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Meeting: JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

Date: October 9, 1986

Day: Thursday

Time: 7:30 a.m.

Place: Metro, Conference Room 330

*1. MEETING REPORT OF SEPTEMBER 11, 1986 - APPROVAL REQUESTED.

#2. TRANSIT AND ROADS FINANCE STUDY PROPOSALS - INFORMATIONAL - Andy Cotugno.

*3. LETTER FROM CLACKAMAS COUNTY REGARDING SOUTHWEST CORRIDOR STUDY - INFORMATIONAL - Andy Cotugno.

*Material enclosed.

#Available at meeting.

NEXT JPACT MEETING: NOVEMBER 13, 1986 - 7:30 A.M.
DATE OF MEETING: September 11, 1986

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

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

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

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

MEDIA: None

SUMMARY:

MEETING REPORT OF AUGUST 7, 1986

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


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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

REGIONAL TRANSIT CONCERNS

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Fred Miller noted the September 15 dinner meeting of the Oregon Transportation Commission with East Multnomah County leaders. In addition,
the OTC will hold its monthly meeting on September 16 at 9:00 a.m. at the Gresham City Hall. At 1:30 p.m., a presentation will be heard by the Washington County officials at the Oregon Graduate Center.

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

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Rick Gustafson
           Don Carlson
           JPACT Members
### OREGON ROADS FINANCE STUDY

#### UNFUNDED NEEDS ANALYSIS 1987 TO 2005

**INCLUDES INFLATION**

*(Millions of Dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Trust Fund</td>
<td>2,537</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>3,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Federal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4,283</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>6,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>1,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenues</strong></td>
<td>6,820</td>
<td>3,830</td>
<td>1,936</td>
<td>12,586</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Needs:**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations and maintenance</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>3,430</td>
<td>2,260</td>
<td>8,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair and preservation</td>
<td>5,574</td>
<td>5,959</td>
<td>3,111</td>
<td>14,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New construction and expansion</td>
<td>4,379</td>
<td>5,966</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>11,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total needs</strong></td>
<td>14,410</td>
<td>15,969</td>
<td>6,746</td>
<td>37,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated unfunded needed</td>
<td>7,590</td>
<td>12,139</td>
<td>4,810</td>
<td>24,539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Prioritization Criteria

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

Through this prioritization, six-year system requirements are reduced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>From: (1987-1992)</th>
<th>To:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repair &amp; Preservation</td>
<td>$3.18 billion</td>
<td>$0.88 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backlog 6-Year</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backlog 6-Year</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Year Total</td>
<td>$13.47 billion</td>
<td>$6.86 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oregon Roads Finance Study

Revenue Proposals

- Develop a six-year funding program for consideration by the Legislature; set the stage for funding actions at a later date to address future time periods.

- Consider a 2¢ per year increase in gas taxes plus equivalent weight-mile taxes.

- Consider a one-time increase in the vehicle registration fee from the current $10.00 to $20.00 per year.

- Impose a title transfer fee at 2 percent of the value of the car to be paid one time when first titling the car in Oregon (new cars, used cars, transfers from out of state).

Revenues that would result are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gas Tax/Weight-Mile</th>
<th>Veh. Registr. @ $10.00</th>
<th>Titling Fee @ 2%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 88</td>
<td>@ 2¢ = $ 17.5 m.</td>
<td>$ 10.7 m.</td>
<td>$ 45.0 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 89</td>
<td>@ 4¢ = 62.5</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 90</td>
<td>@ 6¢ = 112.3</td>
<td>$562 m.</td>
<td>$102.3 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 91</td>
<td>@ 8¢ = 161.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>102.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 92</td>
<td>@ 10¢ = 208.5</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>104.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 93</td>
<td>@ 12¢ = 257.4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>110.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$819.2 m.</td>
<td>$125.9 m.</td>
<td>$574.0 m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

ACC:1mk
10-7-86
Oregon Roads Finance Study

Distribution Issues

Current Revenue Base (1987-1992) including:
10¢ State Gas Tax @ 68/20/12
2¢ State Gas Tax @ 50/30/20
Federal Highway Funds
Local Gas Taxes
Federal Forestry Receipts
Local Revenues

Distribution of New Revenue Based Upon Prioritization Assuming:

1. Backlog is cut across the board 31% 34% 35%
2. Preservation backlog is spread over 18 years; construction backlog is deferred 25% 35% 40%
3. Backlog and current period requirements are cut across the board 40% 34% 26%
4. Maintenance is fully funded and the balance is cut across the board 39% 32% 29%

ODOT Proposal on the Basis of Auto and Truck Travel Volumes 65% -- 35% --

County Proposal on the Basis of Uniformly Funding the Shortfall Excluding Local Roads 33% 46% 21%

City/County Bottom Line 50% 30% 20%

Consultant Direction 56% 27% 17%

ACC: lmk
10-7-86
1. In order to maintain flexibility to meet the actual priorities of the individual agencies and jurisdictions, the preference is to distribute most if not all of the funds through existing formulas once the state/county/city split is established. This would also avoid creation of new institutional layers for selecting projects to be funded.

2. The priority for use of a funding increase by ODOT would be for Modernization purposes, especially on their principal state routes. As such, it may be appropriate to establish all or part of the ODOT increase as another State Modernization Program.

3. Because of the multiplicity of state, county and city jurisdictions in the urban areas, formula allocations are not conducive to meeting Modernization needs. To ensure this priority is addressed, it may be appropriate to:

   a) Establish an Urban Modernization Fund modeled after the FAU Program for urban areas over 5,000 population.

   b) Increase the Small Cities' Allotment Program for urban areas under 5,000 population.
Oregon Transit Finance Study

Recommendation

1. Special Transportation Fund (STF)

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

Issues:

a. Distribution - Ability to respond to capital requests; need to provide a minimum allocation to smaller counties; role of Oregon Transportation Commission.

b. Eligibility - Pay for state and local administrative costs; supplement UMTA 16(b)(2) capital program for private, nonprofit agencies.

c. Address method to stabilize declining revenues expected from cigarette tax over them.

2. Transit Capital Assistance Fund

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

Issues:

a. Procedures and criteria for consideration of applications would need to be defined.

b. Short-range transit service and capital programs consistent with local comprehensive plans, local and regional transportation plans and state transportation plans would need to be a prerequisite.

3. Continue state support for in-lieu-of payroll taxes and Small Cities Assistance Program.

4. Further consider:

a. A joint transit/highway fund.

b. A dedicated state funding source for transit.

10-7-86
Oregon Roads Finance Study

Urban Modernization Fund

. Establish a 1¢ Urban Modernization Fund.

. Distribution (similar to FAU):

   To urbanized areas over 50,000 population
   To urban areas between 5,000 and 50,000 population
   Use population within the Urban Growth Boundary as the basis of distribution

. Eligibility:

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

. Project Selection:

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

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

ACC:1mk
10-7-86
Date: October 2, 1986

To: JPACT

From: Andrew C. Cotugno, Transportation Director

Regarding: Southwest Corridor Study - Recommendations

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

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

ACC: lmk

Attachment

CC: Southwest Corridor Policy Committee
September 22, 1986

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

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

Dear Andy,

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

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

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

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

Andy, I believe it is critical to develop a Regional Highway Corridor Funding Strategy. This strategy would identify critical highway improvements needed in each corridor - it would not prioritize one corridor over another because I believe that is haphazard planning. All our regional corridors are critical to the overall functioning of our regional system. All of them need phased improvements, simultaneously, over time.
Although I believe the Southwest Corridor technical analysis was a good one, I believe the next step cannot be taken independent of other regional corridor needs. Thus, I would like to recommend that a financial strategy be worked out either by TPAC/JPACT or by expanding the Southwest Corridor technical and policy committees to include other corridor and local jurisdiction representatives.

Sincerely,

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

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

l/gs/917: elk
COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE: TRACT
DATE: 10-9-83

NAME
M. Bob McMullin
M. Mark Leshly
G. Joe Span
M. George C. Strug
M. Fred Stiller
M. Tom Stephans
M. Larry Cole
M. Larry Cooper
M. Richard Walker
G. Jill Lashwale
G. Rick Kuen
G. G. L. McCauley
G. Henry Stack
G. Ira More
G. Bebe Tucker
G. Mary Volf
G. Geoff Larkin
G. Cynthia Kent
M. Margaret Atkinson
G. Pat Z
G. W. R. Clark
M. Rod Thom
M. Pauline Anderson

AFFILIATION
CLACKAMAS CO.
City of Wall C
ODOT
Metro Council
ODOT
DEQ
CITIES OF WASHINGTON COUNTY
Metro
METRO
MULTCO
ODOT
F R CO. CLWR CO
Clackamas County
ODOT-TRAN
PORT
ODOT
PDOT
City of Portland
City of Portland
C F I D
Washington County
Cities in Clackamas Co.
Multnomah County
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grace Cunican</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Dotterer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Hames</td>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Cotugno</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geraldine Ball</td>
<td>DJB, Inc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>