

Portland State University

**PDXScholar**

---

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on  
Transportation

Oregon Sustainable Community Digital Library

---

11-12-1987

## Meeting Notes 1987-11-12

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 1987-11-12 " (1987). *Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation*. 102.

[https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl\\_jpact/102](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact/102)

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: November 12, 1987  
Day: Thursday  
Time: 7:30 a.m.  
Place: Metro, Conference Room 330

- \*A. MEETING REPORTS OF AUGUST 13; SEPTEMBER 10, 14 AND 28; AND OCTOBER 12, 1987 - APPROVAL REQUESTED.
- \*B. AMENDING THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO INCLUDE A PROJECT FOR THE REGION'S NON-URBANIZED AREA PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Andy Cotugno.
- #C. DISCUSSION OF JPACT TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES AND STRATEGIES - Andy Cotugno.

\*Material enclosed.

#Available at meeting.

NEXT JPACT MEETING: DECEMBER 10, 1987 - 7:30 A.M.

NOTE: Overflow parking is available at the City Center parking locations on the attached map, and may be validated at the meeting. Parking on Metro premises in any space other than those marked "Visitors" will result in towing of vehicle.

## 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

# World-Wide City Transport Study A First For Murdoch Researchers

(EMBARGOED TILL 9 A.M. WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 26)

A landmark study of 32 of the world's major cities has some strong suggestions for car-dominated cities in Australia and the U.S.

Two Murdoch University researchers, who compiled the study over four years, argue strongly for reassessing road construction, car parking and traffic flow to develop more efficient and environmentally attractive Australian and U.S. cities.

Dr Peter Newman and Dr Jeffrey Kenworthy call for planning policies to shift road supply per head of population in Australian cities to about one-third the current level; to set the central city parking ratio at 200 spaces per 1,000 workers (currently averaging 327:1,000 in Australia--562:1,000 in Perth), and to accept that average speeds of about 30km/h are adequate in a city.

"This should not be a punitive restriction on freedom of movement, but part of a longer term strategy to shift the emphasis away from cars towards other forms of travel," Dr Newman said.

The researchers say present urban planning policies are entrenching dependence on the private car, leaving cities vulnerable to:

- \*oil supply disruptions
- \*transport-related inflation
- \*air pollution from exhaust emissions
- \*more road accidents
- \*expensive public transport, and
- \*an environmentally unattractive and dead city heart

Drs Newman and Kenworthy released their study report in Melbourne today at an international symposium on transport and urban form.

Between 1983 and 1986 they studied transport and land use in ten U.S. cities, the five mainland capitals in Australia, 12 European and three Asian capitals, and one each in Canada and Russia.

The study is believed to be unique in the depth, breadth and reliability of its comparative data and analysis.

Drs Newman and Kenworthy found that on average U.S. city residents use twice as much fuel as their counterparts in Australia, four times as much as in European cities and ten times as much as in Asian cities (see table). Moscow is positively miserly in its use of fuel--using 150-times less per person than U.S. cities.

"Moscow, with almost no private car use, is only of interest in showing that a city of eight million people can exist on virtually no gasoline," Dr Newman said. "Of more interest is how cities in Europe, with high car ownership, can manage to be so accessible but use cars half as much as Australian cities.

The study assessed the importance of income, gasoline price and vehicle efficiencies and found that the planning of a city was more fundamental than economics.

Dr Newman said planning for non-automobile modes, more compact and diverse housing (with shops, restaurants and businesses mixed together) had a big effect on travel patterns.

"Relatively cheap fuel is not the only reason why more people use cars in the U.S. and Australia," Dr Newman says. "Allowing more road and parking space, less competitive public transport and urban sprawl encourages greater use of the private car--and risks the attendant central city crisis that will inevitably cause."



Although Australian cities are a little less car-oriented than those in the U.S., Perth is defined as 'virtually an average U.S. city' as far as transport is concerned. Perth residents use more gasoline than their eastern states counterparts, they have by far the most road space to use of any city surveyed, and more parking space in the city centre than all but one other city.

U.S. cities have less than 5% of their total passenger travel on public transport and Australian cities are only marginally better with 8%. By contrast, the corresponding figures are 25% in European cities, 65% in the three Asian cities and more than 95% in Moscow. Interestingly, these cities also have far more people prepared to walk and cycle to work. It fits a pattern of a much less car-dependent city.

"Buses are not a viable option to the car for city commuters," Dr Newman said. "By comparison with the average traffic speed (about 43km/h) in car-oriented cities, buses are very slow, averaging a remarkably uniform 20-21km/h in all cities surveyed.

"Only the rail option can compete with cars as the average speed of urban trains is above 40km/h."

The overall shape of the U.S. and Australian car-oriented city is of low residential density and concentration of employment with a central city characterised by high rise office blocks. The residential density of U.S. and Australian central cities is generally less than 20 people per hectare, while in Europe they average 90 per hectare.

Drs Newman and Kenworthy suggest a re-urbanization of cities presently dominated by the private car, based on policies designed to encourage more people to live in the city heart and inner area, and a greater spread of jobs to subcentres in the outer metropolitan area linked by rail services.

Mr Jan Kolm, chairman of the National Energy Research Development and Demonstration Council, which funded the study, said in Melbourne: "The project is a fascinating and unique comparison of cities that NERDDC was proud to assist. That such a major study has come out of Australia is a remarkable feat."

For further information contact: Peter Newman and Jeff Kenworthy (09) 332-2569

CITY	GASOLINE USE (MJ PER CAPITA)
<b>US CITIES</b>	
Houston	74,510
Phoenix	69,908
Detroit	65,978
Denver	63,466
Los Angeles	58,474
San Francisco	55,365
Boston	54,185
Washington	51,241
Chicago	48,246
New York	44,033
Average	58,541
<b>AUSTRALIAN CITIES</b>	
Perth	32,610
Brisbane	30,653
Melbourne	29,104
Adelaide	28,791
Sydney	27,986
Average	29,829
<b>CANADIAN CITIES</b>	
Toronto	34,813

CITY	GASOLINE USE (MJ PER CAPITA)
<b>EUROPEAN CITIES</b>	
Hamburg	16,671
Frankfurt	16,093
Zurich	15,709
Stockholm	15,574
Brussels	14,744
Paris	14,091
London	12,426
Munich	12,372
West Berlin	11,331
Copenhagen	11,106
Vienna	10,074
Amsterdam	9,171
Average	13,280
<b>ASIAN CITIES</b>	
Tokyo	8,488
Singapore	6,003
Hong Kong	1,987
Average	5,493
<b>USSR CITY</b>	
Moscow	380

GASOLINE USE PER CAPITA IN 32 CITIES, 1980


**NEW BOOK**

# SOURCEBOOK

## of Urban Land Use, Transport and Energy Data for Principal Cities of North America, Europe, Asia and Australia

By Jeffrey R.KENWORTHY and Peter W.G.NEWMAN  
Environmental Science, Murdoch University

Adelaide  
Amsterdam  
Boston  
Brisbane  
Brussels  
Chicago  
Copenhagen  
Denver  
Detroit  
Frankfurt  
Hamburg  
Hong Kong  
Houston  
London  
Los Angeles  
Melbourne  
Moscow  
Munich  
New York  
Paris  
Perth  
Phoenix  
San Francisco  
Singapore  
Stockholm  
Sydney  
Tokyo  
Toronto  
Vienna  
Washington  
West Berlin  
Zurich



The SOURCEBOOK is a unique collection of urban data gathered by the authors from literature and personal visits to each of the 32 cities.

Analysis of the data ranks the cities according to primary variables and develops policies for reducing dependence on the private automobile emphasising land use changes.

Data covers 1960, 1970, 1980 and includes:

- Population, Urbanised area and Employment for CBD, Inner Area and Total City.
- Parking in CBD.
- Length of road network in whole city.
- Passenger cars and total vehicles on register.
- Total annual VKT (vehicle kilometres of travel) by passenger cars and other vehicles.
- Average gasoline consumption and diesel consumption for whole city.
- Journey to work modal split (%) and other modal split data.
- Average trip lengths (km) for the journey to work and other trips.
- Annual vehicle kilometres, passengers carried, average travel distance of passengers, average speed of travel and annual energy consumption for all bus, train, tram and ferry operations (including publicly and privately operated transit services).

The data are then standardised into parameters such as density, and per capita transport factors.

*Don't miss your chance to purchase this invaluable new study.  
The SOURCEBOOK is also available on computer diskettes for ready use in data processing.*

I would like to order \_\_\_\_\_ copies of The SOURCEBOOK at \$ \_\_\_\_\_ each.  
I would also like \_\_\_\_\_ copies of it on computer diskette. Please bill me.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

SEND TO: Dr Peter Newman, Environmental Science, Murdoch University,  
Perth, Western Australia.

## MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: October 12, 1987

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

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

Guests: Mike Hollern, Rick Kuehn, Ted Spence and Denny Moore (Public Transit), ODOT; Loren Wyss, Chair, Tri-Met Board; Grace Crunican, Laurel Wentworth, Steve Iwata, Vic Rhodes and Julia Pomeroy, City of Portland; Bob Post, Doug Capps, Lee Hames, Dick Feeney, Ken Zatarain and G.B. Arrington, Tri-Met; Ken McFarling, Oregon Association of Railway Passengers; Ray Polani, Citizens for Better Transit; Gary Spanovich, Winston Kurth and Tom VanderZanden, Clackamas County; Howard Harris, DEQ; Rick Root, City of Beaverton; Bruce Warner, Washington County; Richard Ross (Gresham), Cities of Multnomah County; Bebe Rucker, Port of Portland; and Larry Nicholas, Multnomah County

Rena Cusma, Executive Officer, Metro

Staff: Andrew Cotugno, Richard Brandman, Susan Hopkins, Marc Madden, John Cullerton, Keith Lawton, James Giesecking, and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

Media: Harry Bodine, The Oregonian

### SUMMARY:

Chairman Waker opened the third meeting of the series of special JPACT worksessions for the purpose of discussing a "vision" for the Regional Transportation Plan and to plan for the means of financing the program.

Ray Polani, representing Citizens for Better Transit, spoke of a publication entitled "The Future of Urbanization: Facing the Ecological and Economic Constraints," and he hoped JPACT would avail themselves of a copy. He cited the study's conclusions and advocated rail as a more competitive option to cars than buses. The study was produced by Worldwatch Paper under the authorship of Lester Brown and Jodi Jacobson. Mr. Polani further cited the importance of gaining citizen input in this process.

Chairman Waker thanked Mr. Polani for his comments and indicated that at this point in time, it is merely JPACT's intent to draft a set of policy directions and that public input before adoption would be appropriate.

Andy Cotugno then reviewed the Regional Transportation Policies hand-out, asking for feedback from the Committee. He hoped that, following the discussion, staff could produce a summary document on the policies discussed to date and those agreed upon. He felt that the focus of this meeting and the next should be the goal for the next 10 years and the policy issues relating to that.

Lloyd Anderson felt that something was missing from the Regional Transportation Policy statement. He cited the need for a statement clarifying what we are trying to accomplish, what the facilities are in the Regional Transportation Plan, our intent or treatment in siting the connector between I-84 and U.S. 26, the intent behind new alignments (what we are trying to accomplish), and the level of service desired. In addition, he felt that a statement as to the quality of service should be included.

Another issue raised by Mr. Anderson concerned the point at which we begin cutting back the plan if there are insufficient funds. He cited factors such as volume of traffic, accidents or economic development impacts. He suggested a preamble to the "Policies" outline stating the goals to be accomplished and their basis.

Commissioner Hays expressed concern over what level the plan would be cut back because of insufficient funds. She also spoke of funding options being explored in Washington County by citizenry such as Local Improvement Districts and private-sector partnerships.

Following further discussion, no consensus was reached on Section I-A relating to "areas of policy agreement" pertaining to the RTP, so action was deferred on that segment.

It was agreed to insert the following after the first sentence of clause I-B: "Priorities in transportation improvement should be used to facilitate economic development."

Andy Cotugno suggested combining clauses I-A and B to emphasize the balance of development and livability, stressing what land use-oriented development we are trying to achieve.

On clause I-E of the outline, it was agreed to delete the word "suburban" preceding "growth centers and the rail corridors."

On clause I-F, it was agreed to insert the word "circumferential" preceding "state highway system..."

Lloyd Anderson felt the need to include an acknowledgement of existing development, and cited the airport as an example.

Mayor Brian felt that the proposed language stresses economic development as a by-product of expected growth. He spoke of the choices between emphasis on accommodating existing growth versus promotion of economic development.

Fred Hansen questioned what the priority commitment to Sunset LRT (clause I-D) meant in terms of dollars, schedules, etc. Also, the issue of whether it is practical to pursue more than one corridor at a time was discussed.

Ron Thom emphasized the need to include circumferential corridors in terms of setting a vision for our policy statement.

Commissioner Blumenauer expressed the need to identify responsibilities for projects by local jurisdiction or the state as they relate to resources. He suggested raising the point about the proper allocation conceptually to guide strategies (clause I-G). He felt that clauses I-H and I should perhaps be tied to the Public-Private Task Force for a solid foundation to accomplish things regionally.

Chairman Waker spoke of the need for some sort of regional revenue measures in terms of responsibility versus permissibility, the need to identify appropriately what our local responsibilities are -- those of the cities, counties and state -- and the need for flexibility (the example given being that 5 percent of the gas tax would be used for transit purposes).

With regard to clause I-J, Bob Post reported that it is tied to Tri-Met's resolution of claims, when they will go to court, and that it will probably fall in the range of \$10-12 million. Rick Kuehn indicated that the I-505 Alternative project is still a year from completion (also pertaining to clause I-J).

Given the restrictions on the resources, Lloyd Anderson stressed the importance of having all resources that are available listed to make certain we are getting the maximum use for transit purposes.

With regard to clause I-K, Andy reviewed the breakdown of fundamental choices on what the priorities should be for the highway funding options. Issues to be examined include how we should prioritize state funds, whether state funding should have an emphasis on regional corridors, whether there should be an Urban Arterial Fund and whether it should include ODOT arterials.

Bob Bothman, Director of ODOT, reported that the Interstate-4R funds' (concluded by a statewide study) needs are \$4.1 billion over the next 20 years while estimated revenue totals \$700 million, sufficient only to take care of the present highways. About 29 percent of the state total is allocated to this region.

The question was then raised -- if the regional corridors are functioning in one part of the state but not in others, where should the funds be prioritized? The need for a logical set of criteria was stressed.

Rick Kuehn, Region I Engineer of ODOT, also spoke of Interstate 4R use of funds for preservation needs.

Commissioner Hays questioned whether there would be a statewide policy or one in place just for the region if Option C of the Policy discussion paper were approved (pertaining to a joint transit/highway expansion program in the radial corridors). In response, Mike Hollern indicated that there is a comprehensive statewide policy and a state level of \$450 million of which \$300 million will be allocated to the basic Modernization Program (on top of the funds in the current Six-Year Program). Under the "Oregon Access" program, the state intends to focus on specific corridors of statewide significance accessing various parts of the state and tying into the Interstate system. Those targeted right now in the Metro area include the Sunrise Corridor and the I-5 to 99W segment of the Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor. Some of the other highways considered around the state include State Highways 28, 42 and 97. He indicated that there were not enough funds to fulfill the needs in all of the corridors. He stated that the funds would be placed within those corridors within the Six-Year Program process.

Ron Thom felt it was difficult to make any judgments between projects and corridors at this time until more information was provided, clarifying that the impacts of the two choices remains unclear.

Commissioner Blumenauer spoke of the need to be active on the national level in dealing with the Federal Government's approach for generation of resources. If the state resources are inadequate, he cautioned not to wait until a crisis arose. He felt the region's principles should be articulated to the Legislature and that all revenue sources should be identified. Commissioner Hays supported that position, emphasizing the need to identify gaps and move in a concerted regional effort to fill those gaps, whether regional or state. Issues to be discussed further include: what kinds of funds should not be pooled and what will be our funding revenue principles.

Lloyd Anderson proposed that user charges should be utilized to finance the transportation system and supported identification of available sources of revenue for both mass transit and highways.

Mike Hollern agreed that there was a need to identify all possible revenue sources; that the region must have a "vision" and that it must be understandable, achievable and salable; and that the funding problem needs to be solved regionally. He stressed the importance of a realistic program that would include the Westside LRT, the need to solve Tri-Met's operating problems, an effort to gain strong support from the business community, and the need to get the funding package to the voters. He indicated the state's emphasis on funding would be on regional corridors and the Interstate.

Commissioner Blumenauer emphasized the need to strike a balance between highways and transit in articulating what the region plans to

accomplish. He suggested an approach of political practicality, equity and technical judgment. He cited the need to work cooperatively with Tri-Met and to follow through with the Legislature over realistic expectations and clearly defined needs.

Andy Cotugno then reviewed the handout on Transit Funding Policy Options. In discussion on this, Linore Allison spoke of the need to incorporate transit into the overall transportation system and the fact that it offers a large part of the solution. She felt this was an opportunity to integrate transit and seek out funding sources that would make transit an integrated part of the funding package. A discussion followed on whether gas tax funds could be used for transit purposes.

On page 1 of the Transit Funding Policy Option paper, Loren Wyss requested that the word "operating" be deleted preceding the word "funds" on clause B-2. There was consensus on the proposed change.

Commissioner Anderson expressed support of Sunset LRT as the region's first priority while concurrently pursuing the I-205 corridor. While Commissioner Hays indicated she had statistics placing the Milwaukie Corridor's needs over I-205, Andy Cotugno noted that the choices are constrained because of the inability to advance the projects simultaneously with Section 3 funds and the opportunity to do something at the same time as the Westside LRT with available Interstate funding for I-205.

Loren Wyss suggested that our public commitment be toward a group of interconnected LRT corridors, with immediate emphasis on Sunset LRT and the Milwaukie LRT (depending on the timeframe) -- Option A-3 on the Transit Funding outline. He suggested that the prudent thing to do would be to pursue an entire LRT system, not just a single corridor.

Commissioner Blumenauer suggested dropping the Lake Oswego line because it is not competing for regional resources. Andy indicated it has a 20-year horizon.

In clarification, Andy Cotugno indicated that the 20-year vision includes I-5N, Barbur, Milwaukie, Sunset and I-205. The 10-year objectives include Sunset, Milwaukie and I-205.

Loren Wyss informed the Committee that the only LRT funds anticipated by Tri-Met are for the Westside light rail and noted that they have reservations regarding potential ridership in the timeframe of the I-205 LRT project.

Linore Allison suggested merging the transit and highway needs into a single paper.

Fred Hansen concurred with other JPACT members on the need to get more analysis from staff before choices are made.



Special JPACT Worksession  
October 12, 1987  
Page 6

Andy Cotugno noted that the emphasis on State Modernization projects should be on the regional corridors and that there is a need for an Urban Arterial Fund for city/county/state arterials.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Rena Cusma  
Dick Engstrom  
JPACT Members

## MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: September 28, 1987

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Richard Waker, Pauline Anderson, Lloyd Anderson, Marjorie Schmunk, Larry Cooper, Tom Brian, Linore Allison, George Van Bergen, Earl Blumenauer, Ed Lindquist, Bob Bothman, and Ron Thom

Executive Officer: Rena Cusma

Guests: Loren Wyss, Chairman, Tri-Met Board; Doug Capps, G.B. Arrington, Dick Feeney, Alonzo Wertz, Pamela Dunham and Lee Hames, Tri-Met; Mike Hollern, Denny Moore, Rick Kuehn and Ted Spence, ODOT; State Senator Bill Kennemer (District 12); Cherie McGinnis, Senator Kennemer's office; Gary Spanovich, Tom VanderZanden, and Dave Poesse, Clackamas County; Pat Levine, UMTA; Ray Polani and Doug Allen, Citizens for Better Transit; Bob Stacey, 1000 Friends of Oregon; Howard Harris, DEQ; Bruce Warner and Frank Angelo, Washington County; Rick Root, City of Beaverton; Larry Nicholas and Martin Winch, Multnomah County; Bebe Rucker and Dawn Pavitt, Port of Portland; Dave Evans, Citizen on TPAC; Mike McKillip, City of Tualatin; Wink Brooks, City of Hillsboro; Ramsay Weit, Multnomah County Commissioner Casterline's office; Jim Gardner, Metro Councilor; Dan Seeman, IRC of Clark County; Bernie Bottomly, Representative Les AuCoin's office; Richard Ross, Cities of Multnomah County; and Stephen Iwata and Grace Crunican, City of Portland

Staff: Andrew Cotugno, Richard Brandman, Keith Lawton, John Cullerton, Susan Hopkins, James Giesecking, Tim Collins, and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

MEDIA: Harry Bovine, The Oregonian and Robert Goldfield, Daily Journal of Commerce

### SUMMARY:

Chairman Waker opened the special JPACT worksession for an overview on the LRT policy issues.

Andy Cotugno reviewed the conclusions reached at the last JPACT meeting, indicating that there was good discussion on the need for a clear vision. He noted that this meeting was intended to provide background

information on the LRT corridors and that the issue of the "vision" would be taken up again at the next meeting. Input at the last meeting suggested that JPACT categorize those policies or issues of clear agreement and those subject to further discussion and consideration.

Andy emphasized the need to decide on whether to remain with the current policy direction for transit expansion or shift that direction to further highway expansion, to determine what future LRT is needed for implementation, and to establish what are the priorities and which corridors should be pursued. Information received at the meeting was intended to help make these decisions.

Andy then noted the advantages/disadvantages of LRT as specified in the LRT Policy Issue handout, and reviewed the potential criteria in selection of the corridors. He emphasized the issue at hand -- the decision of whether or not we should be "pursuing" LRT corridors (those which appear promising enough) as opposed to a decision on "building" LRT in the corridors. The latter would require further information on engineering, operating costs, a financial plan, economic development impacts, etc. Andy stressed the importance of making technical comparisons of the LRT corridors as well as policy judgments before any of the criteria is applied.

Richard Brandman reported that the sketch level analysis has been concluded and that each corridor was examined on an all-day basis and a peak corridor basis. All the figures are for the year 2005, noting that the same population/employment forecasts and methodologies were used in each corridor. He indicated that ridership forecasts do not reflect the Banfield Before-and-After Study, which will be completed this summer, with adjustments to be made following completion of that study.

Richard then provided an overview of LRT comparisons based on ridership for the year 2005, trunk ridership for the peak hour/peak load point, travel time savings to the Portland Central Business District, capital costs (which includes sketch engineering costs such as right-of-way, construction and vehicles) and trunk operating costs. The corridors examined included: the Westside, Milwaukie, I-5, I-205 North (airport to downtown), I-205 South (Clackamas Town Center to downtown), Barbur and Lake Oswego.

A map was displayed indicating the need for further highway expansion if the transit system were to remain status quo.

During discussion, Richard emphasized the fact that operating costs are tied to ridership demand. He stated that if you don't build LRT or you don't improve the bus system, you're going to have a lot of highway impacts. If you don't spend the money on LRT and you substantially improve the bus system to the same level of service as LRT, he indicated that the travel models suggest you would have about the same

JPACT

September 28, 1987

Page 3

level of highway congestion with an improved bus system as you would with an improved LRT system. However, this needs to be reanalyzed following the Banfield Before-and-After Study.

Mr. Brandman noted that the Regional Transportation Plan calls for a balanced growth between highways and transit.

A Synopsis of Financing Options for light rail was distributed at the meeting. It was prepared by the Strategic Planning Office of Tri-Met and focused on the sources of funds and techniques available to fund expansion of light rail in the region. Linore Allison stated that Tri-Met intends to make no service cuts while attempting to attract more riders. She emphasized the lack of capital and operating options for expansion, citing the need to obtain new sources of revenue. She discussed the possibility of forming partnerships or agreements to secure such funds.

Linore spoke of the success of MAX but indicated that Tri-Met could not fund and operate a new system unless there is a funding commitment from the region; the emphasis was on political support and cooperation from all the jurisdictions. She indicated past efforts for an income tax had failed and that mass transit is not allowed capital through the Gas Tax Fund.

Loren Wyss, Chairman of the Tri-Met Board, indicated that the primary federal source for transit capital is one cent of the federal gas tax. He spoke of the competition for such funds, which total \$1.5 billion annually. "Entry criteria" have been established by the Federal Government for use of UMTA Section 3 funds citing compliance with the following: a goal of 50 percent local match for 50 percent Section 3 funds for qualified projects and a cost-effectiveness index for worthiness of a project. Mr. Wyss also mentioned the fact that the Westside LRT rates well nationally; the requirement in the new Transportation Act stipulating that a project must show evidence of local financial commitment prior to federal approval of the Letter of Intent; that UMTA's rules only allow for one project per region at a time; and that private sector involvement is being encouraged by the Federal Government. A discussion followed on the issue of whether or not the Government would allow another LRT project to proceed prior to completion of the Westside LRT.

Mr. Wyss then reviewed the available federal sources that could be tapped to fund new rail projects; he cited: UMTA Section 3 Westside Letter of Intent; UMTA Section 9; FHWA Federal-Aid Urban; Interstate withdrawal funds; I-205 withdrawal busway funds; and UMTA demonstration grants. He then reviewed techniques and sources tapped by regions around the country. Some regions have imposed a sales tax, property tax or have an income tax in place (or all three).

JPACT

September 28, 1987

Page 4

Mr. Wyss stressed the need for a regional LRT Plan that would incorporate other regional projects as well. He suggested that resources be pooled by means of obtaining agreements from jurisdictions who have access to one-time only or formula funds for the purpose of committing some of those funds for securing local match. He emphasized the fact that the state implies this is a regional rather than a state problem and that a way should be found to fund projects regionally.

Commissioner Blumenauer indicated that this administration is very sympathetic to the needs of this region, that we have one of the two most successful rail projects in the country, and that we have a degree of regional consensus that has not occurred elsewhere. He appreciated the information received to date from Tri-Met and Metro on what the options are, noting that he did not feel the problems were insurmountable. He felt there was something for everybody in the region. He supported a regional rail system integrated with transportation improvements that are road-related, that it should be a joint effort and that rail be the dominant mode of transit.

An addendum handout, prepared by AASHTO, was distributed on excerpts taken from the 1986 Survey of State Involvement in Public Transportation. An additional handout, relating to two hypothetical funding scenarios for Westside and I-205 LRT, was also distributed and reviewed by Andy Cotugno.

Commissioner Lindquist supported the City of Portland's position in support of rail because he felt it was cheaper and a better system. He expressed agreement to pooling of funds in a joint effort. He added his appreciation for the process JPACT was going through in setting these priorities and expressed enthusiasm over a regional effort.

Oregon City Councilor Ron Thom expressed a commitment from the cities of Clackamas County toward a regional pooling of funds and being supportive of Tri-Met's need for operating funds. The need to secure long-term funding for Tri-Met's operating costs is evident in view of the support expressed to expand the current rail system.

Commissioner Pauline Anderson expressed appreciation for the presentations made at the workshops, commenting on Multnomah County's strong commitment to rail. She indicated further that regional pooling of funds is essential to a regional approach. Multnomah County is supportive of a combination of rail and highway expansion. She was hopeful that not only could they plan for the long-range projects but that short-term projects would be considered as well in terms of importance to the community.

Mayor Tom Brian concurred that the cities of Washington County and Washington County are both supportive of joint transit/highway development. He indicated that, over the past year, Washington County has shown a strong and increased commitment to LRT; he felt it appropriate

to pursue more than one corridor at once. He cautioned the group not to delay the more complex, expensive project because of the expediency of a short-term project.

Bob Bothman, Director of ODOT, pointed out the importance of a reasonable, overall highway and transit plan that can be worked on together. He indicated that a package similar to one developed 10 years ago is needed now to set direction, one that provides a list of projects within a given timeframe.

Port Director Lloyd Anderson supported Bob Bothman's comments. In agreeing to the concept of a joint highway/transit plan, he stressed the need for standards of performance (level of service) to be discussed, standards that would be acceptable to the people in this community and that are relevant to the transportation system. He also pointed out the need to establish what can be accomplished within the legal constraints of the jurisdictions and what are our federal legal constraints. There may be more flexibility for LRT and bus but more legal constraints at the state level. He suggested a least cost approach, determining how we can get the whole system done with the least cost to the community -- working federal funds to our advantage.

Metro Councilor George Van Bergen expressed appreciation for the presentations made and information provided JPACT. He was appreciative of the process that established JPACT because of the importance of having a regionwide consensus.

Tri-Met representative Linore Allison expressed concern that the standards of performance should reflect criteria that links the region environmentally and with economic development.

Ray Polani, citizen, spoke on the need for input from the community. He stressed the importance of a vision for the Portland region, the need for more citizen involvement, and the limitation of funding resources. He felt that LRT should be looked at as an alternative to highway expansion, noting that people want growth but are concerned over the kind of expansion. He indicated they want a more orderly, economically benign growth.

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Rena Cusma  
Dick Engstrom  
JPACT Members

## MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: September 14, 1987

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Richard Waker, Majorie Schmunk, Pauline Anderson, Earl Blumenauer, Tom Brian, Bonnie Hays, Larry Cooper, Bob Bothman, Lloyd Anderson, Ron Thom, Ed Lindquist and Linore Allison

Executive Officer: Rena Cusma

Guests: Loren Wyss, Chairman, Tri-Met Board; Nancy Ponzi, Citizen; Merrie Buel, Congressman Ron Wyden's staff; Marge Kafoury, Grace Crunican, Vic Rhodes and Steve Dotterer, City of Portland; Mike McKillip, City of Tualatin; Rick Root, City of Beaverton; Ramsay Weit, Multnomah County Commissioner Casterline's staff; Tom Griffith, City of Gresham; Richard N. Ross, Cities of Multnomah County; Wink Brooks, Cities of Washington County; R. Scott Pemble and Larry Nicholas, Multnomah County; Bruce Warner, Jerry Parmenter and Frank Angelo, Washington County; and Dick Feeney, Doug Capps, Bob Post, Lee Hames and G.B. Arrington, Tri-Met

Staff: Andrew Cotugno, Cathy Thomas, James Giesecking, Richard Brandman and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

MEDIA: Robert Goldfield, Daily Journal of Commerce; and Harry Bodine, The Oregonian

### SUMMARY:

Executive Officer Rena Cusma opened the special JPACT meeting by welcoming everyone to what she termed the "crossroads of the region." She emphasized the need for this group to identify the focus and priorities of the region for the next decade.

Chairman Waker explained that this get-together was the first of a series of four scheduled meetings to establish a common base for the region in setting funding priorities and developing new resources. The following meetings have been scheduled: Monday, September 28, at 3:00 p.m.; Monday, October 12, at 3:00 p.m. and Monday, October 26, at 3:00 p.m.

Handouts were distributed pertaining to the agendas for each meeting, an overview of the Regional Transportation Plan, and one containing technical information relating to the RTP overview (data on population and employment, transit and highway costs, and highway improvement costs and revenues).

JPACT

September 14, 1987

Page 2

Andy Cotugno then reviewed the suggested outline on "Policy Decisions" for the JPACT work sessions, emphasizing the need for flexibility in our plans for the next 20 years. He pointed out that the Recommended 2005 RTP Highway System map depicted the current status of all the highway improvements in the region. Another map displayed depicted future branches and extensions of the regional light-rail core system.

Andy proceeded to review the existing federal funding sources listed on Exhibit A and the matrix outlining eligibility of projects for funding. He noted that all of the projects over the next 20 years are underfunded, representing a 25 percent gap in funding.

All capital costs for transit, including fleet expansion, plus LRT corridor expansions represent a \$250 million shortfall.

Questions raised during discussion related to the terminology of the word "TSM" and whether UMTA funding was actually at 80/20. In response, Andy stated that TSM indicated Transportation Systems Management improvements and provided examples for clarification. He also responded that UMTA funding was closer to 75/25.

Bonnie Hays, Chairman of the County Commissioners for Washington County, spoke on behalf of Washington County and the cities of Washington County. She emphasized the following:

- . That transportation investments have not kept pace with land use development
- . That transportation resources be directed to solve transportation problems and that a commitment be made in that regard
- . That Washington County will continue to support the downtown because of its importance to the region's economy
- . That any policy that is adopted reflect past land use decisions
- . That transit and highway improvements in the Sunset Highway Corridor System be recognized as a high priority
- . That the southern section of the Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor (between I-5 and 99W) be recognized as a priority, and that JPACT authorize Interstate Transfer Reserve funds for PE on that segment of the Bypass
- . That the urban arterial system be upgraded
- . That the present level of transit service in Washington County is unacceptable and that the business community is exploring other options



- . That the regional process recognize local funding initiatives
- . Acknowledge that suburban travel is of regional significance

Pauline Anderson, Multnomah County Commissioner, spoke on behalf of Multnomah County and the cities of Multnomah County. She spoke of Multnomah County's objectives as the following:

- . To provide for the existing community by relieving the existing traffic congestion
- . To facilitate growth and development in East County
- . To enhance its role as gateway to the major recreation areas in the state

Commissioner Anderson also stressed the need for a strong transportation system.

Commission Chairman Ed Lindquist, on behalf of Clackamas County, informed the Committee of the following regional priorities:

- . That an Urban Arterial Program be established
- . That suburban travel problems are of regional significance
- . That the Sunrise Corridor and its link with the region is a No. 1 highway priority
- . That I-205 LRT is the No. 1 transit priority for the County
- . That I-205 and I-5 interchanges be refurbished
- . That the McLoughlin light-rail project is a regional priority

Commissioner Earl Blumenauer, City of Portland, commented on the importance of the central city to the rest of the region. He indicated that Portland's first priority would be the Sunset Corridor, and is supportive of all of Tri-Met's priorities. Also noted was the interest in pursuing options of the I-205 freeway.

Commissioner Blumenauer noted significant employment growth in the City of Portland, commenting on the importance of transit expansion, transportation improvements needed for suburban development and the need for a functional radial system to be supportive of a strong downtown. Regarding MAX, he spoke of its impact on development in areas such as the Hollywood district and the Lloyd Center.

Bob Bothman, Director of the Oregon Department of Transportation, stated that he was very impressed with the local government presentations in that their concerns involved land use considerations -- not

JPACT

September 14, 1987

Page 4

just highway improvements. He commented that our radial system, focusing on the central system, is the best in the nation. The central loop encompasses the Central Business District.

Mr. Bothman indicated that the state's No. 1 priority is the Sunset Corridor with focus on a radial system to serve the downtown and a "doughnut" system to serve the suburban area. The state's emphasis is on connections from the state system into and through the Portland region.

On the finance side, he spoke of a \$21 billion statewide shortfall, \$6 billion of which is from backlog. He indicated that we could only meet 40 percent of our requirements over the next 20 years. He acknowledged that establishing priorities for the funds would be a difficult process. Funds are also needed for maintenance and operations, preservation (noting the fact that the transportation system is beginning to wear out and the program will have to be reduced), and there is need to develop a substantial Modernization Program. He stated that the Oregon Transportation Commission plans to commit \$300 million toward Modernization improvements.

From the state's perspective, corridors are a high priority -- with the Sunset Corridor No. 1 (he indicated that the radial corridors were important for a strong downtown and corridors connecting from the rest of the state into the region are important to the whole state); arterials rank second in importance; local roads are third; and transit is considered important as it relates to the corridors.

Loren Wyss, Chairman of the Tri-Met Board, informed the Committee that Tri-Met's highest priority has been an attempt to make expenses meet their income while maintaining a stable transit system. He reported that for the first time in eight years, they came in under budget. He indicated that, without expanding further service, Tri-Met can only plan on continuing its current service. He noted that the Board has made unsuccessful attempts to secure other revenue sources from the taxpayers and the Legislature. Factors cited for Tri-Met's constraints included the price of parts and equipment, price of diesel oil and union labor contracts. He indicated that efforts to provide operating income with an LRT corridor would result in it being considered a higher priority.

Mr. Wyss spoke of the success of MAX, some of the operating expenses that are incurred with an increase of new equipment and LRT lines, and new bus services they would like to implement. He noted that the annual cost to operate the Westside LRT project would be about \$7 million.

Linore Allison commented on UMTA's reluctance to release funds on the Sunset LRT until local funding options are secured. She spoke of the need to develop public and private partnerships to address capital and operating costs.

JPACT

September 14, 1987

Page 5

Mr. Wyss indicated that getting UMTA funds released would not assure that the Westside LRT could be provided -- unless operating income could be secured.

Lloyd Anderson, Executive Director of the Port of Portland, stressed the need to recognize aviation and marine transportation as part of the transportation system. He emphasized the importance of a warehousing and distribution center for electronic parts as critical to the region's survival. He felt that efforts to develop a transportation system in the metropolitan area have ignored the need to move goods through the region during off-peak hours in an expeditious fashion. He emphasized the fact that half the revenue obtained in the state comes from trucks. He felt that the region's philosophy should be that the user pays for the transportation system, adding that property taxes are inappropriate. He suggested that some of the funds from gas tax and truck license fees be diverted for mass transit use. He noted the Port's willingness to bring LRT within 30 feet of the airport's baggage area. In addition, he stressed the need for a comprehensive transportation system.

A discussion followed on the need for JPACT to create a "vision" for the region reflecting decisions already made, the commitment to Westside light rail as the No. 1 priority in the region, development of resources, and agreement on a balance between highway and transit.

Issues to be reached on LRT corridors include the need for comparative information on all corridors, how to decide which corridors to pursue -- which are the important ones, and an introduction to what our federal funding possibilities are. Interest was expressed in knowing what other states are doing. Criteria to be considered should be submitted to Andy Cotugno at the next meeting (September 28) for incorporation into the materials for the third JPACT worksession. Bob Bothman emphasized the need to define the link between the modal split of highways and transit first. The cost/benefit ratio for modal split was suggested.

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Rena Cusma  
Dick Engstrom  
JPACT Members

## MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: September 10, 1987

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Richard Waker, Earl Blumenauer, Marjorie Schmunk, Loren Wyss, Lloyd Anderson, Pauline Anderson, Bob Bothman, Tom Brian, Larry Cooper, Ed Ferguson, Tom Bispham, Roy Rogers (alt.), Ed Lindquist, Ron Thom, George Van Bergen, Vern Veysey

Executive Officer: Rena Cusma

Guests: Gary Spanovich, Clackamas County; Richard Ross and Susie Lahsene, Multnomah County; Peter Fry, CEIC; Steve Dotterrer, Grace Crunican, and Felicia Trader, City of Portland; Howard Harris, DEQ; Bebe Rucker, Port of Portland; Denny Moore, Ted Spence, and Ed Immel, ODOT; Doug Capps, Lee Hames, and Bob Post, Tri-Met; and Frank Angelo, Washington County

Staff: Andrew Cotugno, Richard Brandman, Karen Thackston and Kathleen Elliott, Temp. Secretary

MEDIA: None

### OPENING:

Richard Waker opened the meeting with introductions of Loren Wyss, President, Tri-Met Board; Roy Rogers, Washington County Commissioner, sitting in for Bonnie Hays; and Kathleen Elliott, Temp. Recording Secretary. Richard also reminded the group of the special series of meetings starting Monday, September 14, at 3:00 pm and distributed information on parking locations.

### AMENDING FY88 UWP TO INCLUDE IMPLEMENTATION OF A PUBLIC/PRIVATE TASK FORCE ON THE FUTURE OF TRANSIT FINANCE

Andy Cotugno introduced the Resolution to amend the FY88 Unified Work Program. The proposal was originally submitted by City of Portland, but also reflects amendments made by TPAC to ensure the Task Force reports to JPACT and to ensure there will be regional involvement in the process.

Commissioner Blumenauer felt that the changes TPAC made are consistent with Portland's intent regarding coordination with the jurisdictions and involvement of the Metro staff. However, the Commissioner requested that Portland be designated the lead agency for the study. Mayor Tom Brian questioned how the small cities would be represented on the Task Force. Commissioner Blumenauer responded that due to the size of the committee it was preferable that additional members not be added and that the cities would be adequately represented through the counties and through periodic reports to JPACT.

JPACT

September 10, 1987

Page 2

Commissioner Rogers stated that he supported Portland being the lead agency but asked why the City of Portland would be making all the Task Force appointments. Commissioner Blumenauer responded that it was Portland's intent to consult with all the jurisdictions.

Motion made to amend the Resolution:

Councillor Van Bergen moved to amend the Resolution to include an additional "Resolve":

"The grant applicant is Metro with pass-through to Portland as the lead agency. Portland will convene the Task Force and will appoint committee members in consultation with County Commissioners, Metro, Port of Portland, ODOT and Tri-Met. The committee will select a chair."

Commissioner Thom seconded the motion.

Ed Ferguson requested representation from Clark County be included. Councillor Van Bergen and Commissioner Thom accepted an additional item in their amendment to include representation from CTRAN.

Action Taken: The amendment to the resolution was approved unanimously.

Motion made to adopt Resolution: The full Resolution was approved unanimously, as amended.

#### STATUS REPORT ON JEFFERSON STREET RAILROAD CORRIDOR

Richard Brandman presented a status report on Jefferson Street right-of-way acquisition. Richard indicated Metro has completed the LRT feasibility study, which considers a trolley option at \$35m and an LRT option at \$105m. The report is now under review by the Technical Advisory Committee and is expected to be reviewed by the Policy Committee in early October. Another review of the conclusions will be presented to JPACT after the recommendations from the Policy Committee. Richard also announced that excursion trolley service would begin this weekend. Commissioner Blumenauer distributed a flier announcing schedule and fares.

#### HB 2112 - REFERRAL & OTC DISCUSSION

Andy Cotugno reviewed the Referendum now being circulated for the State Gas Tax Increase. Deadline for signatures is September 25. If there are sufficient signatures, it would be suspended until after the vote.

Andy reviewed loss of revenue figures that would result from a successful referral or defeat of the tax or defeat of the tax measure.

OREGON TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Andy presented information on the Oregon Transportation Commission regarding how to spend the funds that would result from the Gas Tax Increase for the State Highway Department. The choices include: (Cost estimates for next ten years.)

1. Operations and Maintenance.....\$180 m
2. Preservation.....\$160 m
3. Modernization.....\$150 m - \$300 m

The OTC needs to refund these levels because of insufficient funds during the ten year period. Bob Bothman told the Committee that the OTC will likely select the \$300m Modernization Program and therefore, would have to return to the 1989 Legislature to deal with how to fund the effects of inflation on the State Maintenance Program. Bob also indicated that the Commission is considering a \$5m per year "Opportunity Fund" to be able to respond to short term economic development proposals. He told JPACT that the OTC would be finalizing these issues within the next several weeks.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Kathleen Elliott

COPIES TO: Rena Cusma  
Dick Engstom  
JPACT Members

## MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: August 13, 1987

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Richard Waker, Larry Cole (alt.), Linore Allison, Bob Bothman, George Van Bergen, Marjorie Schmunk, Tom Bispham (alt.), Ed Lindquist, Larry Cooper, Bonnie Hays, Pauline Anderson, Lloyd Anderson and Earl Blumenauer

Guests: Ted Spence, Paul Mather and Rick Kuehn, ODOT; Scott Pemble and Susie Lahsene, Multnomah County; Blanche Schroeder, Portland Chamber of Commerce; Cynthia Weston, Tri-Met; Steve Dotterer, City of Portland; Richard Ross, Cities of Multnomah County; Bruce Warner, Washington County; Winston Kurth, Clackamas County; Fred Patron, FHWA; Gilbert Mallery, IRC of Clark County; Bebe Rucker, Port of Portland; and Peter Fry, Central Eastside Industrial Council

Staff: Andrew Cotugno, Richard Brandman, Bill Pettis, Bob Hart, Karen Thackston and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

MEDIA: None

### SUMMARY:

#### MEETING REPORT OF JULY 9, 1987

The meeting report of the July 9 JPACT meeting was approved as written.

#### ADOPTING THE FY 1988 TO POST 1991 TIP AND FY 1988 ANNUAL ELEMENT

Andy Cotugno noted that this annual update reflects past actions on funding allocations and includes a full Section 9 Program (although overprogrammed) based on Tri-Met's proposed capital improvement program for a five-year period. Also included in the material is a policy on privatization. The TIP is updated each year to comply with federal requirements.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval of Resolution No. 87-798, adopting the FY 1988 to post 1991 Transportation Improvement Program and the FY 1988 Annual Element. Motion CARRIED unanimously.

#### FOLLOW-UP ON I-205 BUSLANE TRANSFER PROCEDURES

Richard Brandman reviewed the process for withdrawing the I-205 busway, substituting a rail project, and securing the \$17 million for the I-205 corridor through FHWA. The two requirements are that the I-205 busway be withdrawn and that construction commence by September 30, 1989.

The process for withdrawal starts with a letter from the Governor and resolutions in support of the request from the affected jurisdictions. Richard noted that it is a three-month process to withdraw the busway and another three months to get into the alternatives analysis. He also stated it is important to withdraw only those sections that are planned for rail purposes.

Richard then reviewed the UMTA process for receipt of Section 3 Discretionary funds. In its rules, a system plan must first be completed. Then an analysis of potential cost-effectiveness must be performed.

Andy Cotugno indicated that, if supplemental funds are sought, the extra procedures through UMTA are cumbersome. Also, the question of pursuing funds for this corridor or the Sunset Corridor and the issue of transportation was raised. The \$17 million is currently dedicated for busway; once withdrawn, it will be substituted for light rail in that corridor. Ted Spence commented that it was his understanding that the funds could also be used for other Interstate 4R highway purposes.

This was presented for informational purposes only.

#### STATUS OF EAST MULTNOMAH COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Andy Cotugno noted that both the East Multnomah County Transportation Plan update and the state's Highway 224/212 Reconnaissance study are nearing completion, and that information is now available.

Scott Pemble presented an overview of the East Multnomah County Master Transportation Plan update. Objectives of the study are: 1) to determine improvements needed for a street system (arterials and collectors) that will meet 2005 forecasted travel demands; and 2) to identify a primary corridor alignment that will provide a safe and efficient travel connection between I-84 and U.S. 26. He indicated that the arterial system throughout the East County area was being re-evaluated, and then reviewed the primary corridor alternatives. A total of 34 alternatives are being considered.

Schedule for the process includes selection of the primary corridor alignment by October 5 followed by a public approval process, with consensus reached by the end of December.

Chairman Waker thanked Mr. Pemble for his presentation.

#### STATUS OF SOUTHEAST CORRIDOR STUDY

Bob Hart reviewed the Scope of Work for the Southeast Corridor Study, citing the two major issues: identification of the Johnson Creek area corridor east-west traffic problems and Willamette River Bridge impacts. He indicated some preliminary traffic analysis has taken



place for minimum and maximum improvements. The study will be coordinated with the state's efforts for improvements in the Highway 224/212 corridor.

Bob reported that a Citizens Advisory Committee is now being formed and that letters requesting appointments were sent to Clackamas County, City of Milwaukie, and City of Portland. The Citizens Committee will help provide input throughout the course of the study. Participants will be from the area between Holgate and Monroe and McLoughlin and 82nd Avenue on the east and west. A compromise needs to be worked out, but it is not anticipated that there will be a Policy Advisory Committee.

#### STATUS OF ODOT HIGHWAY 224/212 RECONNAISSANCE

Paul Mather, Highway Engineer with Region I of ODOT, reported that the engineering for the reconnaissance study is completed for improvements for the Clackamas (Highway 224) and Clackamas-Boring (Highway 212) highways. The range of alternatives covered a high of \$215 million and a low option of \$100 million. Mr. Mather indicated that a complete report would be available in September.

Chairman Waker thanked Mr. Mather for his presentation.

#### STATUS OF ODOT BIKE FUNDING

Chairman Waker reported that historically the region has gone through a selection process, which has been followed by the Highway Division, for ranking of routes eligible for bike funds. In the recent Priority 3 funding process, the Division of Highways has selected projects other than the ones prioritized by the region's Bicycle Advisory Committee. He expressed concerns over whether or not the regional process would continue to function, whether the Advisory Committee was notified of any rule changes on bike funds, whether any other part of the state was impacted by changes in the allocation formula, and whether the Six-Year Program update was going to be handled in the same manner.

Chairman Waker indicated that three or four years ago, when the Bike Plan was updated, the Oregon Transportation Commission changed its policy to allow use of Priority 3 bike funds on or parallel to state highway rights-of-way, and a cooperative planning process was developed.

Richard Brandman explained that ODOT and the regional Bicycle Funding Group had previously defined the Westside Bicycle Corridor as their priority. The Bike Coordinator for ODOT recommended, however, that some projects not be funded, that other projects be funded at a 50 percent level, and that the regional allotment for Priority 3 bike funds be reduced from \$300,000 to \$200,000. The state's recommendation focused funds on the Oregon coastal route. At issue is why the region's bike funds would be decreased at a time revenues are increasing.

JPACT

August 13, 1987

Page 4

It was suggested that Mr. Unrein be invited to the next TPAC meeting to resolve the issue.

Bob Bothman indicated that the OTC has not changed any of its policies regarding Priority 3 bike funds and did not understand where the conflict was coming from. He noted that they are governed by the State Advisory Committee. He indicated further that they would welcome an opportunity for the region to make its case before the Advisory Committee.

Lloyd Anderson questioned what criteria was being used to determine where the funds would be allocated.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Rena Cusma  
Dick Engstrom  
JPACT Members

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 87-823 FOR THE  
PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT  
PROGRAM TO INCLUDE A PROJECT FOR THE REGION'S  
NON-URBANIZED AREA PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

---

Date: November 3, 1987

Presented by: Andrew Cotugno

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

Proposed Action

Recommend Council adoption of the attached Resolution which authorizes \$368,800 of Section 18 funds for the purchase of capital equipment to support public transportation service outside the urbanized area.

The project will be used for rural service improvements consistent with regional policies and objectives.

TPAC has reviewed this TIP amendment and recommends approval of Resolution No. 87-823.

Background

Section 18 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended, provides operating and capital assistance funds for the establishment and maintenance of transit programs for areas that are not in urbanized areas (i.e., areas of less than 50,000 population). The federal matching shares for these areas correspond to those in the larger cities: 50 percent for operating and 80 percent for capital assistance projects.

This is a formula grant program under which funds are apportioned to the State based on non-urbanized area population with eligible recipients including public bodies, nonprofit organizations and operators of services. Private providers of service are eligible through purchase of service agreements with a local public body for the provision of public transportation services.

Tri-Met intends to purchase equipment (Attachment A), which will be used by Tri-Met and subcontractors to provide service in the rural areas of Multnomah, Washington and Clackamas Counties. The equipment will be owned by Tri-Met and, therefore, it will be possible to transfer it (except for the standard buses) to whichever operator is the prime contractor for the coordinated special transportation service.

The acquisition of the two standard buses will replace old equipment and is not expected to increase service. They will be assigned to existing fixed routes and be operated by Tri-Met drivers. One computer is for the exclusive use of Tri-Met.

The purchase of the three small buses will increase service, with their operation being performed by subcontractors. Two computers will be used by the service providers for the purpose of improving the quality of management information currently available to them.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends approval of Resolution No. 87-823.

AC/sm  
8431C/517  
11/03/87

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE  
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE	)	RESOLUTION NO. 87-823
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT	)	
PROGRAM TO INCLUDE A PROJECT FOR	)	Introduced by the Joint
THE REGION'S NON-URBANIZED AREA	)	Policy Advisory Committee
PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM	)	on Transportation

WHEREAS, Section 18 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended, provides capital assistance and operating funds for the establishment and maintenance of transit programs for non-urbanized areas; and

WHEREAS, Funds are apportioned to the State based on non-urbanized area population; and

WHEREAS, The Public Transit Division of the Oregon Department of Transportation is authorized to make grants for public transportation services outside of major urbanized areas; and

WHEREAS, Tri-Met wishes to file a capital grant under Section 18 to fund equipment for the non-urbanized area; and

WHEREAS, The equipment will be used for rural service improvements consistent with regional policies and objectives; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That federal funds be authorized in the amount noted in Attachment A.

2. That the Transportation Improvement Program and its Annual Element be amended to reflect the authorization set forth in the attachment.

3. That the Council of the Metropolitan Service District finds the project to be in accordance with the region's continuing, cooperative, comprehensive planning process and, hereby, gives affirmative Intergovernmental Project Review approval.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District  
this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 1987.

Richard Waker, Presiding Officer

AC/sm  
8431C/517  
11/03/87

ATTACHMENT A  
PROJECT BUDGET

1.	Two (2) standard buses with lifts and radios	\$320,000
2.	Three (3) small buses with lifts and radios	120,000
3.	Three (3) computers	<u>21,000</u>
	TOTAL REQUEST	\$461,000

Section 18 Funds (80 percent)	\$368,800
State Share (20 percent)	<u>92,200</u>

TOTAL \$461,000

8431C/517

## JPACT TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES AND STRATEGIES

The purpose of this paper is to define the transportation program that is of greatest priority to the Portland metropolitan area. This program is vital to the long-term well-being of the entire metropolitan area and it is through the commitment of the jurisdictions throughout the region that it will be possible to implement this program. The priorities defined here are intended to be those actions that are of common interest to all of the jurisdictions and are the priority for use of any federal, state or regional funding that is allocated or recommended by the region as a whole.

This program is not intended to be sufficiently comprehensive to address all transportation actions that are strictly of local interest. Nor is it intended to prescribe which local improvements will be implemented or how local or private funding will be spent.

- I. The transportation objectives of the region include a long-range vision and a 10-year step toward the vision, as follows:
  - A. The long-range vision for the region is to develop the transportation system to facilitate and promote economic development while preserving and improving the region's livability (see Attachment A).
  - B. The 10-year goal for regional transportation investment is the next step toward the long-range vision and is as follows:
    1. 10-year regional highway corridor priorities (not in priority order)
      - a. Sunset Highway (in conjunction with LRT)
      - b. I-5/I-84 to Fremont Bridge - Phases I and II
      - c. Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor - Phase I
      - d. Sunrise Corridor - Phase I
      - e. I-84/181st to U.S. 26 Connector
      - f. I-84/U.S. 26 Connector - through Gresham - Phase I
      - g. Highway 217 - Phase I
      - h. I-5/Highway 217
      - i. I-5/I-405 loop reconnaissance
      - j. Various regional corridor interchange improvements
    2. Regional transit corridors
      - a. Sunset LRT -- initiate PE on No. 1 regional priority; pursue UMTA Section 3 Discretionary funding.
      - b. I-205 LRT -- initiate PE concurrent with Sunset LRT without Section 3 Discretionary funds.



- c. Milwaukie LRT -- initiate PE as soon as allowable; next priority after Sunset LRT for UMTA Section 3 Discretionary.
    - d. Acquire or protect rights-of-way necessary for long-range transitway development.
  - 3. Urban Arterials -- fund city/county/state arterial improvements needed to correct transportation deficiencies expected in the next 10 years.
  - 4. Transit Service -- fully fund the capital requirements of the TDP in order to ensure existing service can be maintained -- and -- begin implementation of transit service expansion called for in the RTP to include increased operating funds for extension of service into growth areas and LRT operations; implement required capital improvements to support service expansion, including bus replacement and expansion, needed transit stations, park-and-ride lots, traffic operations improvements, the north mall extension and passenger transfer improvements.
- II. To implement the 10-year program, priorities must be established to guide specific funding decisions, now and during the course of the 10-year period. Criteria for setting these priorities will be as follows:
  - A. Criteria for ranking projects:
    - 1. Improvements that correct severe existing traffic problems will have first priority.
    - 2. Improvements that correct traffic congestion problems anticipated in the next 10 years and improvements that correct access capacity deficiencies that constrain 10-year development areas will have next priority.
  - B. In order to minimize costs, regional corridor improvements to be implemented will give priority consideration to actions to reduce costs through increased people-moving capacity obtained by transit, regional and corridor ride-share programs and low-cost management techniques such as ramp metering, signal improvements, access control and high-occupancy vehicle lanes.
  - C. Large projects should be broken into manageable parts so that the most critical part is prioritized for construction.
  - D. Consideration should be given to the region "reserving" a portion of available funds in order to be able to quickly respond to economic development opportunities.

III. The strategies for implementing the 10-year program will include the following:

A. Establish federal strategies for implementing the 10-year goal, to include the following:

1. ODOT should seek annual funding reallocations to advance Metro area projects.
2. UMTA Discretionary funding will be sought for the Sunset LRT; for Milwaukie LRT thereafter.
3. Identify key highway improvements for Congressional Discretionary funding.
4. Pursue reauthorization of the Surface Transportation Act to increase funding for urban highways and transit.
5. Seek FAA funding for I-205 LRT.
6. Withdraw the I-205 bus lanes for LRT.

B. Establish state strategies for implementing the 10-year goal, to include the following:

1. ODOT Six-Year Highway Improvement Program:
  - a. Prioritize Interstate Improvements.
  - b. Prioritize State Modernization Improvements.
2. Continue to pursue state legislation to increase the state Highway Trust Fund to meet state and local needs and inflation.
3. Define the state interest and role in urban arterial financing and pursue state legislation, as needed, to establish an Urban Arterial Program, including consideration of a statewide Urban Arterial Program, regional vehicle registration fee authority and/or regional gas tax authority.
4. Define the state interest and role in transit finance.
  - a. Continue partial state match on routine transit capital.
  - b. Continue funding for Special Needs Transportation; consider an increase in cigarette tax.
  - c. Continue state in lieu of payroll tax.
  - d. Consider state funding for regional corridor (i.e., Sunset LRT, Milwaukie LRT, I-205 LRT) capital and operating costs.

5. Consider changes in Tri-Met taxing authority to increase transit funding, such as the proposed payroll/wage tax and/or payroll tax on local government.

C. Establish regional strategies for implementing the 10-year goal, to include the following:

1. Establish an Urban Arterial Fund for:

- a. city/county arterials;
- b. ODOT improvements;
- c. determine whether to include ODOT regional corridors or ODOT arterials as part of the Urban Arterial Fund; adjust priorities for ODOT Six-Year Highway Improvement Program funding in accordance with results; and
- d. Consider bonding to accelerate needed improvements.

2. Pursue regional transit capital funding for LRT.

3. Pursue regional transit funding for LRT operations and service expansion before beginning implementation of LRT facilities and/or service expansion.

4. Allocate Interstate Transfer funds.

5. Allocate FAU funds; establish a strategy for future FAU allocation.

6. Allocate Section 3 Trade funds.

7. Allocate excess Banfield LRT funding.

D. Establish private funding strategies for implementing the 10-year goal, to include the following:

1. Continue pursuing private mechanisms for road improvements.
2. Pursue private mechanisms for transit capital and operations.

IV. Follow-up activities to implement these recommendations are as follows:

A. Develop a staff recommendation for JPACT consideration for the allocation of Interstate Transfer, Federal-Aid Urban and UMTA Section 3 funds.

1. Responsibility: Metro -- TIP Subcommittee.

2. Schedule: Draft recommendation for consideration by December 10 JPACT meeting.
  3. Product: Resolution itemizing allocation of funds.
- B. Develop a staff recommendation for JPACT consideration on the region's priorities for funding from the next ODOT Six-Year Highway Improvement Program update.
1. Responsibility: Metro -- TIP Subcommittee.
  2. Schedule: Draft recommendation for consideration by January 14 JPACT meeting to enable presentation of conclusion to ODOT public hearing in February.
  3. Product: Resolution itemizing priorities for ODOT's consideration.
- C. Develop a recommended funding level, purpose and mechanism for an Urban Arterial Program; establish legislative actions necessary to implement the program.
1. Responsibility: JPACT Subcommittee
  2. Schedule: Develop a recommended program for consideration by JPACT in June 1988.
  3. Product: Resolution defining program and required legislative actions.
- D. Develop a public-private program to implement the capital and operating costs of recommended transit improvements.
1. Responsibility: JPACT Public-Private Task Force on Transit Finance.
  2. Schedule: Develop a recommended program for consideration by JPACT in June 1988.
  3. Product: Resolution defining federal, state, regional, local and private actions necessary to fund transit capital and operating costs.
- E. Define a regional recommendation for Congressionally earmarked transportation funds.
1. Responsibility: TIP Subcommittee in cooperation with Congressional Delegation staff.
  2. Schedule: After adoption of ODOT Six-Year Highway Improvement Program in July 1988.
  3. Product: Resolution itemizing project priorities.

- F. Initiate preliminary engineering (PE) on Sunset LRT.
1. Responsibility: Tri-Met
  2. Schedule: Initiate as soon as possible; conclude in 18 months.
  3. Product: Preliminary plan, costs, environmental impacts and financing plan for capital and operating costs.
- G. Withdraw I-205 bus lanes; initiate PE on I-205 LRT.
1. Responsibility: Metro staff -- draft resolutions to initiate bus lane withdrawal; JPACT, Portland, and Multnomah County -- adopt resolutions requesting bus lane withdrawal; Tri-Met implement PE; seek local match from Emergency Board.
  2. Schedule: Initiate as soon as possible; conclude in 18 months.
  3. Product: Preliminary plans, costs, environmental impacts and financing plan for capital and operating costs.
- H. Define the transit ridership market in the suburbs; determine the most cost-effective service plan for serving the market.
1. Responsibility: Metro staff -- market analysis; Tri-Met staff -- service design.
  2. Schedule: Initiate in February 1988; preliminary conclusions in April 1988; final conclusions in December 1988.
  3. Product: Preliminary product -- define the range of cost for providing suburban transit service for consideration by the Public-Private Task Force on Transit Finance; final product -- suburban service design for inclusion in the 20-Year RTP and five-year TDP (initial plan will focus on Washington County, then be expanded regionwide).
- I. Adopt the update to the Regional Transportation Plan.
1. Responsibility: Metro staff.
  2. Schedule: Draft RTP for review by January 1988.
  3. Product: Ordinance and update document incorporating these JPACT priorities.

## ATTACHMENT A

### REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN -- VISION


- I. Encourage and facilitate economic growth of the Portland region  
Economic growth of the region is necessary for the viability of the region and state. Investment in transportation improvements is needed to both promote and facilitate development. Local comprehensive plans are in place providing development capacity for a 90 percent increase in employment and a 72 percent increase in population. Provision of other essential public services and infrastructure is progressing.
- II. Protect the quality of life for residents of the region  
The region should pursue economic growth but avoid the excessive traffic problems and degradation of livability common to major growth areas. Excessive traffic degradation from today's condition, leading to the loss of accessibility to job centers, intrusion of traffic into neighborhoods and increased air pollution, should be avoided. Serious traffic congestion areas that presently exist should be corrected.
- III. Improve the network of regional transportation corridors  
Radial and circumferential transportation corridors should be improved to maintain accessibility into, across and through the region. Necessary highway improvements should be constructed to maintain adequate mobility in the regional corridors. In combination with selective highway improvements in the radial corridors, transit service should be expanded; development of a MAX system should be pursued throughout the region to minimize highway construction requirements and to foster development opportunities.
- IV. Extend and improve the Urban Arterial System  
Circulation within the region should be accommodated through road improvements to provide access into development areas and support the regional corridors.






V. Extend transit service  
into urbanizing parts of  
the region

Transit service should be provided  
to growth areas as urban densities  
are developed to provide access to  
the regional transit corridors and  
to provide mobility for those that  
are unable to use the private auto.

8308C/516  
11-3-87

# Regional Transportation Vision



-  Regional highway corridors
-  Regional transitways
-  Transit service to support transitways
-  New arterial construction in development areas
-  Arterial rehabilitation in existing urban areas





**METRO**

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

# Memorandum

Date: November 12, 1987

To: JPACT

From: <sup>RB</sup> Richard Brandman, Senior Analyst

Regarding: Transit and Highway Funding Strategies

Attached is an example of a transit and highway funding strategy which was approved by the voters in the San Diego region on November 3 of this year. While the specific strategy ( $\frac{1}{2}\%$  sales tax) could not be applied here, the approach is worth noting.

1. From past experience, they knew that 30 percent of the electorate would vote no on any tax increase. This translated into needing support from two-thirds of the voters with an open mind.
2. Through a comprehensive poll, they found the electorate fairly split on their willingness to incur a tax increase to fund transit and highway projects. (one-third support for transit, one-third for major highway improvements, and one-third for local streets)
3. After some debate, they decided to present a package which had something for everybody. This included \$100 million per year for specific highway and transit projects (mostly rail) at the percentages described above, \$1 million annually for bike path construction, cutting the senior citizen bus pass price by 50 percent from its already discounted level, and the creation of a student bus pass.
4. The campaign was well organized and well funded. \$600,000 was raised. Every city council in the region endorsed the measure. A direct mailing was done to every voter in the last special election. AAA was behind it. Speeches were made to over 250 groups.
5. The measure passed with 53 percent support.

RB:lmk

Attachment

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE

JPACT

DATE

11-12-87 - 7:30 am

NAME

AFFILIATION

NAME	AFFILIATION
M- <del>James Allison</del>	<del>Tri-Met</del>
M- Larry Cooper	Metro
MA- Dick Kuehn	ODOT
M- Ed Hodge	Clark Co.
M- George Van Bergen	Metro
M- Pauline Anderson	Mult. Co.
M- Marjorie S. Schumaker	Cities of Mult Co.
G- Janis Collins	ODOT
G- Steve Dotterper	CITY OF PORTLAND
G- <sup>Calvin Grace</sup> his redheaded associate	same digs
✓ Richard	Metro
✓ G- James Lytle	DesLigne Co.
✓ G- Gary Spornovich	Clatsop County
✓ G- Ted Farnum	ODOT
✓ G- Eric Jensen	Mult Co.
✓ G- JOHN O. SACHS	CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
✓ G- Robert R. Rogers	Chamber of Commerce
✓ G- Jimmy Moore	ODOT-Transit
✓ G- Lee Hames	TRI-MET
✓ G- RICHARD ROSS	CITIES OF EAST MULTNOMAH CO.
✓ G- Bebe Rucker	Port of Portland
G- Fred Petrou	FHWA
G- Peter F Fry	CEIC
✓ S- Karen Thackston	Metro

