

Portland State University

PDXScholar

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on
Transportation

Oregon Sustainable Community Digital Library

11-14-1996

Meeting Notes 1996-11-14

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

Follow this and additional works at: 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 1996-11-14 " (1996). *Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation*. 218.

https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact/218

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.

**METRO**

Meeting: **JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION**

Date: November 14, 1996

Day: THURSDAY

Time: 7:15 a.m.

Place: METRO, CONFERENCE ROOM 370A-B

- *1. MEETING REPORT OF OCTOBER 10, 1996 - APPROVAL REQUESTED.
2. RECAP AND FOLLOW-UP ON BALLOT MEASURE 32 - DISCUSSION.
3. STATUS OF OREGON TRANSPORTATION INITIATIVE - INFORMATIONAL - Grace Crunican.
- *4. RECOMMENDATION OF JPACT FINANCE COMMITTEE ON REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDING INITIATIVE - INFORMATIONAL - Ed Lindquist/Andy Cotugno.

*Material enclosed.

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: October 10, 1996

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Chair Rod Monroe, Susan McLain and Jon Kvistad (alt.), Metro Council; Grace Crunican, ODOT; Rob Drake, Cities of Washington County; Charlie Hales, City of Portland; Claudiette LaVert, Cities of Multnomah County; Dean Lookingbill (alt.), Southwest Washington RTC; Ed Lindquist, Clackamas County; Dave Yaden (alt.), Tri-Met; Linda Peters (alt.), Washington County; Dave Lohman (alt.), Port of Portland; and John Kowalczyk (alt.), DEQ

Guests: Bruce Warner (JPACT alt.), Leo Huff, and Tamara Clark, ODOT; Elsa Coleman, Steve Dotterer and Vicky Diede, City of Portland; John Rist and Rod Sandoz, Clackamas County; Mike Mabrey, City of Gresham; Xavier Falconi, TVEDC; George Pernsteiner, Portland State University; Peter Fry, Central Eastside Industrial Council; Andy Ginsburg and Howard Harris, DEQ; and John Rosenberger, Washington County

Staff: Andy Cotugno, Richard Brandman, and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

MEDIA: Gordon Oliver, The Oregonian

SUMMARY:

The meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Chair Rod Monroe.

MEETING REPORTS

Mayor Drake moved, seconded by Commissioner Lindquist, to approve the August 8 and September 12, 1996 JPACT meeting reports as submitted. The motion PASSED unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 96-2395 - AMENDING THE RTP AND MTIP TO INCLUDE PROJECTS FUNDED BY THE FY 97 SECTION 5309 (FORMER SECTION 3) APPROPRIATION

Andy Cotugno reviewed the Staff Report/Resolution that would amend the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Metropolitan

JPACT

October 10, 1996

Page 2

Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) to include the Portland State University Transit Center and the Portland Central City Streetcar projects.

George Pernsteiner, representing Portland State University (PSU), explained that the PSU Transit Center project is one element of the Urban Center project, one component of the PSU master plan, and a transit mall. Light rail would be located along the bus mall. The University district comprises a 52-block area targeting 1,500 housing units, retail, and a transportation hub and is being planned with the City of Portland to accommodate the marked growth in student enrollment. A graphic, depicting the Urban Center project, was distributed. The area is already one of the busiest areas in terms of transit.

Design plans underway for the Urban Center project are the result of direct communication with the City of Portland and Tri-Met during the design planning process. Improvements would include pedestrian-oriented circulation, a transit information center, doubling size of sidewalks and a light rail stop. Mr. Pernsteiner reported that the City of Portland has approved the Central City Transportation Master Plan which includes the mall extension. PSU has tried to be consistent with bus needs, light rail potential, and yet move forward with the academic building without harming any of the transportation initiatives.

Portland State University anticipates growth of 40 percent over the next eight years, 20 percent over the next four years. PSU anticipates a student enrollment of 22,000 in the year 2004. The latest survey indicates that 30 percent of PSU students travel by transit. Dave Yaden felt it would become a center of urban activity. It will include new housing, a new elementary school, retail, and would create a new urban neighborhood that needs to be served by transit. They expect a lot more foot traffic from the transit mall than would be evidenced by a 40 percent increase in student body.

Commissioner Hales reaffirmed that the City of Portland has already approved the University District plan and that their respective zone changes and comprehensive plan amendments have already been considered.

Vicky Diede, Project Manager of the Portland Central City Streetcar project, explained that the impetus behind the project was to tie two large undeveloped parcels of land into the heart of the city. Their efforts have focused on facilitating and supporting mixed use development in Northwest Portland, the University district and into the Macadam Avenue area.

JPACT

October 10, 1996

Page 3

Chair Monroe asked whether the Central Eastside Industrial district was still being considered as part of the project. Vicky responded that if the first phase is built and becomes successful, there may be opportunities on the Eastside to supplement service. Phase 1 of the alignment entails engineering and design work. She spoke of the opportunity for infill development. Vicky reported that the work being done on Preliminary Engineering has been funded by HUD and the City of Portland.

Portland Streetcar, Inc. has a contract with the City of Portland to scope the project with regard to operation and maintenance, where stops should be placed, and how the project should be coordinated with the South/North Light Rail project. No decision has been reached on who should operate the streetcar. The \$42 million capital plan for the project will be funded 60/40 (federal/local). The public component will include general revenues from the City of Portland, tax increment revenues, system development charges, a local improvement district, and possible utility investments. Vicky noted that discussions have been held with Portland General Electric, the phone company and the gas company over the incremental costs to provide that service compared to the revenues gained by the utility companies. An effort will be made to have them help us invest in the transportation infrastructure.

Operation and maintenance of the Portland Central City Streetcar will cost about \$3 million per year. The City hopes to recapture one-third of that cost through fares and advertising.

Commissioner Peters expressed excitement about the project but noted that it is in stark contrast to development in other parts of the region. Because of the project's operating cost, she spoke of continual funds that must come out of the regional pot each year at a time when there are limited resources. The question of balance between investments for future growth and the need to make up for existing deficiencies was noted.

John Rosenberger reported that, at the last Washington County Coordinating Committee meeting, concern was expressed about the operating issue and how it would affect the South/North or Westside operations. The second issue dealt with the next phase of the Lovejoy ramp and the TOD proposal. They felt this project would be competing with such projects. Commissioner Hales felt that few other projects in the region had enlisted the same level of private sector support. He noted that the Portland Streetcar board is looking at a variety of revenue sources which emphasize local sources where there is a correlation between transportation behavior in the Central City and revenue sources for people making other choices of travel. Commissioner Hales felt we

JPACT

October 10, 1996

Page 4

should be supportive of projects where 50-60 percent of the trips will be made by facilities other than the auto.

Dave Yaden felt that other public-private initiatives will be submitted for consideration. The operating question is one to concentrate on. While Tri-Met wants to be supportive, they are not in a position to financially absorb this.

Mayor Drake felt that it represented a great project. He indicated that the concern expressed at the Coordinating Committee meeting is that the financially-constrained transportation package is putting a lot of pressure on Washington County. He wanted the committee to be mindful to work toward 2040 and to encourage citizens to get out of their cars, ride MAX, and bike, but noted that there are other areas that don't have the basic framework. He emphasized the need to be mindful that it is a broad region and that, in Clackamas and Washington Counties, people have always driven.

Chair Monroe spoke of the need for a healthy urban goal as essential to a healthy urban region. He didn't want to disregard our responsibilities for the outlying communities but didn't feel these were at cross-purposes. Commissioner Peters agreed with that but also wanted some assurance that the things that are needed for growing and new regional centers in our station areas would receive the same level of support. An acute need for basic amenities at the suburban stations was also cited as acute needs.

Commissioner Lindquist applauded the City of Portland's efforts and spoke of the operating fund deficiencies that Tri-Met has. He reminded everyone of the partnership forged around the JPACT table as it exhibits leadership throughout the region. He noted that the anticipated densities need to have the full operation of transit.

Councilor McLain commented on MPAC's efforts with their long-range functional plan. They are discussing a functional plan for the suburbs and Central City commitments. JPACT needs to decide what can truly get on the ground in the short and long term. We need to establish whether we can build those densities.

Councilor Kvistad noted that there are two regional centers on the Westside that are dysfunctional and won't work without a fully functional I-5/217 interchange.

Action Taken: Commissioner Hales moved, seconded by Mayor Drake, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 96-2395, amending the RTP and MTIP to include projects funded by the FY 97 Section 5309 (former Section 3) appropriation. The motion PASSED. Councilor Kvistad abstained.

1998-2001 STIP/MTIP UPDATE

Information provided the committee in the agenda packet reflects the TIP Subcommittee's recommendation. The process has been proceeding in a consolidated fashion toward development of a draft that would go out for public comment. A major decision will be made following the public hearing in January. Final adoption will take place in February/March subject to the air quality conformity analysis.

Revenues were divided into two categories -- State Modernization (currently an overcommitted resource) and flexible funding (Transportation Enhancement, Congestion Mitigation Air Quality, and Regional STP) where commitments have been made through 1998.

Andy reported that the proposed draft was developed in close coordination between ODOT and Metro staff. A number of issues are subject to approval of the Oregon Transportation Commission. In the past, 20 percent of the Modernization funds have been programmed in the rural portion of Region 1. This year, it is being proposed that those funds, totaling \$14 million, be transferred to the Metro region. Past Modernization commitments in the rural areas will have been met.

In addition, the OTC has set apart funds for safety projects. The region will be asking the OTC to recognize that some of the projects on the Modernization list include some of those safety improvements and needs they hope to meet. Andy referred the committee to Attachment 1 of the October 4 memo that defines the recommendations for the Modernization projects and use of flexible funds.

Grace Crunican reported that ODOT is still shifting numbers around to try to fund the full \$37 million for the I-5/217/Kruse Way interchange. She expressed concern about taking some of the rural funds for Region 1 and wanted to see what kinds of funds could be leveraged. She also cited the need to maintain transit in the region.

Given the limited resources, TPAC's recommendation is not to do a broad transportation solicitation. They would like to see projects considered that have already gone through the last allocation and ranking process. The exact dollar figures have not been finalized.

The last issue is the criteria to be used for project allocation. The recommendation is to expand the character of the criteria for 2040 as depicted on Attachment 3. To reflect the draft *Urban Growth Management Functional Plan*, land use, density, street connectivity and street design criteria have been incorporated. By

the time the public hearings are held, the flexible funding projects would be ranked.

Mayor Drake supported funding projects that have already been in the queue. He expressed concern over the I-5/217/Kruse Way interchange project.

In discussion on the expanded 2040 criteria, the question was raised about whether such criteria will be used retroactively for use of the \$34 million of candidate projects. Councilor Kvistad was not supportive of going back retroactively and proposed putting as much funds as possible toward the I-5/217/Kruse Way interchange project.

Commissioner Hales noted that it is timely that we start to rely on the 2040 plan in making transportation investments.

Commissioner Peters expressed concern about the inability to address congestion and provide funds for pedestrian-friendly and adequate transit improvements in the south end of Washington County. She felt they will be out of step with the rest of the region and have no way to reverse it.

Dave Lohman supported the concept represented but felt it is overwhelmingly a list of passenger-related transportation improvements. He felt the list should also recognize an economy that is reliant on trade and hoped that, in the future, it would be a more balanced list. Commissioner Hales felt that potential freight projects would likely fare better than safety or congestion measures under this grading system.

Commissioner Lindquist noted that Clackamas County is where most of the Urban Reserves will end up and applauded all efforts to help solve that problem. He felt ODOT and Metro staff had done a good job in developing the recommendation.

Action Taken: Commissioner Lindquist moved, seconded by Mayor Drake, to approve the draft report as presented. The motion PASSED unanimously.

OZONE UPDATE

John Kowalczyk, DEQ, introduced Andy Ginsburg who presented an overview relating to exceedance and violation of the federal ozone standard. He reported that the ozone standard is exceeded when it is over 0.124/ppm. A violation occurs if there are more than three days in a three-year period that exceed that measured ozone concentration at one monitoring site.

JPACT

October 10, 1996

Page 7

Andy reported that the region had two exceedances this summer at Milwaukie High School and one at Carus and is designated in non-attainment for ozone. EPA has not acted on the Maintenance Plan as yet but will approve it prior to the next ozone season. If the Maintenance Plan is not approved by next summer, there is a potential for more exceedances. New control requirements can be imposed on industry if we violate before being redesignated by EPA. We can trigger our Maintenance Plan after designation has been made. The air quality strategies have a major impact on transportation.

Andy noted that the two exceedances triggered Phase 1 of the Contingency Plan. The Maintenance Plan is due to be submitted to EPA in February. Ninety degree days and multiple days of 90° with stagnant wind conditions triggered the exceedances.

Most of the strategies have not been implemented yet. Andy cited the need to make Clean Air Days more effective, to place less emphasis on commuting and limitations on lawn mowing. If necessary, he felt that an advisory committee would be formed to re-evaluate certain strategies, consider using reformulated gasoline, and look at other options. John Kowalczyk felt that, at that point, DEQ would be looking for regional consensus on other appropriate strategies. John emphasized the need to do a good job in implementing the contingency strategies. He noted that there was no safety margin built into the Maintenance Plan.

A discussion followed on whether there were any differences in the pollution components in the different grades of gas and the process and cost difference in reformulated fuel. John Kowalczyk reported that the split between industrial and vehicle emissions for was 50/25 for carbon monoxide and 30/25 for ozone.

Also discussed was possible implementation of "cash for clunkers" as a means of getting the older vehicles off the road. It was noted that, starting with the 1996 model years, the new cars will be operating cleaner. Also noted was Portland General Electric's incentive relating to lawnmowers and the possibility of placing a ban on operating your lawnmower on certain days.

Other strategies mentioned included implementation of an odd/even drive day.

From the standpoint of process, John Kowalczyk and Andy Ginsburg suggesting giving the Maintenance Plan an opportunity to prove itself. They indicated that the Employee Commute Program option is underway.

Chair Monroe thanked Andy Ginsburg and John Kowalczyk for their presentation.

JPACT
October 10, 1996
Page 8

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Andy Cotugno announced that the next JPACT Finance Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 24, at 7:30 a.m. at Metro in the Council Annex.

In accordance with JPACT bylaws, Andy noted that it is the responsibility of the City of Gresham to solicit nominations to fill JPACT member/alternate terms expiring in January for the cities of Multnomah County.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Mike Burton
JPACT Members

Ballot Measure 32 - LRT Bonds - Unofficial Final

Clackamas County

Yes	67,091	47.8%
No	73,277	52.2%

Multnomah County

Yes	105,650	60.29%
No	69,576	39.70%

Washington County

Yes	76,888	51.8%
No	71,304	48.1%

Total Tri-County

Yes	249,629	53.8%
No	214,157	46.2%

Statewide

Yes	563,932	47.0%
No	645,278	54.0%

Balance of State

Yes	314,303	42.0%
No	<u>431,121</u>	58.0%
	745,424	

Revised
on 11/14/96

Ballot Measure 32 - LRT Bonds - Unofficial

Clackamas County

Yes	67,091	47.8%
No	73,277	52.2%

Multnomah County

Yes	105,650	60.29%
No	69,576	39.70%

Washington County

Yes	76,888	51.8%
No	71,304	48.1%

Total Tri-County

Yes	249,629	53.8%
No	214,157	46.2%

Statewide

Yes	563,932	47.0%
No	645,278	53.0%

Balance of State

Yes	314,303	42.0%
No	<u>431,121</u>	58.0%
	745,424	

Oregon Transportation Initiative (OTI)

Process Timeline

January 19, 1996

Governor announces Initiative

Phase I

February - June

**Five Regional Advisory Committees /
Statewide Advisory Committee**

- Community & business leaders, citizens
- 34 meetings in more than 16 communities

July 11, 1996

Statewide Advisory Committee Report

- Maintenance & preservation is top priority
- Intergov't coordinating and decision making needs improvement
- Road and highway capacity should be better managed
- Access to regional centers must be maintained and enhanced
- Local public transit is badly needed statewide
- Freight movement is critical to maintaining economic health
- Road safety is a top priority statewide

Oregon Transportation Initiative (OTI)

Phase II

July - December

Transportation Action Agenda

I. Efficiency Initiatives

- A. Ensuring Continuous Efficiency Improvement
- B. Adjusting Road Design and Surface Standards
- C. Lower Transit Costs
- D. Control Congestion on Key Routes
- E. Change Truck Traffic Flows (Recapture Road Capacity)
- F. Accelerate Congestion Management Initiatives
- G. Assess Feasibility of Shifting Freight Traffic

II. Preservation and Maintenance of a "Base System"

- A. Define "Base System" for Roads and Transit
- B. Define "Base Systems" for Other Modes

III. Linking to Livability and Economic Opportunity

- A. Emphasize "Livability/Economic Opportunity" in the STIP Process
- B. Complete Oregon' Fiber Optic Loop

IV. Regionalize and Streamline Decision-Making

- A. Organize Regional Transportation Bodies
- B. Synchronize State Agency Activities and Schedules

V. Funding

October -
November

Working Groups

- Base System
- Livability / Regional Decision Making
- Efficiencies
- Funding Options

October 24 and
November 8 & 15

SAC Reviews Working Group Reports /
Makes Recommendations

Phase III

January 1997

Legislature Convenes

Oregon Transportation Initiative (OTI)

Key Findings / Recommendations

Base System Working Group

1. The Base System of roads is the approximately 41,000 mile system of State Highways, city streets and county roads, excluding local county access roads. It does not include 55,000 miles of Federal roads.
2. Funding is insufficient to cover base needs on the state, county or city system.
3. State road use taxes alone are insufficient to cover even maintenance and preservation needs on any of the three systems.
4. No conclusion yet on base system definition for public transit.
5. State funding responsibility for transit should include:
 - (1) A significant portion the annual cost of elderly, disabled and public transportation dependent;
 - (2) A state matching program to reduce highway expansion needs;
 - (3) Additional local funding options.

Livability / Regionalization Working Group

1. There should be a tight link between transportation decisions/investments, local land use plans, regional economic strategies, and statewide plans/goals related to livability and economic opportunity
2. Regional bodies and process should be created to:
 - Set regional transportation priorities consistent with criteria related to community livability and economic opportunity
 - Advise the Oregon Transportation Commission on regional transportation investments
 - Facilitate coordination among transportation providers
 - Help Improve transportation System Efficiency

Oregon Transportation Initiative (OTI)

Key Findings / Recommendations

Efficiencies Working Group

1. The performance of state, county and city operation, preservation and maintenance should be tracked by three measures:
 - Total Operations and Maintenance (O&M) cost per lane mile
 - Miles of Roads and Bridges with deferred preservation or reconstruction needs
 - Total O&M cost per daily vehicle mile of travel (with truck travel equated to an equivalent amount of auto travel)
2. Annual Report on efficiency improvements made across the state and in each region
3. Biennial Productivity Project Plan developed by ODOT, counties and cities in each region
4. Summary Report on Efficiency Improvements
5. Average total cost of transportation people and goods in Oregon should be tracked and reported regularly to monitor the effectiveness of Oregon's transportation system

Funding Options Working Group

Oregon Transportation Initiative (OTI)

Emerging Proposal

Two “Funds”

- Operations, Preservation and Maintenance “Fund” for Base System
- Livability and Economic Opportunity “Fund” for modernization and capacity expansion of the transportation system

Operations Maintenance and Preservation Fund

- Motor fuel taxes and equivalent weight-mile tax serve as the primary source of revenue for road system
- Indexing is recommended.
- Tax activities that create special costs: studded tires, utility cuts.
- Declining local sources such as property taxes and timber receipts are a problem
- Basic transit service funding should be shared obligation of all Oregonians

Livability and Economic Opportunity (LEO) Fund (Flexible Funding)

- Projects developed consistent with Comprehensive Plans, Transportation System Plans
- Projects selected using livability / economic opportunity criteria
- Jurisdiction blind project selection using state, local, regional decision making process
- Funding Options Under Consideration:
 - Vehicle Registration Fees
 - Transportation Utility Fees
 - Other taxes/fees related to “drivers of demand”
 - Time of day charges for urban freeways
 - Bonding
- Constitutional amendment to allow vehicle fees not related to use (e.g. vehicle registration fees) to be used for non-road purposes

MEMORANDUM

DATE: NOVEMBER 6, 1996
TO: JPACT
FROM: JPACT FINANCE COMMITTEE
RE: WORK PLAN FOR REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDING INITIATIVE

A. OBJECTIVES AND PRINCIPLES

- It is recognized that funding from a ballot measure would be only one of many funding sources available to fund improvements in the region (e.g., ISTEA, state funds, etc.) and that these funding sources are fungible. Thus, the work program is premised on the following principles:
 - "Principle 1: Rising Tide": If an improvement package can be identified which can pass a ballot measure, the measure should focus on those improvements regardless of:
 - which system those improvements are on (state, regional, local)
 - the types of improvements included in the package (congestion relief, growth management, etc.)
 - whether there are high priority items which are not included in the improvement package.
 - "Principle 2: Backfill": High priority projects and critical project types which were not included in the ballot measure would be funded by the other funding sources available to the region.
 - The philosophy of the effort is that adding revenues through passage of a funding measure (the "Rising Tide") will ease pressures on existing sources such that they could be used to fund the other priority projects (the "Backfill") and that the measure and the backfill will produce the broadest improvement program available to the region.
 - Thus, the basic objectives of the work program are to:
 - identify the "optimal" road or multi-modal package of improvements which supports passage of a regional transportation funding initiative and proceed.
- or --
- determine there is no such package of improvements and stop.

- There are three key factors which need to be resolved to identify the "optimal" package:
 - What "Type of Improvement(s)" will the voters support?: should the package focus on (i) major regional highways improvements, (ii) growth management improvements, etc. or (iii) a balance of these "types"?
 - What "Size" package will the voters support?
 - How should projects be geographically "Distributed" to maximize voter support?
- The work plan is predicated on considering each of these factors one at a time, aiming towards the creation of the optimal package in terms of its likelihood of passage.

B. WORK SCOPE

PHASE I: DEVELOPMENT (NOVEMBER - DECEMBER 1996)

- Review work plan with 6-12 stakeholders to inform them of premise and process and to receive comment. Solicit individuals to participate in focus groups scheduled for later phases of the process.
- Review work plan with JPACT, Metro Council and local governments to inform them of premise and process and to receive comment.
- Staff begins to define 3-4 "Type of Improvement Package" to be evaluated during the research phase. Each of these "Types" packages will include a set of specific improvements which roughly equate to the same cost.
- Finalize work plan.
- Determine existing staff resources that can be used and role(s) for consultant(s).
- Determine the "transportation problem" that the public is concerned about and interested in solving through review of past surveys, door-to-door interviews and focus groups.
- Hire consultant(s) for Phase II and III.

PHASE II: RESEARCH (JANUARY - MAY 1997)

- Research on "Type of Improvement Package"

- Finalize "Type" packages with consultant.
- Test package in one or both of the following ways:
 - Run a series of focus groups in which participants are shown the "Type Packages" and asked which one of these packages would they support and why; and why they would not support the other packages.
 - Get on the agenda of existing transportation committees of chambers, neighborhood groups, other organizations, etc. and ask them which of these packages they support and why.
- Option: In addition to the above (not in lieu of), a relatively short and small survey can be taken on the "Type" issue to determine how respondents view the Types -- which are more important, types of projects that fall under a "Type", etc.
- Study Decision Point: What "Type of Improvement Package" will be carried into next stage.
- Research on "Size of Package"
 - Research issues associated with gas tax and registration fees sources including collection mechanisms, administrative costs, net revenue estimates and application to trucks.
 - Select source of revenue: Gas Tax vs. Registration Fee
 - It's hard to pick a package size absent an assumption on the revenue source, although we could if necessary.
 - This work plan assumes that there is already sufficient data to make a selection and that there is no need for additional research. Compile existing data.
 - Study Decision Point: What revenue source will be assumed in the next stages of the study?
 - Create "Size" packages
 - Staff and consultant prepare 3-4 "Size" packages which consist of projects within the "Type" package that was selected above.
 - Determine how much the gas tax or registration fee (depending on the decision above) would have to be raised to fund Size package.
- Test Size package in one or both of the following ways:

- Run a series of focus groups in which participants are shown the "Size Packages" and the tax/fee requirement associated with the package and ask which package they support and why. Focus groups should also address some basic questions about "Distribution" in preparation for next step.
- Field a relatively short and small survey on the "Size" issue. Survey should also address some basic questions about "Distribution" in preparation for next step.
- Conduct 3-6 public outreach meetings to receive input.
- Study Decision Point: What "Size of Improvement Package" will be carried into next stage.
- Distribution
 - Given the research of "Type", "Size" and "Distribution", staff in conjunction with consultants prepare the "Proposed Improvement Package" which complies with previous study decisions.
- Go/No Go Decision
 - At the conclusion of the "Distribution" stage, JPACT Finance will have in front of it the "best" package staff could prepare in terms of its ability to pass muster with the voters. The question now is, does it?
 - Test package in one or both of the following ways:
 - Run a series of focus groups in which participants are shown the "Proposed Improvement Package" and the related tax/fee requirement and asked would they support it and why.
 - Field a survey on the "Proposed Improvement Package" and the related tax/fee requirement.
 - Hold a final Metro/JPACT public meeting on the proposal.
 - Study Decision Point: Can the proposed package pass, or is there no package which is feasible at this point?

PHASE III: PUBLIC OUTREACH AND AWARENESS (JANUARY - JULY 1997, PARTIALLY CONCURRENT WITH PHASE II)

Concurrent with the process described above to develop the "package," it is important to educate and engage the general public. Toward this objective, materials will be developed for general dissemination describing transportation-related issues and alternatives and asking for feedback. At this time, it is envisioned that a marketing consultant will assist in

developing the messages and that a direct mail tabloid will be sent to all households of the region. Costs for this task will be shared with other regional transportation projects.

PHASE IV: FINAL DEFINITION OF IMPROVEMENT PACKAGE (MAY - JUNE 1997, PARTIALLY CONCURRENT WITH PHASE IV) *Assuming a "Go" Decision*

- While the decision process is going on, refine the package based on comments.
- Doublecheck feasibility of the improvements and cost estimates.
- Doublecheck financial capacity of measure and whether it covers cost of proposed improvement package.

PHASE V: APPROVAL PROCESS (MAY - JULY 1997)

- Prepare Ballot Title.
- Discuss with county/city boards and commissions.
- Work through JPACT/Metro process.

C. COST

Consultant effort would be about \$250,000. Options noted above would have to be limited to fit within this budget. In addition, this would be supplemented by a significant dedication of staff and elected official support and participation from each of the jurisdictions. The consultant budget is proposed to be funded at \$31,250 from each of the following jurisdictions: Metro, Tri-Met, ODOT, Port of Portland, Multnomah County, Washington County, Clackamas County and the City of Portland. The budget breakdown for the major tasks is proposed as follows:

Consultant:

Surveys	\$ 30,000
Focus Groups.	45,000
Public Outreach and Awareness.	75,000
Project Management.	<u>100,000</u>
	\$250,000

Staff Support:

- Program Development
- Financial Analysis
- Public Meetings
- Stakeholder Meetings
- Problem Definition Analysis



METRO

Date: November 14, 1996
To: JPACT Members
From: *AK* Andrew C. Cotugno, Planning Director
Re: JPACT Meetings for Calendar Year 1997

Please mark your calendar for the following JPACT meeting times scheduled during calendar year 1997 in Conference Room 370A-B:

- Thursday, 1-9-97, 7:15 a.m.
- Thursday, 2-13-97, 7:15 a.m.
- Thursday, 3-13-97, 7:15 a.m.
- Thursday, 4-10-97, 7:15 a.m.
- Thursday, 5-8-97, 7:15 a.m.
- Thursday, 6-12-97, 7:15 a.m.
- Thursday, 7-10-97, 7:15 a.m.
- Thursday, 8-14-97, 7:15 a.m.
- Thursday, 9-11-97, 7:15 a.m.
- Thursday, 10-9-97, 7:15 a.m.
- Thursday, 11-13-97, 7:15 a.m.
- Thursday, 12-11-97, 7:15 a.m.

ACC:lmk

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE SPACT

DATE 11-14-96

NAME

AFFILIATION

NAME	AFFILIATION
✓ GB ARRINGTON	TRI-MET
✓ Howard Harris	DEB
✓ GORDON OLIVER	OREGONIAN
✓ ROD SANDOZ	CLACKAMAS COUNTY
✓ JOHN C. MAGNANO	WSDOT/ODOT Highspeed Rail
✓ Brad Higbee	Metro
✓ ARB	Metro
✓ ROBERT BETHUNE	CITIZENS AGAINST TRANSIT SCAMS
✓ Bruce Solberg	Daily Journal of Commerce
✓ JIM HOWELL	AORTA
✓ Gary Katsion	Kittelson & Associates, Inc
✓ Mary Leagy	WSDOT
✓ Bernice Bottomly	Tri-met
✓ Kathy Buss	Mult Co
✓ BRIAN J CHOSE	Portland State University
✓ Benjamin Schonberger	N.G.I.
✓ BOBE WARNER	ODOT
✓ Jeanna Cernazanu	Metro
✓ Ron Higbee	TRI-MET
✓ Ellen Vanderslice	PDOT/BTED
✓ DAN HANDEN	ODOT Reg I
✓ Chris Lagerbauer	CEC
✓ Kate Deane	City of Portland
✓ Mary Fetsch	Tri-Met
✓ Paul Fox	Tri Met
✓ TOM MARKGRAT	

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE SPACT

DATE 11-14-96

NAME

AFFILIATION

NAME	AFFILIATION
✓ CHARLIE HAZES	City of Portland
✓ Dean Lookingbill	RTC
✓ GREG GREEN	DEQ
✓ DON MORISSETTE	Metro
✓ Gerry Smith	WSDOT
✓ TANYA COLLIER	MULTNOMAH COUNTY
✓ ROB DRAKE	CITIES OF WASHINGTON CO.
✓ Don DeLoe	Chelan County
✓ Dave Yaden	Tri-Met
✓ David Lehman	Port of Portland
✓ Mike Burton	Metro EXO
✓ Rod Monroe	Metro Council
✓ Andy Cotupaw	Metro
✓ Grace Cronican	ODOT
✓ Roy ROGERS	WASHINGTON COUNTY
✓ Craig Tommash	Chelan County Cities
✓ Phil Sul	Metro
✓ JASON TELL	ODOT
✓ Elsa Coleman	FDOT
✓ Dick Feeney	Tri-Met
✓ Tim RAPHAEL	METRO
✓ Kathy Lehtola	Washington County
✓ Mackey Bizard	Congressman Earl Blumenauer
✓ DOVE WILLIAMS	ODOT
✓ Allison Dobbin	Metro
✓ Pamela Peck	Metro
✓ Maile Hood	Metro