739,600	1,653,600	910,000	854,900
2010	-----	1,789,500	-----	920,900

Completion of the regional forecast sets the stage for the Growth Allocation Workshops. This group of jurisdictional planners will determine the distribution of population and employment growth to subareas of the region. The initial meeting is scheduled for June 14 at Metro.

Enclosure

COMPUTER-
THE BATTLE
OVER OPEN SYSTEMS
PAGE 112

▶ **RJR'S ROSS JOHNSON** ▶ **BURT SUGARMAN VS. MEDIA GENERAL**

BusinessWeek

MAY 23, 1988

A MCGRAW-HILL PUBLICATION

\$2.00

HOT CANDIDATE

Editorials

LET'S GEAR UP NOW FOR THE COMING OIL CRUNCH

Low oil prices are predictably stimulating oil consumption in the U.S. and around the globe. The world's thirst for refined products, slaked by a decade of price jolts to a 1983 daily low of 58 million barrels, climbed to 62 million barrels last year and is headed back toward the 1979 peak of 65 million barrels. The countries that hold most of the world's reserves—the OPEC members around the Persian Gulf—probably won't produce more oil than they need to finance their own budgets and certainly not as much as consumers would like. The inevitable result: rising oil prices sometime in the 1990s even without further political disruption in the Mideast.

Consuming nations can act now to cushion the price shock. If they don't, they risk a replay of the shattering price jolts of 1973 and 1979. The U.S., as the world's biggest oil user and importer, must take the lead with a combination of policies aimed at increasing supply and dampening demand. To spur exploration, the U.S. should deregulate natural-gas prices and abolish the windfall-profits tax on oil, now more a nuisance than a revenue producer.

But after 120 years of intensive drilling and pumping, U.S. oil output is falling fast, and prospects for major new finds are limited. To head off a new oil-price crunch, Washington will have to focus on holding down demand. The Transportation Dept. should strictly enforce fuel-efficiency rules for autos—both to save oil now and to encourage Detroit to begin tooling up for the next surge of demand for gas-saving cars. The U.S. should also hike its taxes on gasoline, which are much lower here than in almost every other industrial country. The revenues should be used to reduce the federal budget deficit—not be earmarked to build more highways. And federal, state, and local governments must continue to support the building and modernization of mass-transit systems. To be ready when they are needed in the 1990s, they must be planned now.

None of these measures will be painless. But if policymakers shirk hard decisions now, the coming adjustments to steep oil-price rises will be harder and more painful still.

Sprinkel, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, said on May 10 that there would be an increase in rates—but that it would likely be temporary.

The Fed will be playing a dangerous game if it follows the path of least resistance and pushes rates up. True, the economy has not folded in the aftermath of the October crash, as many economists said it would. Nonetheless, the economy is not as robust as many of those same economists have recently concluded. Continued growth of the economy is far from assured. Gross national product growth in the first quarter showed a tepid 2.3% increase, hardly a rate that implies inflation ahead.

The pickup in rates already threatens to dampen the revival in the housing sector. Consumer demand, as measured by department store sales, is showing signs of weakness. To be sure, capital spending is rocketing. That is a big plus for the economy that will not only increase growth but also add to capacity. However, many of those orders are going to overseas suppliers, and in any case, a rise in interest rates could easily abort the capital-spending boomlet. This is not the time to raise rates.

IS IT TIME TO EQUALIZE TWO-TIER STOCKS?

Beverly Hills movie producer Burt Sugarman complains that directors of Media General Inc. haven't given the takeover bid by companies he controls a fair hearing (page 81). Sugarman's offer to buy the Richmond, Va., newspaper publisher and cable-TV operator at a substantial premium fell on deaf ears at Media General, where there is a lopsided allocation of voting power. The Bryan family, which controls 70% of the 560,000 Class B shares, can elect six of Media General's nine directors. Holders of the company's 27.6 million Class A shares select the remaining three. A takeover would end Bryan control of Media General, which began as the Richmond *Times-Dispatch* a century ago.

Sugarman's lawyers argue that the two-tiered stock unfairly perpetuates the Bryans' control at the expense of outside shareholders. Indeed, the Securities & Exchange

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE

JRACT

DATE

6-9-88

NAME

AFFILIATION

NAME	AFFILIATION
11- George Van Bergen	Metro
MA- Rick Kuehn	ODOT
MA- Bob Post	TRI-MET
M- Jim Gardner	Metro
M- Ed Nussbaum	Clackamas Co.
M- RICHARD WAKER	METRO
M- Pauline Anderson	Multnomah County
M- Robert Woodell	Port of Portland
M- Earl Blumauer	Portland
G- Bebe Rucker	Port
G- Carter Marshall	Port
G- Jimmy Moore	ODOT
G- Gil Mauser	FRC
G- Leanne MacColl	League of Women Voters.
G- Ted Jensen	ODOT
S- Keith Lenton	Metro
G- Bill Stark	Wilsonville
M- BONNIE HAYS	Wn. County
G- BRUCE YARIVER	"
G- Missie Larsen	Mult. Co.
G- Roy Polani	CBT
G- GRACE CRUNICAN	Pdx
G- Lee Hames	→ Metro TRI-MET
S- Richard Brandman	Metro
S- Andy Cotugno	Clack Co
G- Gary Spornich	"
G- John Patterson	"