

Portland State University

**PDXScholar**

---

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on  
Transportation

Oregon Sustainable Community Digital Library

---

10-9-1986

## Meeting Notes 1986-10-09

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

Follow this and additional works at: [https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl\\_jpact](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact)

**Let us know how access to this document benefits you.**

---

### Recommended Citation

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation, "Meeting Notes 1986-10-09 " (1986). *Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation*. 87.

[https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl\\_jpact/87](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact/87)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: [pdxscholar@pdx.edu](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).



**METRO**

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

# Agenda

Meeting: JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

Date: October 9, 1986

Day: Thursday

Time: 7:30 a.m.

Place: Metro, Conference Room 330

- \*1. MEETING REPORT OF SEPTEMBER 11, 1986 - APPROVAL REQUESTED.
- #2. TRANSIT AND ROADS FINANCE STUDY PROPOSALS - INFORMATIONAL - Andy Cotugno.
- \*3. LETTER FROM CLACKAMAS COUNTY REGARDING SOUTHWEST CORRIDOR STUDY - INFORMATIONAL - Andy Cotugno.

\*Material enclosed.

#Available at meeting.

NEXT JPACT MEETING: NOVEMBER 13, 1986 - 7:30 A.M.

## MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: September 11, 1986

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Richard Waker, Tom Bispham (alt.), Ed Ferguson, Larry Cole, Marv Woidyla, Linore Allison, Margaret Strachan, Fred Miller, George Van Bergen and Jim Gardner (alt.)

Guests: Keith Ahola, WSDOT; Bob Bothman, Denny Moore and Rick Kuehn, ODOT; Grace Crunican, Steve Dotterer and Julia Pomeroy, City of Portland; and Gary Spanovich, Clackamas County

Staff: Andrew Cotugno, Richard Brandman, Bill Pettis, Cathy Thomas, Karen Thackston and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

MEDIA: None

### SUMMARY:

#### MEETING REPORT OF AUGUST 7, 1986

The Meeting Report of the August 7 JPACT meeting was approved as written.

#### ADOPTING THE FY 1987 TO POST-1990 TIP AND THE FY 1987 ANNUAL ELEMENT AND SELF-CERTIFICATION COMPLIANCE

Andy Cotugno reviewed the funding categories and components of the Transportation Improvement Program and Annual Element that list all projects scheduled for federal transportation funds in the region for the next five years. Also for consideration is Resolution No. 86-687 certifying that the Portland metropolitan area is in compliance with federal transportation planning requirements. Andy noted that all projects presented by the Oregon Transportation Commission in its proposed Six-Year Highway Improvement Program (released in June, 1986) are also incorporated in the TIP.

An errata sheet covering both resolutions was distributed at the meeting outlining the proposed changes.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval of Resolution No. 86-686, adopting the FY 1987 to post-1990 Transportation Improvement Program and the FY 1987 Annual Element, and Resolution No. 86-687 on self-certification with the corrections stipulated on the Errata Sheet. Motion CARRIED unanimously.

JPACT

September 11, 1986

Page 2

#### STATUS OF THE ROADS AND TRANSIT FINANCE STUDIES

Andy Cotugno reported that both the Roads and Transit Finance Committees are trying to finalize their recommendations. Copies of excerpts from the Oregon Roads Finance Study Needs Assessment were distributed.

Andy then provided highlights of the Roads study which addresses: 1) the urban/rural needs for the next 5-10 years (defined for state, counties and cities); 2) an unfunded needs analysis (based on consideration of existing revenues); and 3) an analysis of road performance and its impacts (based on future revenues).

Andy informed JPACT that the Roads Study Committee is now trying to develop options for funding to meet the most important needs, and it is hoped that some type of legislation will result.

Fred Miller complimented Andy on his presentation, and reported on a meeting scheduled by State Senator Jane Cease and attended by supporters of highway funding.

A discussion followed over a comment raised by Fred Miller as to the disproportionate needs of the Portland metropolitan area. In response, Andy suggested that the Portland region only has a disproportionate need because this area produces gas taxes that are used to support the statewide road system. If those funds were used here instead, our needs would be comparable to the rest of the state.

On the transit side, it is hoped that a proposal will be developed to provide a state-level contribution that would be matched from one at the local level. It was noted that the state's figures for road funds are based on a viable planned transit system.

#### REGIONAL TRANSIT CONCERNS

Andy reported that Dan Mercer, Chairman of the Tri-Met Board, paid a surprise visit at TPAC's September 4 meeting in response to the August 8 memo addressed by JPACT on regional transit concerns. He explained that the Tri-Met Board is trying to resolve its problems and agreed to a future JPACT/Tri-Met Board meeting to discuss the issues of concern. Linore Allison encouraged JPACT members to meet with the Board to gain a real consensus.

Chairman Waker agreed to plan such a meeting and work out scheduling with Andy Cotugno.

#### ANNOUNCEMENTS

Fred Miller noted the September 15 dinner meeting of the Oregon Transportation Commission with East Multnomah County leaders. In addition,

JPACT  
September 11, 1986  
Page 3

the OTC will hold its monthly meeting on September 16 at 9:00 a.m. at the Gresham City Hall. At 1:30 p.m., a presentation will be heard by the Washington County officials at the Oregon Graduate Center.

Margaret Strachan announced that September 19-20 are the dates scheduled for meetings by the National League of Cities Transportation and Communications Committee.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Rick Gustafson  
Don Carlson  
JPACT Members

OREGON ROADS FINANCE STUDY

UNFUNDED NEEDS ANALYSIS 1987 TO 2005

INCLUDES INFLATION  
(Millions of Dollars)

<u>Revenues</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>Total</u>
Federal Trust Fund	2,537	329	136	3,002
Other Federal	-	1,500	3	1,503
State	4,283	1,242	769	6,294
County	-	759	-	759
City	-	-	1,028	1,028
Total revenues	6,820	3,830	1,936	12,586
<b>Needs:</b>				
Operations and maintenance	3,100	3,430	2,260	8,790
Repair and preservation	5,574	5,959	3,111	14,644
New construction and expansion	4,379	5,966	1,284	11,629
Bridges	1,357	614	91	2,062
Total needs	14,410	15,969	6,746	37,125
Estimated unfunded needed	7,590	12,139	4,810	24,539

This projection is prepared on the basis of information and assumptions set forth in the accompanying text and accompanying appendix and cannot be properly interpreted without reference to the underlying assumptions described therein. The projections are not intended to be used to solicit or obtain external financing for any roadway or bridge projects. It should be noted that the achievement of any financial projection is dependent upon the occurrence of future events which cannot be assured, as well as on the assumptions and estimation methods. Actual results, therefore, may differ from these projections, and others may arrive at conclusions different from those which are present in this report.

Oregon Roads Finance Study

Prioritization Criteria

	<u>Repair &amp; Preservation</u>	<u>Construction</u>
Interstate	5% of backlog allowed Includes overlays	Includes all new construction
Freeways, Arterials	10% of backlog allowed Includes overlays	Includes all new construction
Collectors	20% of backlog allowed Includes overlays	Limited to pavement needing reconstruction Modernization excluded
Locals	30% of backlog allowed Includes overlays	All work excluded

Through this prioritization, six-year system requirements are reduced

	<u>From:</u> (1987-1992)	<u>To:</u>
Repair & Preservation		
Backlog	\$ 3.18 billion	\$0.88 billion
6-Year	2.46	1.16
Construction		
Backlog	4.54	1.84
6-Year	1.46	1.15
Operations & Maintenance		
6-Year	<u>1.83</u>	<u>1.83</u>
6-Year Total	\$13.47 billion	\$6.86 billion

Oregon Roads Finance Study

Revenue Proposals

- . Develop a six-year funding program for consideration by the Legislature; set the stage for funding actions at a later date to address future time periods.
- . Consider a 2¢ per year increase in gas taxes plus equivalent weight-mile taxes.
- . Consider a one-time increase in the vehicle registration fee from the current \$10.00 to \$20.00 per year.
- . Impose a title transfer fee at 2 percent of the value of the car to be paid one time when first titling the car in Oregon (new cars, used cars, transfers from out of state).

Revenues that would result are as follows:

	<u>Gas Tax/Weight-Mile</u>		<u>Veh. Registr. @ \$10.00</u>		<u>Titling Fee @ 2%</u>
FY 88	@ 2¢ = \$ 17.5 m.	}	\$ 10.7 m.	}	\$ 45.0 m.
FY 89	@ 4¢ = 62.5		22.0		97.3
FY 90	@ 6¢ = 112.3		23.0		102.0
FY 91	@ 8¢ = 161.0		23.2		104.7
FY 92	@ 10¢ = 208.5		23.4		110.2
FY 93	@ 12¢ = 257.4		23.6		114.8
	\$819.2 m.		\$125.9 m.		\$574.0 m.

GRAND TOTAL - 1987-1992 . . . \$1,123.5 million  
 1987-1993 . . . \$1,519.0 million

Oregon Roads Finance Study

Distribution Issues

	<u>State</u>	<u>Counties</u>	<u>Cities</u>
Current Revenue Base (1987-1992) including:	\$2,021 m.	\$950 m.	\$447 m.
10¢ State Gas Tax @ 68/20/12			
2¢ State Gas Tax @ 50/30/20			
Federal Highway Funds			
Local Gas Taxes			
Federal Forestry Receipts			
Local Revenues			
Distribution of New Revenue Based Upon Prioritization Assuming:			
1. Backlog is cut across the board	31%	34%	35%
2. Preservation backlog is spread over 18 years; con- struction backlog is de- ferred	25%	35%	40%
3. Backlog and current period requirements are cut across the board	40%	34%	26%
4. Maintenance is fully funded and the balance is cut across the board	39%	32%	29%
ODOT Proposal on the Basis of Auto and Truck Travel Volumes	65%	--	35%
County Proposal on the Basis of Uniformly Funding the Short- fall Excluding <u>Local Roads</u>	33%	46%	21%
City/County Bottom Line	50%	30%	20%
Consultant Direction	56%	27%	17%

## Oregon Roads Finance Study

### Program vs. Formula Distribution

1. In order to maintain flexibility to meet the actual priorities of the individual agencies and jurisdictions, the preference is to distribute most if not all of the funds through existing formulas once the state/county/city split is established. This would also avoid creation of new institutional layers for selecting projects to be funded.
2. The priority for use of a funding increase by ODOT would be for Modernization purposes, especially on their principal state routes. As such, it may be appropriate to establish all or part of the ODOT increase as another State Modernization Program.
3. Because of the multiplicity of state, county and city jurisdictions in the urban areas, formula allocations are not conducive to meeting Modernization needs. To ensure this priority is addressed, it may be appropriate to:
  - a) Establish an Urban Modernization Fund modeled after the FAU Program for urban areas over 5,000 population.
  - b) Increase the Small Cities' Allotment Program for urban areas under 5,000 population.

## Oregon Transit Finance Study

### Recommendation

#### 1. Special Transportation Fund (STF)

Proposal: Increase the state cigarette tax from 1 cent to 2 cents providing an increase in revenues from \$2.8 million to \$5.6 million per year. As provided by the current statute, the STF would be dedicated to operating and capital costs associated with maintaining and improving transit service to the elderly and handicapped community throughout Oregon.

##### Issues:

- a. Distribution - Ability to respond to capital requests; need to provide a minimum allocation to smaller counties; role of Oregon Transportation Commission.
- b. Eligibility - Pay for state and local administrative costs; supplement UMTA 16(b)(2) capital program for private, nonprofit agencies.
- c. Address method to stabilize declining revenues expected from cigarette tax over them.

#### 2. Transit Capital Assistance Fund

Proposal: Provide a \$12 million biennium appropriation to match federal capital funds for transit vehicles and facilities. Such an appropriation would be funded with \$4 million of Lottery funds for economic development-related capital improvements and \$8 million of general funds for the remainder. Specific capital programs would be selected by the Oregon Transportation Commission based upon applications from local transit districts and jurisdictions.

##### Issues:

- a. Procedures and criteria for consideration of applications would need to be defined.
  - b. Short-range transit service and capital programs consistent with local comprehensive plans, local and regional transportation plans and state transportation plans would need to be a prerequisite.
3. Continue state support for in-lieu-of payroll taxes and Small Cities Assistance Program.
  4. Further consider:
    - a. A joint transit/highway fund.
    - b. A dedicated state funding source for transit.

Oregon Roads Finance Study

Urban Modernization Fund

. Establish a 1¢ Urban Modernization Fund.

. Distribution (similar to FAU):

To urbanized areas over 50,000 population

To urban areas between 5,000 and 50,000 population

Use population within the Urban Growth Boundary as the basis of  
distribution

. Eligibility:

For capital improvements on any state, county, city arterial or collector as identified in adopted comprehensive plans within the Urban Growth Boundary.

. Project Selection:

Through existing institutional mechanisms involving the mutual agreement of affected city, county, regional and state officials.

Upon selection of a project, the state would be requested to release the agreed-upon amount of funding to the implementing jurisdiction for the purpose of implementing that project.



**METRO**

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

# Memorandum

Date: October 2, 1986

To: JPACT

From: Andrew C. Cotugno, <sup>ACC</sup> Transportation Director

Regarding: Southwest Corridor Study - Recommendations

The technical aspects of the Southwest Corridor study are nearing completion and proposed recommendations will soon be developed for adoption by the appropriate jurisdictions. These actions will include proposed amendments to the Regional Transportation Plan.

Associated with this is the attached letter from Clackamas County suggesting that the financial strategy for implementing the recommendations of the Southwest Corridor study be developed in the context of an overall regional strategy addressing required improvements in all the regional corridors. This may be an approach that JPACT wishes to pursue but, in any event, should not affect the final conclusions of the Southwest Corridor study. This study should recommend amendments to the Regional Transportation Plan and address the overall approach for implementing the recommendations. It cannot, however, make a financial commitment to any of the recommendations without taking into consideration priorities elsewhere in the region.

ACC:lmk

Attachment

CC: Southwest Corridor Policy Committee

RECEIVED SEP 25 1986

CLACKAMAS COUNTY

# Department of Transportation & Development

Formerly Department of Environmental Services

**Winston Kurth**  
Executive Director

**Richard Dopp**  
Director  
Operations & Administration

**Ardis Stevenson**  
Director  
Communications & Policy

In Memoriam - John C. McIntyre  
(1935-1984)

**Tom VanderZanden**  
Director  
Planning & Development

September 22, 1986

Andy Cotugno  
Transportation Director  
Metropolitan Service Dist.  
2000 S.W. First Avenue  
Portland, OR 97201-5398

**SUBJECT: Westside Bypass Funding as Part of An  
Overall Regional Corridor Highway  
Improvement Strategy**

Dear Andy,

As the Westside Bypass Analysis is nearing completion it is time to consider where the potential \$200 million would come from for funding the project.

I believe MSD has done a good job with the technical analysis and it appears that major transportation investments are needed in the Southwest Corridor. It also appears that the region does not have sufficient resources to cover these investments. Thus it is critical for MSD to provide leadership in developing a financial strategy for Southwest Corridor transportation investments.

However, I am beginning to get concerned about developing a financial strategy for the Southwest Corridor outside the context of an overall regional position. As I reviewed your Draft Staging Plan I was continually struck with the words, "requires immediate commitment" in relation to State highway improvements.

Obviously, Clackamas County and its citizens and businesses are concerned about transportation investments in the Hwy. 224/212 corridor and in the I-205 Corridor. Both of those Corridors also "require immediate commitment".

Andy, I believe it is critical to develop a Regional Highway Corridor Funding Strategy. This strategy would identify critical highway improvements needed in each corridor - it would not prioritize one corridor over another because I believe that is haphazard planning. All our regional corridors are critical to the overall functioning of our regional system. All of them need phased improvements, simultaneously, over time.

Although I believe the Southwest Corridor technical analysis was a good one, I believe the next step cannot be taken independent of other regional corridor needs. Thus, I would like to recommend that a financial strategy be worked out either by TPAC/JPACT or by expanding the Southwest Corridor technical and policy committees to include other corridor and local jurisdiction representatives.

Sincerely,

*Gary Spanovich*

GARY SPANOVICH, Transportation & Economic Planning Administrator  
Planning and Economic Development Division

cc: Tom VanderZanden  
Winston Kurth  
Bob Schumacher  
Ed Cooley, North Clackamas Employers Assoc.  
Bob Bocci, Sunnyside/205 Association  
Jack Smith, North Clackamas Chamber of Commerce  
Stan Nash, Lake Oswego  
Kathy Lairson, West Linn

1/gs/917:elk

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE JPACT

DATE 10-9-83

NAME

AFFILIATION

M- <del>Bob [unclear]</del>	CLACKAMAS CO.
M- <del>Maed [unclear]</del>	City of Mult. Co
G- <del>Del [unclear]</del>	ODOT
M- <del>George [unclear]</del>	Metro Council
M- <del>Fred miller</del>	ODOT
MA- <del>Tom [unclear]</del>	DEQ
M- <del>LARRY COLE</del>	CITIES OF WASHINGTON COUNTY
M- <del>Larry y Cooper</del>	Metro
M- <del>RICHARD WAKER</del>	METRO
G- <del>Sixie [unclear]</del>	Multico
G- <del>Rick Kuehn</del>	ODOT
G- <del>G.I. MAULERY</del>	FRS - Clark Co
G- <del>Jerry [unclear]</del>	Clackamas County
G- <del>Werry Moore</del>	ODOT-Transit
G- <del>Bebe Rucker</del>	Port
G- <del>Mary Volm</del>	ODOT
G- <del>GEOFF LARKIN</del>	PDOT
G- <del>Cynthia [unclear]</del>	City of Portland
M- <del>Margaret [unclear]</del>	City of Portland
G- <del>John [unclear]</del>	CEID
M- <del>Wes [unclear]</del>	Washington County
M- <del>Ken Thom</del>	Cities in Clackamas Co.
M- <del>Pauline Anderson</del>	Multnomah County

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE JPACT

DATE 10-9-86

NAME

AFFILIATION

G- Grace Crunican City of Portland

G- Steve Dotterer " " "

G- Lee Humes Tri-Met

S- Andy Cotugno Metro

G- Geraldine Bull DJB, Inc.

Blank lined area for additional entries.