



JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION (JPACT)

Meeting Minutes

March 16, 2017

Metro Regional Center, Council Chamber

REVISED 04/20/17

MEMBERS PRESENT

Shane Bemis
Jack Burkman
Shirley Craddick
Nina DeConcini
Craig Dirksen (*Chair*)
Tim Knapp
Neil McFarlane
Roy Rogers
Dan Saltzman
Paul Savas
Bob Stacey
Jeanne Stewart
Kris Strickler
Jessica Vega Pederson
Rian Windsheimer

AFFILIATION

City of Gresham, Cities of Multnomah County
City of Vancouver
Metro Council
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ)
Metro Council
City of Wilsonville, Cities of Clackamas County
TriMet
Washington County
City of Portland
Clackamas County
Metro Council
Clark County
Washington State Department of Transportation
Multnomah County
Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)

ALTERNATES PRESENT

Jef Dalin
Kathryn Williams

AFFILIATION

City of Cornelius, Cities of Washington County
Port of Portland

OTHERS PRESENT: Michael Williams, Mark Ottenad, Kari Schlosshauer, Shoshana Cohen, Nicole Hendrix, Dwight Brashear, Brendon Haggerty, Tim Clark, Jaimie Lerezini, Scott Ridhman, April Bertelsen, David McDevitt, Jess Larsen, Emerald Bogue, Eric Tressa, Doug Helsey, Eric Chambers, Gerik Gransky, Kris Fitch, Dough Helsey

STAFF: Elissa Gertler, Alison Kean, Kim Ellis, Elizabeth Mros-O'Hara, Lisa Hunrichs, Dan Kaempff, Craig Beebe, Ernest Hayes, Frankie Lewington, Tom Kloster, Christopher Spencer, Nellie Papsdorf, Andy Shaw, Ken Lobeck

1. CALL TO ORDER, DECLARATION OF A QUORUM & INTRODUCTIONS

JPACT Chair Craig Dirksen called the meeting to order and declared a quorum at 7:08 a.m. All attendees around the table proceeded to introduce themselves.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATION ON JPACT ITEMS

Ms. Noel Mickelberry, Oregon Walks: Ms. Mickelberry testified in support of state and regional transportation funding to support affordable and reliable transportation while reducing displacement. She encouraged engagement with citizens to address their needs and to request a larger proportion of state funding towards statewide priority projects.

3. UPDATES FROM THE CHAIR AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Chair Dirksen, JPACT members, and staff provided updates on the following items:

- Chair Dirksen discussed the 2016 Compliance report. He noted that per Metro Code, the Metro Chief Operating Officer was required to annually submit to the Metro Council the status of compliance by cities and counties with the requirements of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan and the Regional Transportation Functional Plan. He added that the Metro COO submitted the report to Metro Council on February 23, 2017 and that the compliance report was submitted to the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) and JPACT as an informal non-action item for review. He stated that compliance with the Functional Plan included meeting requirements for maintaining housing capacity, protecting water quality and flood management, protecting industrial land, continuing concept planning in areas added to the Urban Growth Boundary, and protecting and enhancing fish and wildlife habitat. He added that all jurisdictions were in compliance with the Functional Plans and noted a single change with the disincorporation of Damascus in 2016 and management of that land area had reverted back to Clackamas County and Happy Valley.
- Chair Dirksen discussed a February 21, 2017 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) meeting by stating his appreciation for the submission of letters in support of maintaining regional CMAQ funding. He recapped the CMAQ Policy Advisory Committee meeting by noting that they met to discuss the overall program framework. He noted that there was general agreement from the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) and transit agencies to support sub-allocation in order to allow each region the flexibility to tailor the program to their specific regional needs. He explained that further meetings would likely focus on factors to determine how much funding each region would receive.
- Chair Dirksen mentioned a informal meeting on February 28, 2017 to discuss 2016 transportation ballot measures across the country and noted that the PowerPoint from that discussion was available as a supplemental for JPACT.
- Chair Dirksen reminded attendees of a JPACT trip to Washington DC and noted that there would be a meeting at the Metro Regional Center on March 28, 2017 to discuss preparation.
- Mr. Rian Windsheimer reported to JPACT on the March 6, 2017 Region 1 ACT meeting. He explained that they heard from freight representatives on Fast ACT requirements for the freight plan and impacts to Region 1 and noted that the process was moving forward. Commissioner Roy Rogers added that the ODOT presentation on MTIP/STIP was informative and asked Mr. Windsheimer to send the contents to JPACT interested parties. Mr. Windsheimer agreed and noted that the content focused on how different programs are coordinated with respect to funding.
- Councilor Jack Burkman provided an update on the Washington State Legislature. He noted work on a replacement to the I-5 Bridge and the process of convening groups to move forward. He stated that the measure passed both the house and senate transportation committees and would go under reconciliation between the two bodies.
- Mayor Tim Knapp gave a report on the Metropolitan Mayors Consortium meeting with several state representatives in Salem. He stated that this was the first instance in the region where a group of mayors convened to discuss legislative priorities that they

agreed on. He noted that transportation was a major topic and that there was a call for a formal presentation to observe alternative financing and investment strategies. He noted other topics discussed including the ability to connect regional growth to the transit network, right-of-way legislation for autonomous cities, and the restoration of recreational immunity.

- Mr. Neil McFarlane gave a highlight on the proposed federal budget and focused on the capital investment grant program. He noted that the proposed budget recommended that new projects cease to be included in the pipeline but that it agreed to fund existing projects. He emphasized the importance of capital grants to the transportation program.

4. CONSENT AGENDA

Chair Dirksen noted that there was a bundled package of MTIP amendments on the consent agenda. He explained that due to changes prescribed by the USDOT, the process eliminated previous exemptions to approving cost changes and smaller, new projects that were consistent with existing policy direction. He stated that the new process was similar to the process that the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) utilized for the STIP amendment process. He added that JPACT would generally process MTIP amendments on the consent agenda unless they were major amendments. He announced that a description of each project change was included in the amendment's staff report and that members can request amendments be pulled from the consent agenda for discussion.

4.1 Consideration of the February 16, 2017 Minutes

4.2 Resolution No. 17-4774, For the Purpose of Amending the 2015-18 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) to Modify and/or Add New Projects as Part of the February 2017 Formal MTIP Amendment for Beaverton, Clackamas County, DEQ, Metro, Portland, ODOT, Tigard, and TriMet

MOTION: Mayor Knapp moved, and Mr. McFarlane seconded, to approve the consent agenda.

ACTION: With all in favor, the motion passed.

5. INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

5.1 Draft Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) 2017-2018

Chair Dirksen introduced Mr. John Mermin, Metro staff, to lead the discussion.

Key elements of the presentation included:

- Mr. Mermin stated that a copy of the draft UPWP was available at the meeting, and that JPACT would reconvene at the following meeting to call for action.
- Mr. Mermin noted that the UPWP is linked with federal MPO self-certification. He added that the self-certification discussed compliance with federal requirements and is required every four years.

- Mr. Mermin explained that the UPWP was necessary to ensure the flow of federal funds and that the UPWP is a federally required document that ensures efficient use of federal funds and that it included budget summaries.
- Mr. Mermin stated that it is important to note that it does not influence policy decisions and that the draft version had gone through TPAC.
- Mr. Mermin asked JPACT members and alternates if they had any questions.

Member discussion included:

- Chair Dirksen stated that JPACT members would have time to review the draft UPWP before the next JPACT meeting to ask for clarification and action on the item.

5.2 Update of Regional Policy and Funding Priorities for 2017 State Transportation Legislation

Chair Dirksen provided background information by stating that JPACT adopted a legislative agenda at the prior JPACT meeting. He explained that regional staff was present to share the proposal from the congestion work group to develop a funding proposal in coordination with our region. He noted that the proposal would likely be changed before a formal bill is drafted and introduced to the legislature. He stated that staff would attempt to schedule time for JPACT members and JPACT Finance Subcommittee members to travel to Salem to meet with legislators and discuss potential and proposed bills. He then introduced Mr. Andy Shaw, Metro staff, to lead the presentation.

Key elements of the presentation included:

- Mr. Shaw stated that he and Mr. Jim McCaulley, Washington County Government Affairs staff, were present to provide context on the legislative package.
- Mr. McCaulley stated that the legislative package incorporated elements from the 2015 package and that several key pieces were introduced from the Governors Vision Panel and the Joint Legislative Committee. He explained that congestion was a key element across all jurisdictions. He noted that this was a unique opportunity for JPACT to fulfill a consulting role in the legislative process.
- Mr. Shaw stated that the Congestion Work Group presented a case that congestion in Portland was of statewide concern. He explained that making the case for using state funds for statewide priority projects in the region. He added that ODOT had focused on overcoming regulatory barriers and creating project timelines towards bottleneck projects.
- Mr. Shaw illustrated that the state grants funding on a 50:30:20 proportion to ODOT, to counties, and to cities. He noted that the congestion work group focused on state allocation directed to bottleneck projects on a match basis. He explained that 50-60% of bottleneck projects needed state funding, and that the state should be funding at least 50% of projects for match funding. He highlighted bottleneck projects such as the I-5 to Rose Quarter, the I-205 lane widening, and north and south bound fixes on OR-217.
- Mr. Shaw stated that determination of the scope of the bottleneck projects had not been defined but would be done through a fluid process. He explained that match funding would be contingent for the success of the package. He noted the possibility of a regional measure and a surcharge for the area. He stated that the goal would be to establish higher taxes and fees towards individuals in a particular area. He gave

examples of an 8-10 cent gas tax and a 10-25 dollar registration fee implemented over time. He explained that this would gradually increase revenues to fund debt services to help defund bottleneck projects and would raise enough funds to match for projects of regional significance.

- Mr. Shaw stated that TriMet was leading a voter measure on the Southwest Corridor project and bottleneck projects. He explained that this would decrease the proportion of funding sourced from surcharge fees if successful.
- Ms. Kathryn Williams stated that if the proposal was passed successfully that it would serve as an example for other MPO's to follow. She added that the Metro region had determined regional projects that the state identifies as significant to invest but that there was competition from statewide maintenance projects.
- Mr. Shaw conveyed that there were other discussions focused on transit capital and transit operation projects but not with the Congestion Work Group.

Member discussion included:

- Chair Dirksen remarked that the work done at the legislation surpassed prior efforts. He noted that there were unanswered questions and legal concerns on definitions and tax increases.
- Mayor Knapp brought attention to concerns in obtaining city support for local gas taxes. He encouraged the idea of local control for city determination and to not pre-empt local entities.
- Commissioner Savas stated that he appreciated the conversation focused on funding for local projects. He asked what the size of the budget for local projects was.
- Mr. Shaw answered that it would depend on the scale of the gas tax fee, the date of implementation, the size of bottleneck, and state matching funds. He noted that ODOT had a spreadsheet to "build your own fund." He stated that this would create about 20 million in funds initially, with annual fluctuations and distribution back to the MPO. He added that this did not consider bond leveraging.
- Commissioner Savas highlighted a need for clarification on the scope of the I-205 bottleneck project and recommended augmenting the language to add the 5.8 mile stretch to show that it was not only a lane widening project for Abernethy Bridge. He stated his concern that it would jeopardize support from legislatures who travel on the Columbia Corridor if it was perceived as only a lane widening project. He added that this was the first instance of statewide support for three bottleneck projects and that the Clackamas County Coordinating Committee was supportive of state and local matching funds.
- Mr. McCaulley stated that the I-205 project consisted of two separate projects that were presented as one to the congestion workgroup.
- Mr. Shaw added that the challenge is other interests proposing projects while maintaining the current structure of the project.
- Commissioner Savas asked if they could leverage 20 million in funds with bonding. He added that the argument is for more a more attractive bond for voter approval.
- Mr. Shaw responded that it would require further consideration.
- Commissioner Jessica Vega Pederson stated that she appreciated the base outline presented. She mentioned her concern on the boundaries of applied charges and the authoritative body over projects in the boundary. She noted that the other part of the commitment was towards active transportation and multimodal projects using state

- funds. She added that it is important to understand how attractive the regional bond measure would be perceived.
- Chair Dirksen stated that the local package was for regional determination. He added that bonding property taxes could be used to fill the gap in funds for active transportation projects. He noted that a separate state work group would focus on using local funds and would be dependent on JPACT to determine what would be additional needs after receiving state contribution.
 - Mr. McFarlane stated his appreciation for the presentation. He explained that the 50:30:20 distribution was essential for funding local projects and the three priority bottleneck projects. He advised to keep projects invested in discussions. He asked how to link advancements on highway projects to transit priorities. He noted that the TriMet bond measure would play a key part as well as how surcharges would play as an important element.
 - Mr. Shaw answered that the congestion workgroup worked with transit and active transportation authorities to understand why the whole package was important.
 - Mr. McFarlane noted that there would need to be developments with the transit workgroup as well.
 - Commissioner Dan Saltzman stated that Portland was working to state that for every dollar raised for bottleneck projects that there should be an equal amount raised for regionally significant projects. He explained that he believed ODOT should provide 60% matching funds for highway bottleneck projects.
 - Mayor Knapp stated that there was a need to present to voters that the system was invested in itself. He commented on Abernethy Bridge project and stated that he understood that ODOT was working on refining definitions and wording. He advised clearly communicating the I-205 Abernethy Bridge project and the I-205 lane widening project so that understanding would not be further misconstrued.
 - Chair Dirksen stated that it could be appropriate for JPACT to take formal action on making the statement on the existing language that defines widening Abernethy Bridge and I-205 to the Stafford Road interchange. He asked if Mayor Knapp would be willing to make the motion, to which he agreed.
 - Commissioner Savas stated that the language should be indicative that it is the I-205/Abernethy Bridge/5.8 mile stretch to the Stafford Road interchange.
 - Councilor Stacey asked if the motion would clarify the definition under a bottleneck project so as not to indicate that it was a priority project above the rest of the package. Chair Dirksen responded that the project would fit in the entire package, not as an exception.
 - Commissioner Rogers stated that he perceived the discussion as a request for clear direction and that he did not sense that was coming to a conclusion.
 - Mr. Shaw responded that the discussion was focused on receiving input from JPACT members if the legislative session was going in the right direction. He noted that senators would look at JPACT's review for development.
 - Commissioner Rogers stated that they are moving in the right direction with the project package. He noted that it would not be possible for the legislature to solve local issues on active transportation but that it could be done at the regional level. He reiterated the need to send a clear message to the legislature.

MOTION: Mayor Knapp moved, and Commissioner Savas seconded, to refine the existing language of the widening of Abernethy Bridge and I-205 to the Stafford Road interchange.

ACTION: Ms. DeConcini abstained. With all else in favor, the motion passed.

5.3 Powell-Division Transit Locally-Preferred and Regional Transportation Plan Amendment

Chair Dirksen provided background information on the topic. He stated that the presentation would lead to the implementation of moving TriMet's first bus rapid transit project to address the needs of current and future transit riders on one of the most heavily used bus lines in the region. He noted that Metro staff was working with project partners to incorporate their comments on the materials, and that the materials would be revised to address partner and public comments received before the following JPACT meeting. He stated that no action was required at the meetings and that in May 2017, JPACT would be asked to consider recommending Metro Council adopt the revised resolution and ordinance. He then introduced Ms. Elizabeth Mros-O'Hara, Metro staff, to lead the discussion.

Key elements of the presentation included:

- Ms. Mros-O'Hara discussed what was in the LPA and the engagement process. She noted that the process was important for the steering committee to consider the entire corridor. She explained that this was the first BRT project from TriMet to connect Gresham and Portland.
- Ms. Mros-O'Hara explained that the outreach process was extensive and unprecedented. She remarked that they had over 300 public meetings and survey opportunities to reach hard to reach constituents. She noted the overarching equity lens that was incorporated and that half of the committee was composed of community members.
- Ms. Mros-O'Hara stated that the approach to the corridor focused on transit investment, equitable housing, community development, and safe and active transportation. She also explained that local action plans were implemented to focus on stationary areas and on alignment. She highlighted City of Portland's work on equitable development and City of Gresham's focus on area specific impacts.
- Ms. Mros-O'Hara noted that the LPA highlighted the importance of the transit project and of the high transit demand in the area was impacted by congestion. She added that the route received the highest number of TriMet complaints towards service and that it went through one of the most diverse parts of the region. She explained that three aspects of the LPA as the selection of mode of transit, the route travelled. And the location of stations. She added that the steering committee recommended BRT as the ideal mode of transit.
- Ms. Mros-O'Hara discussed the route and noted that a final decision towards what bridge to cross had yet to be determined. She remarked that the Tillikum Bridge was identified as a preference.
- Ms. Mros-O'Hara explained that the result would be better transit responsive to the needs of the community and to improve access to places and reliability of service. She noted that the advantages were context sensitive and that early estimates measure a 20% improvement in speed of trip due to higher capacity of BRT. She added that the

most notable improvements would be during the most congested times of the day to travel.

- Ms. Mros-O'Hara described the features of the BRT. She stated that the buses would be articulated, would have 60% greater rider capacity, and three doors to expedite boarding. She highlighted concepts of traffic signal prioritization and station improvements to increase efficiency of travel. She described the visualization of inner and outer Division Street and how concept planning attempted to maintain characteristics of neighborhoods.
- Ms. Mros-O'Hara noted that TriMet agreed to not use the same resources used today for Division Street Transit for the project and stated that the funds would go to other local service improvements to improve the overall transit network in the area.
- Ms. Mros-O'Hara stated City of Portland's condition of approval that would be placed in the formalized process. She added that Metro was working on the 82nd Avenue Furniture Store Improvement Project to develop into affordable housing.
- Ms. Mros-O'Hara discussed City of Gresham and Multnomah County's agreement to improve service to Mount Hood Community College (MHCC). She stated that the BRT route could not connect but that it would lead to service improvements to line 20.
- Ms. Mros-O'Hara stated that the next step in the adoption process would be a presentation on revised materials on May 18, 2017 with adoption by Metro Council slated for June 17, 2017, with a plan to implement service in 2021.

Member discussion included:

- Chair Dirksen explained that the presentation was to make JPACT aware of the materials released for public comment and that they would return in May 2017 with responses and modifications. He noted that there would not be a discussion today but stated that there was the opportunity for members to comment on the presentation.

6. ACTION ITEMS

6.1 Discussion and Determination of RFFA Project (Cleveland St. or Division St.)

Chair Dirksen stated that the discussion on the two projects was carried over from the prior JPACT meeting. He explained that there was an unsuccessful motion on Cleveland Street Project and that members requested more information before reaching a decision. He stated that new information was available for review and that work has been done with Gresham to reach a resolution. He stated that Gresham agreed to contribute \$2 million in System Development Charges (SDC's) to fund the Division Street Sidewalk project as a condition of approval for JPACT to reconsider and approve the Cleveland Street project. He noted that this would allow both projects to move forward and that the solution would help maintain regional partnerships and to focus on achieving funding for regional transportation needs. He thanked Councilor Craddick and Mayor Bemis for their partnership as well as Metro and Gresham staff in reaching a compromise. He explained that a JPACT member who voted against the Cleveland Street project would need to propose the motion to reconsider Cleveland Street with a condition of approval. He asked if Commissioner Rogers was willing to make the motion.

Key elements of the presentation included:

- Commissioner Rogers stated that he appreciated the compromise and highlighted the need for clarity of the verbiage used in the amendment.

Member discussion included:

- Councilor Stacey stated his appreciation for Mayor Bemis in his roles to compromise and present leadership towards regional goals.
- Councilor Jeanne Stewart stated her appreciation to Gresham and Metro staff to work together to find a reasonable outcome and compromise.
- Councilor Craddick stated her appreciation to Gresham staff towards the compromise and to fund both critical safety projects.
- Ms. DeConcini explained that she would abstain but appreciated the compromise. She requested that JPACT review the bylaws to have an abstention reclassified as neutral rather than a vote of opposition.

MOTION: Commissioner Rogers moved, and Councilor Craddick seconded, to approve the motion to reconsider Cleveland Street with a condition of approval.

ACTION: Ms. DeConcini abstained. With all else in favor, the motion passed.

ADJOURN

JPACT Chair Dirksen adjourned the meeting at 8:44 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Christopher Spencer
Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF MARCH 16, 2017

ITEM	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT NO.
3.0	PowerPoint	03/16/17	2016 Transportation Funding PowerPoint	031617j-01
5.1	Handout	03/16/17	Draft Report on 2017-2018 Unified Planning Work Program	031617j-02
5.1	PowerPoint	03/16/17	2017-2018 Unified Planning Work Program	031617j-03
5.2	Handout	03/16/17	2017 Portland Metropolitan Region Transportation Agenda	031617j-04
5.2	Memo	03/16/17	Investing in Our Region's Transportation and Livability Needs	031617j-05
5.3	PowerPoint	03/16/17	Powell-Division Transit and Development Project	031617j-06
6.1	Handout	03/16/17	Exhibit A to Resolution No. 16-4756	031617j-07
6.1	Handout	03/16/17	Exhibit B to Resolution No. 16-4756	031617j-08
N/A	Handout	03/16/17	Metro's March Hotsheet	031617j-09