

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: October 26, 1987

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Richard Waker, Lloyd Anderson, Earl Blumenauer, Ed Lindquist, Eldon Edwards (alternate), Larry Cooper, Marjorie Schmunk, Pauline Anderson, George Van Bergen, Bonnie Hays, Tom Brian, Linore Allison, Bob Bothman and Fred Hansen

Executive Officer: Rena Cusma

Guests: Mike McKillip, City of Tualatin; Mike Hollern, Ted Spence, and Denny Moore (Public Transit), ODOT; Ramsay Weit, Martin Winch and Susie Lahsene, Multnomah County; Rick Root, City of Beaverton; Richard Ross (Gresham), Cities of Multnomah County; Robert Burrow, East Multnomah County Economic Development Comm.; Doug Capps, Bob Post, Lee Hames, G.B. Arrington, Dick Feeney, and James Cowen, Tri-Met; Bob Stacey, Felicia Trader, and Grace Crunican, City of Portland; Wink Brooks, City of Hillsboro; Bruce Warner and Frank Angelo, Washington County; Gary Spanovich, Clackamas County; Cherie McGinnis, State Senator Kennemer's office; Dan Seeman, IRC of Clark County; Bebe Rucker, Port of Portland; and Robert R. Rogers, Portland Chamber of Commerce

Staff: Andy Cotugno, Vickie Rocker, James Giese-king, Richard Brandman, and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

MEDIA: None

SUMMARY:

Andy Cotugno explained that the policy paper presented at this work-session is an effort to define a comprehensive outline of transportation conclusions derived from previous worksessions. He indicated that this paper focuses on a complete list of priorities for the next 10 years, and asked for Committee input as to deletions or additions. Andy noted that Section I-B1 (pertaining to highway corridor priorities) does not rank the projects although it does recognize phasing of projects, and that Section I-B2 (pertaining to regional transit corridors) does set priorities. The paper also deals with a long-range vision for the region, establishment of criteria to use in implementation of the 10-year program, strategies for funding of the program, and follow-up activities defining issues to be dealt with further.

In asking for Committee input, the following questions were raised concerning Section I-B1:

- . Questioning the inclusion of project 1b (I-5/I-84 to Fremont Bridge - Phases I and II); Andy indicated that this recognizes two of the most critical phases of that project.
- . Concerning I-B1f (I-84/U.S. 26 Connector (through Gresham) - Phase I), Pauline Anderson cited the importance of the entire project being included in the 10-year plan; in response, Andy noted that the specific scope of the I-84/U.S. 26 Connector is not defined as yet so it is difficult to discuss specifics, but indicated that the full project was not needed in 10 years and suggested phasing it like the other corridors.
- . Bob Bothman questioned whether the list represented a "prioritized" or "wish" list inasmuch as it represented 10 times the current funding and five times what he felt might be raised, indicating it was too ambitious a list. Andy clarified that the list identifies justified improvements that are based upon level of travel demand and that the improvements are needed during the next decade. Some of the improvements need accompanying arterials to make the system function better.
- . With regard to the listing of highway projects (Section I-B1), Bob Bothman questioned whether all the projects are representative of corridors of statewide significance. He noted that the state is seeking to reprioritize what they are doing.

Chairman Waker cited the need to define the projects that are critical to the region and then to secure the means to finance them. This initial effort is an attempt to present a package that meets the needs of the region. Bob Bothman agreed with the approach taken, but cautioned the Committee that the needs have to be met with available resources.

Andy Cotugno then reviewed the criteria identified in Section II for prioritization of transportation funds during the 10-year program, with emphasis on short-term transportation problems, those anticipated in the next 10 years and transportation constraints on access to new development areas. The emphasis is on the short-term project that is the most critical.

Lloyd Anderson noted that the area from Washington County to downtown is representative of severe traffic congestion, questioning whether it didn't warrant high priority. The need to deal with that problem and a decision on whether it should be resolved by LRT was discussed. It was also emphasized that the implications of each project should be discussed further prior to prioritization of the projects.

Commissioner Hays asked for the status of the pending application for the Public-Private Task Force. Commissioner Blumenauer indicated that the outcome of the grant will not be known for a few weeks. It would provide some additional tools for securing funding for the public-private partnership and help to achieve what is on the prioritized list. Questioning whether there are strings attached to the corporate partnership as to where funds are placed, Commissioner Blumenauer indicated that private funds would be tied to a specific project because it would enhance their own interests. Commissioner Hays expressed concern over tapping into a limited funding pot from the corporate world that could find itself in competition with other regional projects. Commissioner Blumenauer did not, however, see any conflict.

Pauline Anderson expressed concern that only Phase I of the I-84/U.S. 26 Connector was included on the prioritized highway corridor list, citing the intensity of the needs and population/employment figures for traffic funneling into East Multnomah County. Chairman Waker felt it could be re-evaluated at a later date.

Commissioner Anderson questioned whether emphasis should be placed on the regional corridors in line with the state's emphasis and whether the Urban Arterial Fund should be separate from state funding and placed on the priority list. A discussion followed on whether or not an Urban Arterial Fund should be a regional priority. Chairman Waker noted that if the state is not willing to deal with the urban arterials, he questioned who would. He suggested that the Committee has to think of larger revenue-raising measures if an Urban Arterial Fund is to be supported.

In discussion on the Urban Arterial Fund, Andy Cotugno reported that it would amount to a level of funding (\$15 million/year) that has been accomplished over the last 15 years. If FAU funds are included, only \$11 million would be required for city/county arterials. One cent statewide would raise \$11 million per year. If there was a registration fee comparable to the state registration fee, that would raise \$12 million per year.

Commissioner Lindquist was supportive of a registration fee that could be pursued at the next Legislature and felt that was the next logical step.

Mayor Brian emphasized the need for a regional effort on behalf of the fund inasmuch as it was dropped by the Legislature at the last go-round. He felt it should be our next priority. Linore Allison and Richard Waker were also supportive of an Urban Arterial Fund.

As a reminder, it was noted that the state has indicated its preference for key regional corridors but that the need for linkage shouldn't be overlooked. Bob Bothman stated that the needs of the region are greater

than last year and the transit element has come into focus, indicating the need for a blend between transit and highway projects. The state must maintain its role with emphasis on major corridors, picking a few routes for completion -- access routes into the Portland metro region. The urban arterials will rate a lesser priority.

Bob Bothman indicated that the East Marquam and Delta Park projects should also be included among the Interstate projects to be prioritized and that all I-5 and I-84 projects should be looked at for prioritization (Section III-B1a). He felt that the cities and counties would gain better support from the Legislature for an Urban Arterial Fund than would the state. Bob agreed that the needs are greater here in the region than in the rest of the state. Andy Cotugno indicated that while the magnitude is great here, there are improvements on "main streets" needed elsewhere in the state and that there was considerable support for the concept by other cities. He emphasized that an Urban Arterial Fund would fund capital improvements on city, county or state roads. Chairman Waker asked whether there would be any support from the state toward a regional Arterial Fund. Bob Bothman indicated the state would probably support some kind of an arterial program.

Mr. Bothman further reported that Federal highway money to Oregon has dropped \$33 million. He noted that we are approaching the end of the Interstate Program and that Congress will be putting such funds into discretionary projects. Bob Bothman encouraged the region to seek discretionary funds for specific key projects. Asked whether the State of Oregon would be penalized in any way by such a strategy, Mr. Bothman indicated it would not represent a trade-off of funds.

With regard to Section III-B4 (pertaining to the state's role in transit finance), there was discussion that, as defined, there is some degree of previous funding commitment to it. It was noted that the draft TDP is designed to maintain the program status quo, which includes park-and-ride lots and bus replacement, and the total capital program is \$13.5 million underfunded. There was consensus that a new source for capital LRT match needs has to be developed and is one of the issues to be pursued when Portland gets their grant approved.

Based on comments and discussions, Chairman Waker indicated the paper would be distributed for public comment prior to reconsideration and adoption by JPACT. The next step is for Metro staff to develop recommendations on Section I-A and B. Further deliberation needs to take place regarding Section 3 Trade funds, Six-Year Program priorities and FAU funds. It was further directed that a subcommittee of JPACT review the options of an Urban Arterial Fund, establish what the measure should be, and how it should be implemented. The effort is to be concluded by next May or June to fit into the legislative timeframe, as well as follow-up on a discretionary fund request and a determination as to whether the state undertakes a transit needs study. The latter

would define what the appropriate state role is in transit finance. Also noted by Chairman Waker was the need to pursue a balanced program of Six-Year Program priorities as experienced in the past. There was consensus that a balanced program be submitted to the state public hearings by February with adoption by the state during the month of July.

Mayor Brian concurred the need to prioritize on a tighter basis lacking additional resources. If there is indication that help can be gained from the Legislature, there will be time to re-evaluate priorities.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Rena Cusma
Dick Engstrom
JPACT Members