

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: September 22, 1980

GROUP/SUBJECT: Joint meeting of JPACT/RPC to review the second draft of the Regional Transportation Plan

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Lloyd Anderson, Ernie Bonner, Bob Bothman, Richard Carroll, Larry Cole, Jim Fisher, John Frewing, Connie Kearney, Mike Lindberg, Al Myers, Charles Williamson, Bill Young, Cindy Banzer, Jack Deines, Jane Rhodes, Betty Schedeen, Gene Peterson, and Corky Kirkpatrick

Guests: Paul Bay, Tri-Met; John MacGregor, Port of Portland; Winston Kurth, Clackamas County; John Price, FHWA; Bill Greene, ODEQ; Steve Dotterer, City of Portland; Mike Borresen, Washington County; Bebe Rucker, Multnomah County; Dave Peach, WSDOT; Ted Spence, ODOT - Metro Branch; Sarah Salazar, Port of Portland; and Val Southern, City of Portland

Staff: Andy Cotugno, Richard Brandman, Keith Lawton, Terry Bolstad, Dick Bolen, Rod Sandoz, Ellen Duke, and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

MEDIA: None

SUMMARY:

Chairman Ernie Bonner related that it was the responsibility of JPACT and the RPC to review the second draft of the Regional Transportation Plan prior to consideration by the Metro Council.

Commissioner Kearney expressed concern over the changing role of JPACT in terms of its status as a policy-making board. She questioned whether procedural changes had taken place affecting the task of JPACT, and was assured that its role was status quo. JPACT still has the responsibility of making a recommendation on the RTP to the Council.

Andy Cotugno cited the objective of the study -- to set a direction for meeting regional transportation needs while addressing population growth, cleaner air, and conservation of energy. He then reviewed the layout of the plan and elaborated further on the various chapters contained in the RTP, stating that Chapter II was really the heart of the report. He acknowledged that there were still some problems to be faced, but that realistic targets have to be set.

A slide presentation was next on the Agenda which identified the goals contained in the Regional Transportation Plan and described alternative strategies for reducing traffic. Following the slide show, Andy reviewed the statement of Policy Issues pertaining to the plan, outlining the goals and achievements to be accomplished.

Initial questions raised by the Committee included the following: whether it has been proven that a change from a two-year inspection/maintenance program of vehicles to a one-year program lessens the ozone contributing factor; and whether an annual vehicle inspection would prove more effective than bi-annual. It was brought out that a random sampling of vehicles in the Eugene area, which presently lacks an inspection system, was conducted by the Environmental Protection Agency which showed that Portland's vehicles were 25 percent cleaner than those of a similar sampling from the Eugene area. It was pointed out that Clark County's program for annual vehicle inspection would be voluntary in the year 1981 and mandatory in 1982.

Paul Bay related that Tri-Met has worked very closely with Metro in the preparation of its five-year Transit Development Program slated for 1981-1985. Utilizing 1977 data, he pointed out that there is a big market for transit for trips other than to downtown Portland. Tri-Met's intent is to provide a realistic plan and lay it out in terms of what is actually required, taking into consideration the needs of the people with regard to housing and employment. Fleet requirements, service level, and support facilities were all considerations of the TDP.

Mr. Bay further reviewed a two-year City and Eastside transit improvement program, which needs have been defined and broken down for implementation purposes for FY 1982. He elaborated on the various procedures that take place in the coordination of the proposed improvements. He related that Tri-Met has assurances of 90 percent of the needed funding at this time, adding that there is a 10 percent shortfall for the five-year program. Their intent is to have transit costs increase at or below the rate of inflation, which does not take into consideration the matter of expansion.

With regard to a question raised about a successful transit program in Canada, it was pointed out that better service, weather conditions, and people being oriented to utilize transit over a long period of time are great influences.

Questions raised by the Committee regarded whether buses were in the same category as autos with regard to vehicle emissions and whether diesels emitted any ozone. It was brought out that diesels create a different type of pollutant, that of particulates. The question also arose as to whether diesels would be allowed at all.

Concern arose over meeting air quality standards in light of anticipated population growth. Andy Cotugno related that the amount of pollutants would be less between now and 1987 because of stricter controls on the cars, even with the population growth, but that the clean air standard will still be violated.

Ernie Bonner asked that each Committee member familiarize himself, or herself, with the Policy Issues as presented by the staff. He added that, during the month of October, a public opinion poll would be taken utilizing the same questions provided in the brochure. It was felt that the poll would be helpful in obtaining a good sampling of the public at large. Andy Cotugno reviewed the questions generally raised at the twelve public involvement meetings attended so far. Thirty-five have been scheduled in total.

By adopting the plan, the Committee was concerned over whether it would be subject to further revision. Andy related that it is the intent to update it each year and reaffirm it at that time.

One Committee member felt that the role of land use and its regulations should be clearly pointed out in the RTP as it was felt that a lot of transportation is geared to where people live and work. Considerations such as densities and providing a better mix of shopping and jobs in the suburban area were also suggested.

A question was raised as to highway investments in relation to level of service as contained on the Policy Issue statement -- where and when should this be supported? It was felt that land use, comprehensive plans, and economic development should be tied in with Metro's specific goals and objectives in the RTP. In further discussion, it was felt that the report needs to be very clear in defining the level of service to be accomplished by the year 2000 -- to state the goals or standards we hope to attain as well as the needed financing and strategy. If the goals are unattainable, then definite alternatives and their financing should be clearly defined. The Committee was also in agreement that the report should stress a level of quality of service in order to make an acceptable plan that would reduce traffic and congestion on the streets. It was further suggested that the question of whether our gas tax needs to be moved from one point to another be clearly stated in the report. It was the consensus of the Committee that the public be educated on what the priorities are, what we hope to achieve and what is attainable, and what costs are involved. Bob Bothman expressed the need to set goals for accessibility for ridesharing and carpooling as well as maintenance of the existing system.

One Committee member felt that it was up to the Government officials to set the standards to implement the service that is needed. There was discussion that perhaps the level of transit service and ride-sharing needs to be reassessed.

Questions were also raised concerning the estimate of \$3.10 per gallon of gas by the year 2000. It was brought out that other forecasts have estimated this at \$2.75, while some were considerably higher. It would be somewhat judgmental to determine if that figure is realistic.

Chairman Bonner instructed the staff to define the congestion problems, to the extent that it is technically possible, and to develop a combination of programs and level of service, including alternatives, to be achieved. The financial demands must also be incorporated in their proposals. Maintenance of the existing system should also be clearly delineated. The Committee wanted the public to have its choice of alternatives and their funding clearly defined.

Mr. Cole questioned whether the Murray Road widening project was funded. He further suggested that other modes of travel be considered other than mass transit and cited motorcycles and scooters as an example. He felt that the provision of parking for motorcycles hasn't been addressed and that some consideration should perhaps be given to electric vehicles. A further suggestion was to incorporate the mention of a four-day work week in the RTP as a means of affecting travel.

Andy Cotugno related that the RTP needs to be adopted for Federal certification by the end of the year and was concerned about delaying the project by delving into more detail work. The Committee was then asked whether it wished to adopt the framework of the plan or adopt the plan which would be reviewed each year.

The Committee expressed the need for the staff to meet with more of the citizenry. It was pointed out that a notice was sent to all organized neighborhood associations, and meetings are still taking place. The Committee agreed to proceed with the October 13 public hearing but recognized that a delay in adoption is likely. They were informed that one meeting was held on the RTP with the Mayors and Planning Directors of the various jurisdictions, and that fairly good attendance was recorded. The Committee indicated the need to present the plan to each jurisdiction for some formal review. There is no need to have formal adoption, but a need for formal review was stressed. The staff was forewarned that there would be different values set by different communities in reviewing such a plan. It was suggested that the Councils of each jurisdiction be invited to review the RTP.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: JPACT and RPC Members
Denton Kent
Rick Gustafson