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Meeting: JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION
Date: February 8, 1990
Day: Thursday
Time: 7:15 a.m.
Place: Metro, Conference Room 440

*1. MEETING REPORT OF JANUARY 18, 1990 - APPROVAL REQUESTED.

2. WESTSIDE STATUS REPORT - INFORMATIONAL - Bob Post.

*3. RESOLUTION NO. 90-1213 - PROVIDING THE ASSESSMENT OF DUES TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FOR FY 1990-91 - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Andy Cotugno.


*6. UPDATE ON SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT - INFORMATIONAL - Dick Feeney/Dave Williams.

*Material enclosed.

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.

NEXT JPACT MEETING: MARCH 8, 1990, 7:15 A.M.
MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: January 18, 1990

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Chairman Mike Ragsdale, George Van Bergen and David Knowles, Metro Council; Dave Sturdevant, Clark County; Marjorie Schmunk, Cities of Multnomah County; Craig Lomnicki (alt.), Cities of Clackamas County; Ed Lindquist, Clackamas County; Roy Rogers (alt.), Washington County; Nick Nikkila (alt.), DEQ; Gary Demich, WSDOT; Bob Bothman, ODOT; Clifford Clark, Cities of Washington County; Scott Collier, City of Vancouver; Jim Cowen, Tri-Met; and Mike Lindberg (alt.), City of Portland

Guests: Rena Cusma, Executive Officer, Metro; Steve Nouser and Bebe Rucker, Port of Portland; Vic Rhodes, Grace Crunican, Steve Dotterrer, Stuart Gwin, Ted Leybold, Barrow Emerson and Chris Beck, City of Portland; Ted Spence, Erik East (Public Transit), Don Adams (JPACT alt.); Wink Brooks and Dave Schamp, City of Hillsboro; Susie Lahsene, Multnomah County; Bob Post (JPACT alt.), Dick Feeney, Doug Capps, Bruce Harder, G.B. Arrington, Joe Walsh and Dan Caufield, Tri-Met; Gussie McRobert (JPACT alt.), City of Gresham; Rick Kuehn, consultant; Geoff Larkin, consultant; Walt Peck, Dennis Mulvihill and Bruce Warner, Washington County; Tom VanderZanden and Rod Sandoz, Clackamas County; Mary Tobias, Tualatin Valley Economic Development Corporation; Diane Luther, Multnomah County Board; Greg Baldwin, Zimmer Gunsul Frasca Partnership; Peter Fry, CEIC; Molly O'Reilly, Forest Park Neighborhood Association; Rodger Clauson, City of Gresham; Howard Harris, DEQ; and Leslie White, C-TRAN

Staff: Andrew Cotugno, Richard Brandman, Richard Marshment, Ethan Seltzer, Karen Thackston, Keith Lawton, Harlan Miller (FHWA intern), and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

MEDIA: Robert Goldfield, The Daily Journal of Commerce; and Jim Mayer, The Oregonian
SUMMARY:

The meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Chairman Mike Ragsdale. He introduced David Knowles and David Sturdevant, new appointees to the Committee (representing Metro Council and Clark County, respectively), Roy Rogers (Washington County's JPACT alternate) and Mike Lindberg (City of Portland alternate).

MEETING REPORT

The December 14 JPACT meeting report was approved as presented.

LRT DECISION-MAKING

Andy Cotugno reported that the handout (regarding the Regional LRT System attachment) replaced the mailed-out version in the agenda packet. Resolution No. 90-1179 proposes a comprehensive organizational structure for the LRT corridor studies and methods for Clark County involvement. The corridor planning organization is ready for adoption but direction is needed from JPACT on Clark County involvement.

Andy then reviewed the LRT corridor planning activities consisting of three components: 1) the Westside Planning Management Group is in place to deal with the Hillsboro extension; 2) an I-205/Milwaukie corridor Alternatives Analysis is proposed to be a coordinated effort with JPACT serving as the Steering Committee; and 3) a bi-state organizational structure (IRC/JPACT) will address bi-state and river crossing issues. Andy indicated the need to establish an overall Technical Advisory Committee for these bi-state studies.

Discussion followed on the need for balanced representation for corridor planning and regional systems planning. It was recommended that there be some degree of Clark County involvement on the I-205/Milwaukie corridor.

Andy then reviewed Attachment A outlining options for Clark County involvement. He noted that staff needs basic policy direction from JPACT for inclusion in the resolution.

Chairman Ragsdale felt that discussions have been focused primarily on Clark County's role, noting that he had met with Commissioner Sturdevant to discuss conflicts of interest. Both agreed that it would be useful to defer action for a period of 30 days. Commissioner Sturdevant stated that Option B was a comfortable compromise, adding that the delay would allow him time to meet individually with concerned parties. He felt a regional perspective and common ground would be reached to resolve the
problems.

James Cowen expressed concern about the status of the Westside project and spoke of a recent discussion with Brian Clymer, Administrator of UMTA, who commented that the Portland region is "out of control." His comments centered on the proliferation of projects submitted through the UMTA process, the need to move the Westside LRT project forward and the critical timeline. Mr. Cowen urged JPACT members to postpone all other LRT corridor projects until a Full-Funding Agreement is reached for the Westside project. Even with the backing of our Congressional delegation, Mr. Cowen reported that UMTA is paying little attention to the Westside project. He felt this was happening primarily because of the size of our delegation and because it is heavily Democratic.

A discussion followed on the need to settle planning for future projects and determine which corridor is next. Mr. Cowen suggested making an accommodation with UMTA so that the focus will remain on the Westside/Hillsboro Extension project.

Bob Bothman had also met with Brian Clymer and concurred with Mr. Cowen's comments. Mr. Clymer's concern was that the amount of UMTA funds being sought exceeded the funds available for the entire country. Mr. Bothman pointed out that only one project could be planned at a time, that the state's highest priority is the Westside corridor, and that he would oppose anything that would jeopardize the Westside LRT project. He did not feel we had the resources to do all the planning and proceed with more than one corridor at a time. He pointed out that, after the Alternatives Analysis stage in the other corridors, funding would not be available for construction.

Commissioner Rogers noted that Washington County has received similar messages from Washington concerning the number of LRT funding requests. He did not feel that the Hillsboro project should be regarded as anything other than an extension of the Westside project. Commissioner Rogers felt it was inappropriate for a joint IRC/JPACT management structure to deal with the Hillsboro Alternatives Analysis and asked for clarification of Option B. In response, Chairman Ragsdale stated that exclusion of the Hillsboro AA from a bi-state process was intended in the language for Option B. Commissioner Sturdevant felt that the term "Westside" meant LRT to 185th and was not inclusive of the Hillsboro Extension. It was clarified that Congressman AuCoin's intent is that the Westside route includes the Hillsboro Extension.
Clifford Clark stated that the cities of Washington County are anxious for Hillsboro to be the terminus for the Westside LRT and expressed concern about other non-Westside jurisdictions' involvement.

Commissioner Lindberg stated that the City of Portland believes the Westside LRT is the top priority but regional planning should continue on with a regional LRT agenda.

Councilman Lomnicki commented that the cities of Clackamas County also acknowledge that the Westside LRT is the region's number one priority and the McLoughlin project as next in priority.

Andy Cotugno provided an overview of the LRT corridor planning process: planning activity leading to an Alternatives Analysis; formal approval by UMTA to start preliminary engineering; and signing of a full-funding contract with the Federal Government. Andy indicated there is a question as to how soon implementation proceedings can start with a second corridor. UMTA rules state only when a full-funding agreement is in place.

Andy reported that I-205/Milwaukie is the next corridor ready to commence the Alternatives phase, but the question is when. Commissioner Lindquist asked JPACT to defer action on the Milwaukie/I-205 corridor until a meeting with our Congressional delegation could be held. He suggested having Dick Feeney, James Cowen, Chairman Ragsdale and Andy Cotugno consult with the delegation and report back to JPACT at its February 8 meeting. Commissioner Lindquist cautioned against letting a new Administrator set this region's LRT agenda. Chairman Ragsdale indicated he would be meeting with the Congressional delegation in the next week.

Chairman Ragsdale spoke of the need to develop a better understanding of the region's priorities and to stay with them. He cited "freelancing" by JPACT members as a problem.

Chairman Ragsdale felt there were two issues to be resolved at present: 1) whether or not to defer the matter regarding Clark County relationships; 2) and how we proceed with LRT projects in this region.

After further discussion, the Committee agreed to defer the component relating to Clark County's participation to the February 8 JPACT meeting.

Andy explained that this resolution would reaffirm the organizational structure for the Westside/Hillsboro EIS and for the Bi-State Study. Further discussion needs to take place on how to proceed and coordinate the Milwaukie/I-205 AA.
Action Taken: Chairman Ragsdale proposed, and the Committee concurred, to recommend approval of 1a under "Corridor Planning" of the LRT Decision-Making memo (pertaining to addition of the Hillsboro Alternatives Analysis to the Westside Corridor Project management structure).

Chairman Ragsdale proposed, and the Committee concurred, to recommend approval of 1c under "Corridor Planning" of the LRT Decision-Making memo (pertaining to establishment of a joint IRC/JPACT management structure for the bi-state related studies).

Chairman Ragsdale proposed, and the Committee concurred, to defer action on clause 1b (relating to establishment of a coordinated I-205/Milwaukie corridor management structure) until the next agenda item and clause 2 (relating to Clark County involvement) of the LRT Decision-Making memo for a period of 30 days.

OPTIONS FOR PROCEEDING ON I-205 LRT

An issues paper on I-205 was reviewed by Andy Cotugno. Points included: 1) the I-205 corridor is now estimated at a total of $150 million rather than $40-50 million for each segment; and 2) no decision has been made on how a $15.00 vehicle registration fee would be spent. (It would be possible to construct the Westside and one additional rail line costing less than $200 million assuming 50 percent federal funding.)

Chairman Ragsdale pointed out that we have a responsibility to let Congress know what our preferences are. Congress is seeking a request coordinated through JPACT. Councilor Van Bergen concurred in the need to talk to our Congressional delegation; wanted more time to think about the I-205/Milwaukie corridor management structure before an approach is taken with UMTA; and did not wish to do anything that would jeopardize the Westside project. He commented that he attended a Chamber of Commerce meeting at which Michael Hollern stated that the second LRT corridor would be in the McLoughlin/I-205 corridor.

Commissioner Lindberg supported moving ahead with the recommendations in the packet inasmuch as they (I-205 and Milwaukie) could be delayed a period of up to 18 months.

Commissioner Rogers questioned whether it was premature to adopt recommendation No. 3 (referring to the I-205 Issues paper) and cited the need for clarification on the McLoughlin and I-205 projects to our Congressional delegation.

Andy Cotugno stated JPACT's previously adopted position: 1) that the McLoughlin corridor is the next Section 3 priority after the
Westside project; and 2) that an Alternatives Analysis should also be done in the I-205 corridor without Section 3 funds.

Commissioner Lindquist requested a clarification from Congress on the Section 3 requirements.

In summation, Chairman Ragsdale felt there was JPACT concurrence in: reconfirmation of the Westside project; reconfirmation that it is our intent to proceed with the McLoughlin/I-205 Corridor following advice from our Congressional delegation; and that we should consult with our delegation regarding funding constraints imposed on I-205.

Bob Bothman did not agree with Recommendation No. 2 (I-205 Issues paper) as he felt it would jeopardize the Westside project. It was noted that if we proceed with an Alternatives Analysis for I-205 that is not Section 3 funded, there would be no problem with UMTA. A discussion followed on how best to deal with the UMTA problem. Mr. Bothman stated he would go along with Recommendation No. 2 of the I-205 issues paper if the Alternatives Analysis reference were eliminated.

James Cowen indicated he would be meeting again shortly with UMTA Administrator Brian Clymer.

A discussion followed on whether JPACT should recommend continuing with the Alternatives Analysis for I-205 or deferring the projects for an 18-month period until a Westside Full-Funding Agreement is signed, or adopt a position to proceed with the I-205/Milwaukie corridor AA, the date of which will be determined so that it will not affect the Westside project. Councilor Lomnicki did not feel it was prudent to delay the I-205/Milwaukie project, pointing out that national factors could impact later development.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to amend the I-205 Issues paper recommendations as follows:

1. Rewording for Recommendation No. 1: "Reconfirm that the Westside LRT to Hillsboro is the region's No. 1 priority and will be the priority focus of attention locally, with UMTA and with our Congressional delegation."

2. Rewording for Recommendation No. 2: "Reconfirm that it is our intent desire to proceed with Alternatives Analysis in both the I-205 and Milwaukie corridors and that they will be conducted in a coordinated manner........."
Rewording for Recommendation No. 3: "Seek advice from our Congressional delegation on how to best proceed with Alternatives Analysis for the Milwaukie and I-205 corridors and not unduly jeopardize future funding options for these corridors or for the Westside Corridor."

In discussion on the motion, Councilor Van Bergen took issue with the wording of Recommendation No. 2 and felt it should instead state "Reconfirm that we shall proceed" rather than "it is our desire to proceed" (relating to the Alternatives Analysis for the Milwaukie and I-205 corridors).

Bob Bothman questioned whether Recommendations 2 and 5 were consistent.

The motion was then amended to delete Recommendation No. 5. The motion, as amended, CARRIED. Councilor Van Bergen dissented.

RESOLUTION NO. 90-1189 - JPACT BYLAWS

Andy Cotugno reviewed the three amendments proposed to the JPACT Bylaws. Clifford Clark raised the following concerns:

- Whether the largest city represented from a county should convene a forum to take remedial action against unexcused absences (as noted in Article V, clause g).

- That Section 2f under Article IV be changed to read "Members and alternate from the State of Washington will be either elected officials or principal staff representatives from Clark County, the cities of Clark County, the Washington Department of Transportation and or C-TRAN......"

- Rather than members and alternates from the Cities of Multnomah, Washington and Clackamas Counties being appointed through use of a mail ballot, he suggested nomination through the Transportation Coordinating Committees.

- No mention or specification of special meetings was made in Article Va.

- Clarification of intent and power of subcommittees.

Action Taken: The Committee agreed to defer action on this matter to the February 8 JPACT meeting. Councilor Van Bergen requested that Clifford Clark submit any proposed amendments in writing for consideration of the members at that time.
RESOLUTION NO. 90-1177 - AMENDING THE TPAC BYLAWS

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval of Resolution No. 90-1177 amending the TPAC bylaws. Motion PASSED unanimously.

RESOLUTION 90-1200 - ALLOCATING THE INTERSTATE REGIONAL RESERVE AND AMENDING THE TIP ACCORDINGLY

Andy Cotugno reported that TPAC was supportive of Recommendations 1 and 2. Other options for Recommendations 3 and 4 were for arterial-type projects to be allocated through a formula approach or a discretionary basis. Andy then reviewed the alternative projects as noted in the Staff Report.

Clifford Clark questioned whether there are additional needs for the Banfield Freeway. Don Adams responded that this is the last requirement on the Banfield.

Councilor Van Bergen pointed out past history on the Banfield when concern was raised in UMTA over Section 9 funds being transferred for operating purposes. Andy noted that Recommendation No. 4 would allow funding for expansion of the light rail fleet. He explained that TPAC's recommendation is to approve the resolution or, if another alternative is preferred, to recommend approval of Recommendations 1 and 2 and refer the remainder of the proposal back to the TIP Subcommittee.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval of Resolution 90-1200 allocating the Interstate Transfer Regional Reserve and amending the TIP accordingly. It was noted for the record that approval of Recommendation No. 3 (pertaining to the $2 million toward Convention Center area transportation improvements) does not allocate funds for hotel site acquisition for Project Breakeven.

In discussion on the motion, Commissioner Lindquist suggested approving Recommendations 1, 2 and 4 but raised questions pertaining to funds for the Convention Center transportation improvements.

The motion CARRIED. Craig Lomnicki, Ed Lindquist, George Van Bergen and Marge Schmunk dissented.

WESTSIDE STATUS REPORT

Chairman Ragsdale referred this agenda item to the February 8 JPACT meeting.
ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Rena Cusma
           Dick Engstrom
           JPACT Members
SCHEDULE HIGHLIGHTS

AUG '89  ALIGNMENT OPTIONS
         CONSULTANT CONTRACTS
SEP '89  UMTA REPORTS
OCT '89- MAR '90  DESIGN /
               ENVIRONMENTAL WORK
MAR '90  SDEIS AVAILABLE FOR
          PUBLIC REVIEW
APR '90  PUBLIC HEARING ON SDEIS
MAY '90  STAFF RECOMMENDATION
JUN/JUL '90  LOCAL DECISION
SEP '90  FEIS
          PRELIMINARY DESIGN REPORT
          FINANCIAL PLAN
          COMPLETION OF PE

WESTSIDE CORRIDOR PROJECT
Coordinating development of MAX and highway improvements on the Westside
REVISED 11/13/89
Downtown Portland to SW 185th

Ridership for all options is approximately 30,000 daily passengers in 2005.

All options assume Washington Park Zoo station; a long tunnel with no zoo station would cost $19.8 million less.

All options assume Burlington-Northern route through Central Beaverton; an alternate route on Henry Street would cost approximately $10.3 million more, and displace 6 additional businesses and 8 homes.

### Estimated Capital Cost (millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Estimated Capital Cost</th>
<th>Estimated Travel Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Tunnel</td>
<td>$496.3</td>
<td>27 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Tunnel</td>
<td>$446.2</td>
<td>28 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Surface</td>
<td>$450.9</td>
<td>28 min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Stations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Tunnel</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Tunnel</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Surface</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Park & Ride Lots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Parking Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Tunnel</td>
<td>3,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Tunnel</td>
<td>3,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Surface</td>
<td>3,530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Light Rail Vehicles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Light Rail Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Tunnel</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Tunnel</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Surface</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Estimated Travel Time

(Downtown Portland to SW 185th)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Estimated Travel Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Tunnel</td>
<td>27 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Tunnel</td>
<td>28 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Surface</td>
<td>28 min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Right of Way Acquisitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Homes</th>
<th>Businesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Tunnel</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Tunnel</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Surface</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Short-Tunnel and All-Surface options have station and Park & Ride at Sylvan; long tunnel does not.
2. Today's rush-hour bus travel time: 40 minutes.
Date: January 29, 1990

To: JPACT

From: Andrew C. Cotugno, Transportation Director

Re: Local Government Dues Assessment

In accordance with ORS 268, the Metro Council must notify local governments of the planned dues assessment 120 days prior to the start of the fiscal year (or by March 1). In addition, Metro must consult with a "local government advisory committee" to determine whether it is necessary to assess the dues.

In the past, Metro has convened a separate local government advisory committee for this specific purpose due to the lack of such a committee for the Planning and Development aspect of the agency. Now that the Urban Growth Management Policy Advisory Committee is in place, such committees are available for both the Planning and Development and Transportation aspects of Metro's local government dues functions. As such, it is proposed that these two committees serve this review function -- JPACT for use of dues for Transportation Planning and UGMPAC for Planning and Development. TPAC will be asked to review the Transportation Department's portion of the local government dues assessment and make a recommendation to JPACT.

ACC: lmk

CC: Rena Cusma
    Richard Carson
CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 90-1213 FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING THE ASSESSMENT OF DUES TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FOR FY 1990-91.

Date: January 24, 1990
Presented by: Andrew Cotugno
Rich Carson

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

Assessment Authorization and Procedure

ORS 268.513 (Exhibit A) authorizes the Metro Council to:

"charge the cities and counties within the District for the services and activities carried out under ORS 268.380 and 268.390."

If the Council follows the recommendation of the Local Government Advisory Committee and determines that it is necessary to charge these local governments, it must establish the total amount to be charged and assess each city and county on the basis of population. The assessment cannot exceed $.51 per capita per year.

In making the assessment, the Council is required to notify each city, county, Tri-Met and the Port of Portland of its intent to assess and the amount of the assessment at least 120 days before the beginning of the fiscal year for which the charge will be made. The notification for the FY 1990-91 assessment must be made prior to March 2, 1990. Assessments must be paid before October 1, 1990.

TPAC has reviewed the proposed dues assessment and recommends approval of Resolution No. 90-1213.

Proposed FY 1990-91 Assessment

The attached (Exhibit B) shows the population figures and proposed assessment schedule. The values are based upon the latest certified population figures from the Center for Population Research and Census at Portland State University. Each county's unincorporated population estimate is based upon data provided by the Center for Population Research and Census using a formula devised by Metro staff (Exhibit C).

The total assessment at 51¢ per capita for cities and counties and at 12.5 percent of that rate for Tri-Met and the Port of Portland is $658,432. Consistent with the FY 89-90 budget, the proposed distribution to Metro's planning functions are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>FY 89-90</th>
<th>Proposed FY 90-91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Department</td>
<td>$397,000</td>
<td>$405,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Development Dept.</td>
<td>$247,773</td>
<td>$253,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$644,773</strong></td>
<td><strong>$658,432</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transportation Department**

Use of the dues for Transportation Planning generally falls into the following major categories:

1. **Grant Match - $122,000** - The dues plus ODOT and Tri-Met local match are used to leverage federal funding toward Transportation Planning. The program areas, which will be fully described in the FY 91 Unified Work Program, include:

   - Model Refinement
   - Regional Transportation Plan
   - I-205, Milwaukie, Hillsboro Alternatives Analyses
   - Transportation Improvement Program
   - Bi-State Study
   - Southeast Corridor Study
   - Cornell/Burnside Traffic Study
   - Regional LRT System Plan
   - Management and Coordination

2. **Data Resource Center - $168,000** - The Data Resource Center publishes periodic updates of historical and forecasted population and employment growth throughout the Portland metropolitan area. In addition, the Regional Land Information System (RLIS) is under development to improve the quality and utility of land use-related data. Funding sources for the Data Resource Center include dues, transportation grants, solid waste fees and Metro's General Fund. Of the total budget, the dues share is approximately 25 percent. Revenues collected from data sales are used to reduce the dues share of this budget.

3. **Direct Project Costs - $115,000** - A variety of project costs that may not be grant eligible are funded with 100 percent dues funding. Included are various costs such as furniture, supplies, computers, training, travel, support from public affairs and legal counsel and support in participating in development of state land use requirements affecting transportation planning.

**Planning and Development Department**

Dues are used to support the Department's regional planning programs on a proportionate basis. Dues are proposed to be expended as follows:
Metro Excise Tax

The Metro Council is currently contemplating imposition of an excise tax on its enterprise functions to provide a source of funding for the general government functions of Metro. The effect of this action on Metro's planning functions is significant.

1. Overhead Rate - Each of Metro's department cost for support services (such as utilities, accounting, etc.) will be reduced when the general government function begins paying a share of the support service costs. This results in a reduced overhead charge on all Transportation Department planning projects and therefore all dues and grant-funded activities.

2. Reduction of Dues - The Metro Council will consider as part of the FY 90-91 budget process a reduction of the dues with some of the dues-funded functions of the Planning and Development Department funded through the excise tax instead. This potentially represents a reduction to a dues assessment of 30-35¢ per capita.

3. RLIS Implementation Schedule - The Metro Council will be considering whether to accelerate the implementation schedule for RLIS from 28 months to 16 months through contracting out a portion of the development work. Up to $150,000 of consultant support is feasible of which a portion could be dues-funded if the excise tax results in a reduction of the dues. Metro staff is recommending a one-third share from dues funding or $50,000. If this recommendation is adopted, the total dues assessment would be 35-40¢ per capita.

The final decision on whether an excise tax is imposed, at what level and for what purposes will be finalized by July 1, 1990. In addition, the tax is not final until after the referral period is concluded. As such, the notification to local governments on the dues assessment required by March 2, 1990 will be for 51¢ per capita. If an excise tax results in a reduction in the dues, the billings to be sent out after July 1, 1990 will be for the reduced level that is finally adopted through the budget process.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends adoption of Resolution No. 90-1213.
268.513 Service charge for planning functions of district. (1) The council shall consult with the advisory committee appointed under ORS 268.170 before determining whether it is necessary to charge the cities and counties within the district for the services and activities carried out under ORS 268.380 and 268.390. If the council determines that it is necessary to charge cities and counties within the district for any fiscal year, it shall determine the total amount to be charged and shall assess each city and county with the portion of the total amount as the population of the portion of the city or county within the district bears to the total population of the district provided, however, that the service charge shall not exceed the rate of 51 cents per capita per year. For the purposes of this subsection the population of a county does not include the population of any city situated within the boundaries of that county. The population of each city and county shall be determined in the manner prescribed by the council.

(2) The council shall notify each city and county of its intent to assess and the amount it proposes to assess each city and county at least 120 days before the beginning of the fiscal year for which the charge will be made.

(3) The decision of the council to charge the cities and counties within the district, and the amount of the charge upon each, shall be binding upon those cities and counties. Cities and counties shall pay their charge on or before October 1 of the fiscal year for which the charge has been made.

(4) When the council determines that it is necessary to impose the service charges authorized under subsection (1) of this section for any fiscal year, each mass transit district organized under ORS chapter 267 and port located wholly or partly within the district shall also pay a service charge to the district for that fiscal year for the services and activities carried out under ORS 268.380 and 268.390. The charge for a mass transit district or port shall be the amount obtained by applying, for the population of the mass transit district or port within the boundaries of the district, a per capita charge that is 12 1/2 percent of the per capita rate established for cities and counties for the same fiscal year. Subsections (2) and (3) of this section apply to charges assessed under this subsection.
FY 90-91 METRO DUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>POP 1989</th>
<th>ASSESS. @ $.51/</th>
<th>IN METRO</th>
<th>TOTAL COUNTY</th>
<th>NOT IN METRO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLACKAMAS CO. (Unincorp.)</td>
<td>91790</td>
<td>$46,812.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone</td>
<td>9685</td>
<td>$4,939.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy Valley</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>$780.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson City</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>$244.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Oswego</td>
<td>29428</td>
<td>$15,008.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukie</td>
<td>18830</td>
<td>$9,603.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon City</td>
<td>14975</td>
<td>$7,637.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivergrove</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>$170.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Linn</td>
<td>14270</td>
<td>$7,277.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilsonville</td>
<td>5800</td>
<td>$2,958.00</td>
<td>187123</td>
<td>265500</td>
<td>78377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTNOMAH CO. (Unincorp.)</td>
<td>67735</td>
<td>$34,544.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>$1,007.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gresham</td>
<td>65470</td>
<td>$33,389.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maywood Park</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>$423.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>432175</td>
<td>$220,409.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troutdale</td>
<td>7375</td>
<td>$3,761.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Village</td>
<td>2610</td>
<td>$1,331.10</td>
<td>578170</td>
<td>581000</td>
<td>2830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON CO. (Unincorp.)</td>
<td>126036</td>
<td>$62,278.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaverton</td>
<td>44265</td>
<td>$22,575.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelius</td>
<td>5105</td>
<td>$2,603.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>$408.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Grove</td>
<td>12180</td>
<td>$6,211.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td>33810</td>
<td>$17,243.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King City</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>$997.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwood</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>$1,530.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigard</td>
<td>27050</td>
<td>$13,795.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tualatin</td>
<td>13340</td>
<td>$6,803.40</td>
<td>267541</td>
<td>295000</td>
<td>27459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Assessment</td>
<td>1032835</td>
<td>$526,745.60</td>
<td>1032835</td>
<td>1141500</td>
<td>108665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
<td></td>
<td>$65,843.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
<td></td>
<td>$65,843.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROPOSED ASSESSMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>$658,432.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Population estimates are based on the July 1, 1989 certified estimates of population for Oregon prepared by the Center for Population Research and Census, Portland State University. The unincorporated county population estimate inside Metro is based upon data from the 1980 U.S. Census and from the 1980 Center for Population Research and Census estimates.

**CLACKAMAS COUNTY**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989 Unincorporated population estimate</td>
<td>= 152317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 Census unincorporated population</td>
<td>= 146265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>= 6052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6052 / 146265</td>
<td>= 0.0414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0414 * 88143 (1980 inside Metro)</td>
<td>= 3647</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3647 + 88143 (1980 inside Metro)</td>
<td>= 91790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MULTNOMAH COUNTY**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989 Unincorporated population estimate</td>
<td>= 70565</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 Census unincorporated population</td>
<td>= 150839</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>= -80274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-80274 / 150839</td>
<td>= -0.5322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.5322 * 144790 (1980 inside Metro)</td>
<td>= -77055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-77055 + 144790 (1980 inside Metro)</td>
<td>= 67735</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WASHINGTON COUNTY**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989 Unincorporated population estimate</td>
<td>= 151845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 Census unincorporated population</td>
<td>= 141368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>= 10477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10477 / 141368</td>
<td>= 0.0741</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0741 * 117340 (1980 inside Metro)</td>
<td>= 8696</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8696 + 117340 (1980 inside Metro)</td>
<td>= 126036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHEREAS, ORS 268.513 authorizes the Council of the Metropolitan Service District (Metro) to "charge the cities and counties within the District for the services and activities carried out under ORS 268.380 and 268.390"; and

WHEREAS, Metro Ordinance 84-180 requires the Metro Council to seek the advice of the Local Government Advisory Committee regarding the assessment of dues as authorized by ORS 268.513; and

WHEREAS, The Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation and the Urban Growth Management Policy Advisory Committee were appointed as the Local Government Advisory Committee by Resolution No. 90-1212 and this requirement has been fulfilled; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That the Metro Council hereby establishes local government dues assessment within the District in the amount of $.51 per capita for FY 1990-91.

2. That notification of the assessment be sent to all cities and counties within the District, Tri-Met and the Port of
Portland prior to March 2, 1990.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this ___ day of February, 1990.

Tanya Collier, Presiding Officer
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CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 90-1189 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION (JPACT) BYLAWS

Date: December 5, 1989 Presented by: Andrew C. Cotugno

PROPOSED ACTION

Adoption of this resolution by JPACT and the Metro Council would establish bylaws for JPACT defining roles, responsibilities, membership and other operating procedures. These bylaws, as proposed, largely codify existing practices. One addition is also proposed as an amendment -- to add membership to JPACT for all Oregon cities with a population in excess of 60,000. At this time, this would result in the addition of the City of Gresham to the Committee.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

On January 10, 1989, the Clark County Intergovernmental Resource Center requested the addition of C-TRAN as a member of JPACT to represent the transit interests in Clark County. Subsequently, on March 10, 1989, the City of Gresham requested a seat on JPACT independent of the "Cities of Multnomah County" to represent the majority of population in the East Multnomah County area. In order to consider these requests and to review the overall role and responsibilities of JPACT, a JPACT Membership Committee was formed at the May 11, 1989 JPACT meeting consisting of the following individuals:

Mike Ragsdale, Committee Chair, Metro  
Earl Blumenauer, Portland  
Pauline Anderson, Multnomah County  
Clifford Clark, Cities of Washington County  
Scott Collier, Vancouver  
Bob Bothman, ODOT  
Gary Demich, WDOT

The Committee met on a number of occasions to review the current JPACT operations, consider possible changes in organizational structure and develop an overall recommendation for consideration. Since JPACT bylaws have never been adopted, it was the general consensus of the Committee that recommendations regarding committee roles, responsibilities and membership be established through adoption of a set of bylaws. Major issues discussed by the Committee included:
a. Whether there should be one Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Portland-Vancouver area, or two, as there is now.

b. With two MPO's, whether representation from Washington on JPACT should be restricted to one member or expanded to four with the addition of C-TRAN.

c. If Gresham is added, whether additional "city" representatives should be added from other parts of the region -- either through a population threshold of 30-40,000 or simply by adding an additional "city" representative from each county.

d. Whether the Metro Council needs to approve JPACT actions, how the MPO designation has been made, and whether a Council change to a JPACT action would affect the MPO designation.

e. Concern over the current inequity in representation with the ability of voting members with little or no direct transportation operating responsibility being able to out-vote those members with the majority of operating responsibility.

f. Whether to change to a weighted vote to more accurately reflect population.

g. Concern over the size of the Committee, the need for a smaller working group, and the need to reduce the demands on individuals resulting from numerous subcommittees.

h. Whether to form an Executive Committee to handle routine JPACT business.

i. Whether to make future changes in the bylaws difficult through a two-thirds vote requirement.

j. Whether to include an automatic sunset clause to ensure the issue is revisited if a major change in structure is adopted.

k. Whether JPACT membership should be restricted to elected officials and board members or open to staff representatives from designated agencies.

In addition, background material was provided to the full JPACT on statutory authority (state and federal), population shares for each voting member, current appointment procedures for "city" representatives, current TPAC bylaws and current membership for the Clark County Intergovernmental Resource Center, Washington County Transportation Coordinating Committee, East Multnomah County Transportation Committee and Clackamas County Transportation Committee.
At the September 14, 1989 JPACT meeting, a "draft" set of bylaws were reviewed and a series of options to the status quo were discussed:

Option 1: To reduce JPACT membership;

Option 2: To increase JPACT membership; and

Option 3: To create an Executive Committee with expanded membership on the full JPACT and reduced membership on the Executive Committee.

Based upon discussion at the JPACT meeting and a subsequent Membership Committee meeting, a recommended set of bylaws were presented to the November 9, 1989 JPACT meeting. The key components of the recommendation were as follows:

a. The bylaws identified existing roles and provided for eventual inclusion of an Arterial Fund when it is established.

b. Actions requiring Council approval were identified to include Council approval; the remainder were identified on a JPACT-only action.

c. Membership was recommended to be expanded to include C-TRAN and one additional "city" representative from each county.

d. An Executive Committee was recommended with 9-11 members to serve in an advisory capacity on all action items scheduled for the full JPACT.

e. Membership from Tri-Met and the Port of Portland was recommended to be restricted to board members only.

f. Amendment to the bylaws was recommended to require a two-thirds vote of the full JPACT and a two-thirds vote of the Metro Council.

There was, however, general disagreement by many JPACT members that many of these changes should be adopted. There was particular disagreement to increases in membership and formation of an Executive Committee. At the instruction of the Chair, a bylaws proposal was recommended for consideration at the December 14, 1989 meeting that largely institutionalizes status quo. As such, the bylaws recommended for adoption by this resolution include the following key components:

a. Existing roles and responsibilities are identified.
b. All JPACT actions are forwarded to the Metro Council for adoption; the Council will adopt or refer the item back to JPACT with specific recommendations on all actions except the Regional Transportation Plan; final adoption of the Regional Transportation Plan as a regional functional plan rests with the Metro Council.

c. Membership is retained at the status quo, with the exception that the three State of Washington seats can be filled by Vancouver, Clark County, WDOT or C-TRAN.

d. Members from agencies can be board members or principal staff.

e. An Executive Committee is not recommended.

In addition to the bylaws as recommended by this resolution, also included is an amendment for consideration. The amendment would add JPACT membership for all cities exceeding 60,000 population, which would include the City of Gresham at this time.

During the process, letters were received from Clark County IRC, Washington County, Tri-Met, Gresham and Lake Oswego (attached).

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends approval of Resolution No. 90-1189.
BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

RESOLUTION NO. 90-1189
Introduced by
Mike Ragsdale,
Presiding Officer

WHEREAS, Title 23 of the Code of Federal Regulations,
Part 450, and Title 45, Part 613, require establishment of a
Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) in each urbanized area; and

WHEREAS, These regulations require that principal
elected officials of general purpose local governments be repre-
sented on the Metropolitan Planning Organization to the extent
agreed to among the units of local government and the governor; and

WHEREAS, The Governor of the State of Oregon, on Novem-
ber 6, 1979, designated the Metropolitan Service District as the
Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Oregon portion of the
Portland urbanized area; and

WHEREAS, The Governor of the State of Washington, on
January 1, 1979, designated the Intergovernmental Resource Center
of Clark County as the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the
Washington portion of the Portland-Vancouver urbanized area; and

WHEREAS, ORS 268 requires the Metropolitan Service
District to prepare and adopt a functional plan for transportation; and
WHEREAS, The involvement of local elected officials and representatives from transportation operating agencies is essential for the successful execution of these responsibilities; now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED:

That the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation and the Council of the Metropolitan Service District adopt the JPACT Bylaws as shown in Exhibit A.

ADOPTED by the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation this ___ day of ____________, 1990.

Mike Ragsdale, JPACT Chair

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this ___ day of ____________, 1990.

Mike Ragsdale, Presiding Officer
EXHIBIT A

JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION (JPACT)

BYLAWS

ARTICLE I

This committee shall be known as the JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION (JPACT).

ARTICLE II

MISSION

It is the mission of JPACT to coordinate the development of plans defining required regional transportation improvements, to develop a consensus of governments on the prioritization of required improvements and to promote and facilitate the implementation of identified priorities.

ARTICLE III

PURPOSE

Section 1. The purpose of JPACT is as follows:

a. To provide the forum of general purpose local governments and transportation agencies required for designation of the Metropolitan Service District as the metropolitan planning organization for the Oregon urbanized portion of the Portland metropolitan area and to provide a mechanism for coordination and consensus on regional transportation priorities and to advocate for their implementation.

b. To provide recommendations to the Metro Council under state land use requirements for the purpose of adopting and enforcing the Regional Transportation Plan.

c. To coordinate on transportation issues of bi-state significance with the Clark County, Washington metropolitan planning organization and elected officials.

d. (Pending establishment of an Urban Arterial Fund) To establish the program of projects for disbursement from the Urban Arterial Fund.
Section 2. In accordance with these purposes, the principal duties of JPACT are as follows:

a. To approve and submit to the Metro Council for adoption the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and periodic amendments.

b. To approve and submit to the Metro Council for adoption short and long-range growth forecasts and periodic amendments upon which the RTP and other Metro functional plans will be based.

c. To approve and submit to the Metro Council for adoption the Unified Work Program (UWP) and periodic amendments for the Oregon and Washington portions of the metropolitan area. The Metro Council will adopt the recommended action or refer it back to JPACT with a recommendation for amendment.

d. To approve and submit to the Metro Council for adoption the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and periodic amendments. The Metro Council will adopt the recommended action or refer it back to JPACT with a recommendation for amendment.

e. To approve and submit to the Metro Council for adoption the transportation portion of the State Implementation Plan for Air Quality Attainment for submission to the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. The Metro Council will adopt the recommended action or refer it back to JPACT with a recommendation for amendment.

f. To periodically adopt positions that represent the consensus agreement of the governments throughout the region on transportation policy matters, including adoption of regional priorities on federal funding, the Surface Transportation Act, the Six-Year Highway Improvement Program priorities and regional priorities for LRT funding. The Metro Council will adopt the recommended action or refer it back to JPACT with a recommendation for amendment.

g. To review and comment on the RTP and TIP for the Clark County portion of the metropolitan area and include in the RTP and TIP for the Oregon urbanized portion of the metropolitan area a description of issues of bi-state significance and how they are being addressed.

h. To review and comment, as needed, on the regional components of local comprehensive plans, public facility plans and transportation plans and programs of ODOT, Tri-Met and the local jurisdictions.
ARTICLE IV
COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. Membership

a. The Committee will be made up of representatives of the following jurisdictions and agencies:

- City of Portland ..................... 1
- Multnomah County ................... 1
- Washington County ................... 1
- Clackamas County .................... 1
- Cities of Multnomah County ........... 1
- Cities of Washington County ........... 1
- Cities of Clackamas County ........... 1
- Oregon Department of Transportation. .... 1
- Tri-Met. ................................ 1
- Port of Portland ...................... 1
- Department of Environmental Quality .. 1
- Metropolitan Service District (Metro) .... 3
- State of Washington ................... 3

TOTAL 17

b. Alternates may be appointed to serve in the absence of the regular members.

c. Members and alternates will be individuals in a position to represent the policy interests of their jurisdiction.

Section 2. Appointment of Members and Alternates

a. Members and alternates from the City of Portland and the Counties of Multnomah, Washington and Clackamas will be elected officials from those jurisdictions and will be appointed by the chief elected official of the jurisdiction. The member and alternate will serve until removed by the appointing jurisdiction.

b. Members and alternates from the Cities of Multnomah, Washington and Clackamas Counties will be elected officials from the represented cities and will be appointed through the use of a mail ballot of all represented cities based upon a consensus field of candidates developed through a forum convened by the largest city being represented. The member and alternate will be from different jurisdictions. The member and alternate will serve for two-year terms. In the event the member's position is vacated, the alternate will automatically become member and complete the original term of office. The member and alternate will periodically consult with the appropriate transportation coordinating committees for their area.
c. Members and alternates from the two statewide agencies (Oregon Department of Environmental Quality and Oregon Department of Transportation) will be a principal staff representative of the agency and will be appointed by the director of the agency. The member and alternate will serve until removed by the appointing agency.

d. Members and alternates from the two tri-county agencies (Tri-Met and the Port of Portland) will be appointed by the chief board member of the agency. The member and alternate will serve until removed by the appointing agency.

e. Members and alternate from the Metropolitan Service District will be elected officials and will be appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Metro Council in consultation with the Metro Executive Officer and will represent a broad cross-section of geographic areas. The members and alternate will serve until removed by the Presiding Officer of the Metro Council.

f. Members and alternate from the State of Washington will be either elected officials or principal staff representatives from Clark County, the cities of Clark County, the Washington Department of Transportation or C-TRAN. The members will be appointed by the Clark County Intergovernmental Resource Center and will serve until removed by the appointing agency.

ARTICLE V
MEETINGS, CONDUCT OF MEETINGS, QUORUM

a. Regular meetings of the Committee will be held monthly at a time and place established by the chairperson. Special meetings may be called by the chairperson or a majority of the membership.

b. A majority of the voting members (or designated alternates) of the full Committee shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of business. The act of a majority of those present at meetings at which a quorum is present shall be the act of the Committee.

c. Subcommittees to develop recommendations for JPACT can be appointed by the Chair. The Chair will consult on subcommittee membership and charge with the full membership at a regularly scheduled meeting. Subcommittee members can include JPACT members, JPACT alternates and/or outside experts.

d. All meetings shall be conducted in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised.

e. The Committee may establish other rules of procedure as deemed necessary for the conduct of business.
f. Each member shall be entitled to one (1) vote on all issues presented at regular and special meetings of the Committee. In the absence of the member, the alternate shall be entitled to one (1) vote. The chairperson shall vote only in case of a tie.

g. Unexcused absence from regularly scheduled meetings for three (3) consecutive months shall require the chairperson to notify the appointing agency with a request for remedial action. In the case of the representative for the "cities" of Multnomah, Washington and Clackamas Counties, the chairperson will contact the largest city being represented to convene a forum of represented cities to take remedial action.

h. The Committee shall make its reports and findings public and available to the Metro Council.

i. Metro shall provide staff, as necessary, to record the actions of the Committee and to handle Committee business, correspondence and public information.

ARTICLE VI
OFFICERS AND DUTIES

a. The chairperson and vice-chairperson of the Committee shall be designated by the Metro Presiding Officer.

b. The chairperson shall preside at all meetings he/she attends and shall be responsible for the expeditious conduct of the Committee's business.

c. In the absence of the chairperson, the vice-chairperson shall assume the duties of the chairperson.

ARTICLE VII
RECOGNITION OF TPAC

a. The Committee will take into consideration the alternatives and recommendations of the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) in the conduct of its business.

ARTICLE VIII
AMENDMENTS

a. These bylaws may be amended or repealed only by a two-thirds vote of the full membership of the Committee and a two-thirds vote of the Metro Council.

BYLAWS.NEW
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Article IV - Committee Membership

Section 1. Membership

City of Gresham ............................................. 1

Total 18

Section 2. Appointment of Members and Alternates

c. Member(s) and alternate(s) from all Oregon cities with population in excess of 60,000 will be elected officials from those jurisdictions and will be appointed by the chief elected official of the jurisdiction. The member(s) and alternate(s) will serve until removed by the appointing jurisdiction.
Article IV - Committee Membership

Section 2. Appointment of Members and Alternates

b. Members and alternates from the Cities of Multnomah, Washington and Clackamas Counties will be elected officials from the represented cities and will be appointed through the use of a mail ballot of all represented cities based upon a consensus field of candidates developed through a forum convened by the largest city being represented. The member and alternate will be from different jurisdictions, one of which will be from the city of largest population (after the City of Portland). The member and alternate will serve for two-year terms. In the event the member's position is vacated, the alternate will automatically become member and complete the original term of office. The member and alternate will periodically consult with the appropriate transportation coordinating committees for their area.
JPACT BYLAWS

- PROPOSED AMENDMENT #3 -

Article VIII - Amendments

a. These bylaws may be amended or repealed only by a [two-thirds] majority vote of the full membership of the Committee and a [two-thirds] majority vote of the Metro Council.
JPACT BYLAWS

- PROPOSED AMENDMENT #4 -
Submitted by Clifford Clark

Article V - Meetings, Conduct of Meetings, Quorum

a. Regular meetings of the Committee will be held monthly at a time and place established by the chairperson. Special meetings may be called by the chairperson or a majority of the membership. No special meeting may be held without five working days' notice to members and alternates.

b. A majority of the voting members (or designated alternates) of the full Committee shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of business. The act of a majority of those present at meetings at which a quorum is present shall be the act of the Committee, except for amendments to these bylaws.

c. Subcommittees to develop recommendations for JPACT can be appointed by the Chair. The Chair will consult on subcommittee membership and charge with the full membership at a regularly scheduled meeting. Subcommittees members can include JPACT members, JPACT alternates and/or outside experts. JPACT members shall hold a majority of the seats on any subcommittee.
PROPOSED AMENDMENT #5

JPACT BYLAWS

Article IV - Committee Membership

Section 2. Appointment of Members and Alternates

f. Members and alternate from the State of Washington will be either elected officials or principal staff representatives from Clark County, the cities of Clark County the city of Vancouver, the Washington Department of Transportation, or and C-TRAN. The members will be appointed by the Clark-County-Intergovernmental Resource Center Clark County, the city of Vancouver, the Washington Department of Transportation and C-Tran and will serve until removed by the appointing agencies. The three Washington members will be selected by the IRC Transportation Policy Committee.

Date: January 31, 1990
Presented by: Andrew C. Cotugno

PROPOSED ACTION

This resolution will amend Resolution No. 89-1134A which adopted the region's priorities for inclusion in the ODOT Six-Year Program update as follows:

- In accordance with the resolution reconfirming the priority of those projects currently committed for funding in the Six-Year Program, the Terwilliger Bridge replacement is recognized as one such project.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

Since adoption of Resolution No. 89-1134A, the following two items have been requested by Portland and Multnomah County:

1. Terwilliger Bridge -- Replacement of the Terwilliger Bridge over I-5 is proposed due to the structural deficiency of this bridge as well as the need to redesign it in accordance with the scheduled interchange upgrade on I-5 at Terwilliger and Barbur. The project was previously included as a regional priority and committed for funding by ODOT using federal bridge replacement (HBR) funding. When HBR funds dried up, ODOT gave a preliminary indication that Interstate-4R funding would be used instead due to the integral nature of the new bridge with the upgraded interchange. This funding commitment has not as yet been made by ODOT. This resolution requests that ODOT include this project in their next update.

2. Sandy Boulevard, east of I-205 -- There have been recent requests by the business community along Sandy Boulevard to program improvements to handle recent and expected growth in the area. In response, ODOT has completed a traffic study and identified which improvements are needed now, within a 5-10 year timeframe and in the long range. Based upon the ranking criteria used for the other Six-Year Program priorities, the following phases of improvement ranked as follows (see Attachment A):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-205 - 102nd</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102nd - 112th</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112th - 181st</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181st - 207th</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Resolution No. 89-1134A, the minimum score required for inclusion was 15 which is not met by any of these projects. As such, they are not recommended as regional priorities at this time. In addition, Sandy Boulevard is one of many ODOT arterials in the Portland metro area that ODOT has indicated is not of statewide significance and, therefore, they are seeking to transfer jurisdiction to Portland and Multnomah County. In order to gain a commitment from ODOT to fund these improvements, it will likely be necessary for the local jurisdictions and property owners to develop a cost-sharing proposal that shares the financial burden.

**EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION**

The Executive Officer recommends approval of Resolution No. 90-1218.
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Attachment
## Project Rankings for the 1991-1996 Six-Year Program Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 50</td>
<td>1-205 - 102nd</td>
<td>Ramp Improvement</td>
<td>Low (1 pt.)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3,701.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 50</td>
<td>102nd - 112th</td>
<td>Widens to 5 Lanes</td>
<td>Low (1 pt.)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>129%</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,443.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 50</td>
<td>112th - 181st</td>
<td>Widens to 5 Lanes</td>
<td>Low (1 pt.)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26,494.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 50</td>
<td>181st - 1-84</td>
<td>Ramps</td>
<td>Low (1 pt.)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7,066.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terwilliger</td>
<td>Overcrossing</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>High (3 pts.)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1.025</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Med.</td>
<td>$5.9 m.</td>
<td>916.9</td>
<td>6,434.73</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Terwilliger Bridge)</td>
<td>Improve Access to 1-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE
REGION'S PRIORITY HIGHWAY IMPROVE-
MENTS FOR INCLUSION IN THE 1991-1996
ODOT SIX-YEAR HIGHWAY PROGRAM

) RESOLUTION NO. 90-1218
) Introduced by
) Tanya Collier,
) Presiding Officer

WHEREAS, Metro Resolution No. 89-1134A established the
region's priorities for inclusion of projects in the 1991-1996
ODOT Six-Year Program update; and

WHEREAS, Additional requests relating to the
Terwilliger Bridge have been submitted by Portland and Multnomah
County; and

WHEREAS, The Terwilliger Bridge was previously
identified as a regional priority and included in the previous
Six-Year Program; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That the Council of the Metropolitan Service Dis-
   trict reconfirms the Terwilliger Bridge as a previous regional
   priority commitment.

2. The staff is directed to forward this priority in
testimony during the appropriate hearings on the Six-Year Program
update by ODOT.

3. That this action is consistent with the Regional
Transportation Plan.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service
District this ___ day of ____________, 1990.

Tanya Collier, Presiding Officer
Date: January 29, 1990
To: JPACT
From: Andrew C. Cotugno, Transportation Director
Re: Surface Transportation Act Update

Attached is a set of draft JPACT principles for the next Surface Transportation Act Update. This is intended to serve as a means of reaching consensus on the region's priorities for the update for purposes of coordinating our legislative efforts in Washington, D.C. on this matter.
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Attachment
Surface Transportation Act Update
JPACT Policy Position

Major Principles

1. The Federal Government has a role in serving interstate, urban and rural transportation needs and federal involvement should be retained and enhanced.

2. The Federal Government should meet its full responsibility for interstate rehabilitation and modernization.

3. Addressing urban mobility and congestion is a national problem affecting national economic vitality and international competitiveness. Federal support for a comprehensive approach to addressing the urban mobility problem through the most cost-effective local improvement program of highways, transit and arterials should be adopted.

4. The gas tax commitment to the federal transit program should be significantly increased, especially for New Rail Starts.

5. General Fund support for Section 9 and Section 18 routine capital and operating assistance programs should be continued.

6. Incentives should be included for effective comprehensive land use planning.

Other Issues

1. There should be no federal restrictions on each state's ability to levy weight-mile taxes on trucks.

2. Federal funding programs, match ratios and requirements should support implementation of the most cost-effective solution and not create an artificial bias for freeway improvements vs. arterials vs. bus service vs. rail.

3. Aging of the American population creates a greater federal emphasis for elderly and disabled transportation.

4. Oregon should continue to have access to a discretionary bridge replacement and rehabilitation program.

5. Parking subsidies from employers as a tax deductible item should be treated equal to transit subsidies.

6. The "one-corridor-at-a-time" rule for New Rail Starts should be improved and rationalized to be responsive to the full spectrum of costs and benefits. More appropriate cost-effectiveness standards should be established.
Surface Transportation Act Update
JPACT Policy Position

Major Principles

1. The Federal Government has a role in serving interstate, urban and rural transportation needs and federal involvement should be retained and enhanced.

2. The Federal Government should meet its full responsibility for interstate rehabilitation and modernization.

3. Addressing urban mobility and congestion is a national problem affecting national economic vitality and international competitiveness. Federal support for a comprehensive approach to addressing the urban mobility problem through the most cost-effective local improvement program of highways, transit and arterials should be adopted.

4. The federal commitment to the transit program should be significantly increased, especially for New Rail Starts. In addition, the Section 9 and Section 18 routine capital and operating assistance programs should be at least continued or expanded.

5. Incentives should be included for effective comprehensive land use planning.

Other Issues

1. Federal funding programs, match ratios and requirements should support implementation of the most cost-effective solution and not create an artificial bias for freeway improvements vs. arterials vs. bus service vs. rail.

2. The "one corridor-at-a-time" rule for New Rail Starts should be improved and rationalized to be responsible to the full spectrum of costs and benefits. More appropriate cost-effectiveness standards should be established.

3. Aging of the American population creates a greater federal emphasis for elderly and disabled transportation.

4. Oregon should continue to have access to a discretionary bridge replacement and rehabilitation program.

5. Parking subsidies from employers as a tax deductible item should be treated equal to transit subsidies.

6. Each state should have the ability to levy taxes on trucks.
Ballot Measure 1 amends Oregon’s Constitution to provide local voter control over how local vehicle revenues can be used to meet local transportation needs. Public concern is mounting regarding how to maintain Oregon’s quality of life as the state’s population grows. How local transportation needs will be met is a particular concern. Ballot Measure 1 provides local voters a tool to meet this challenge.

Current state law already permits a local vehicle fee. Unfortunately, because of the way Oregon’s Constitution is written, local voters are not provided the opportunity to decide what type of transportation program best meets their local needs. The Oregon Constitution limits the option of using local vehicle fees to road improvements only. As a result, even if a community decides that the best use of their local vehicle revenue is a transportation program that combines road and transit improvements, the Constitution would not allow a local vote on this program.

The State Legislature proposed this amendment to Oregon’s Constitution to provide a complete scope of local voter control. The amendment grants local voters the right to decide the type of transportation program on which its local vehicle revenues can be spent.

Ballot Measure 1 will not add any new vehicle fees. It simply removes the constitutional restriction which prohibits local voters from determining the use of their local vehicle fees.
Executive Summary

of the American Public Transit Association’s
Transit 2000 Task Force
Final Report

No threat to the quality of life in our communities is greater than the continuing decline of mobility. Explosive growth in travel demand, inattention to transportation investment needs, the harmful consequences of land use decisions, and our insatiable appetite for automobile use are overwhelming our transportation systems and facilities. In turn, the increasing inability of those transportation systems to handle the efficient movement of people and goods undermines our regional economies, weakens our international economic competitiveness, and dramatically diminishes the quality of our environment.

In the face of these challenges, we are afforded a rare opportunity to fashion a new generation of national transportation policies, as current federal programs expire and new national leadership embarks on an effort to formulate new policies to guide future transportation investment in America.

In response to these challenges and opportunities, the APTA Transit 2000 Task Force was formed in 1987 to explore how we can create more productive and liveable communities, and to outline the major contribution that public transportation can make in that effort. The Task Force believes that the fundamental principles and program recommendations that are highlighted here reflect the kind of perspective that must govern transportation policy if we are to move wisely into the twenty-first century.

The conclusions of the Task Force, which are drawn from the 1989 Final Report, center on the need to:

— more closely integrate transportation and other national goals and policies;
— provide viable options to dependence on the auto;
— retool and redirect federal transportation programs to reflect the above; and,
— increase investment in the nation’s transportation systems and services.

The recommendations also serve to strongly reinforce the growing importance of public transportation in the years ahead.
THE FORCES

In communities across the country, we currently are faced with a daunting array of troubling conditions that are growing to crisis proportions. Our shared experience now includes:

— Intolerable and costly congestion on urban and suburban roads with too many vehicles seeking to use limited roadway facilities;
— Increasing isolation of rural residents, the poor, the elderly, those with disabilities, and willing workers from job opportunities;
— Poisoned air that already threatens the health of nearly 150 million Americans;
— Mounting dependence on foreign oil that has become a threat to national security and a major factor in the nation's trade deficit;
— Sluggish rural economic growth due, in part, to inadequate transportation services and facilities;
— Burgeoning urban and suburban development that has overwhelmed our ability to provide public facilities and services; and,
— Failure of our existing infrastructure, resulting from 20 years of chronic under-investment.

These conditions exist, in part, because our existing national transportation policies and programs are increasingly ineffective in meeting current and emerging needs. Current programs promote separation in the planning and funding of different facilities and they are largely unresponsive to the broader consequences of transportation investment decisions. The inflexible, categorical nature of existing programs limits how we deploy available resources and decreases the cost-effectiveness and efficiency of our investments. We remain bound by a traditional preoccupation with accommodating vehicles and an inattention to accommodating people. Finally, existing programs have become ineffective due to the lack of adequate funds, generally, and insufficient support for public transportation, specifically.

Our success as a nation in accommodating future demand for travel and mobility will determine whether we can arrest the problems that confront us or whether they will further diminish our national welfare.

In the next 32 years, by conservative estimates, the nation will experience the same increase in total travel that we have experienced in the last 32 years. If we attempt to cope with future growth in travel demand as we have in the past, through overwhelming reliance on single-occupancy, personal vehicles, the crises noted above will accelerate, further undercutting economic growth and our competitiveness as a nation, and degrading the quality of life for millions.

To avoid this prospect we must begin immediately to seek wiser ways to meet tomorrow's mobility needs. If we are successful, our transportation decisions can be decisive in taming the forces that threaten to immobilize us.

"Greater use of mass transit will in turn increase the capacity of our existing roads." — Rep. Roger Roy, Chairman, Transportation Committee, State House of Representatives, Dover, Delaware

"...if the largest single source of air pollution in this country is vehicle emissions, does it make any sense to design a federal clean air policy with no effort to entice people out of their cars...?" — David R. Boldt, Editorial Page Editor, The Philadelphia Enquirer

"In the United States alone, we could save 33 million gallons of gasoline each day and significantly reduce car air pollution if the average commuter passenger load were increased by one person." — Andrew Kimbrell, Environmental Law Attorney, Foundation on Economic Trends, Policy Director, Greenhouse Crisis Foundation
Enhanced Mobility

Enhanced mobility in the movement of people and goods is the fundamental goal to be served by a new generation of national transportation policies and programs.

One of the basic tenets of a new national policy aimed at enhancing mobility must be a commitment to reducing growth in vehicle-miles-traveled ("VMT") and meeting passenger travel demands without necessarily accepting continued, unrestrained growth in vehicle traffic.

The distinction between meeting the needs of passengers vs. accommodating ever-increasing numbers of vehicles is fundamental. We have a diminishing supply of roadway capacity and limited ability, resources, and will to expand our highway network aggressively. Added to this scenario is an increasingly harmful set of consequences associated with our dependence on single-occupancy vehicles.

With mobility as our basic goal, national policies and programs should result in a wider array of transportation options tailored to specific markets and designed to dampen growth in vehicle-miles of travel, and increase availability and use of transit and other forms of high-occupancy, shared-ride services.

National policy must be directed to making substantial progress in these terms, in order to better serve our mobility goals.

Integrating Transportation and Other National Goals

Problems of congestion, air quality, energy dependence, declining competitiveness of business and industry, declining rural economic well-being, and isolation of increasing numbers of our people traditionally have been addressed by national policy as independent problems. In fact, they are closely related, and nowhere is this relationship stronger than through the linkage provided by our transportation policies and investments.

One of the foremost challenges we face is to provide for our growing transportation needs in closer coordination with efforts to achieve other major national goals. Transportation investment decisions and the products of our transportation planning must be viewed directly as tools to increase economic growth, clean our air, conserve our energy resources, as well as improve mobility. Transportation investments that waste energy, foul our air, dissipate the economic strength, and unravel the social fabric of our communities must be challenged and rejected.

Our success in crafting a new generation of national transportation policies and programs will depend on how skillfully and at what pace we embrace mobility as a goal, and link transportation and other national policies and actions.
WHAT PUBLIC TRANSIT CAN DELIVER

Congestion Relief

Every bus full of passengers at rush hour removes 40 cars from traffic; every full rail car removes 75-125 cars from traffic; every van full of passengers removes 13 from traffic.

Reduced Highway Cost

One high-occupancy vehicle lane carries the same amount of people as three regular highway lanes.

Major highways can cost $100-120 million per mile; busways can be built for $4-12 million per mile; light rail for $10-20 million per mile and heavy rail for costs comparable or lower than major highways.

Energy Conservation

A savings of ten to 15 gallons of gasoline is realized every time 40 single-passenger-car drivers take a 10-mile trip to work on the bus.

30-40 million gallons of gasoline would be saved each day if average commuter-vehicle-occupancies were increased from 1.1 passengers per vehicle to 2.1 passengers per vehicle.

Air Quality

When one commuter leaves the car behind and uses transit to travel to and from work for one year, the health of millions of Americans can be improved through the removal of nine pounds of hydrocarbons, 63 pounds of carbon monoxide, five pounds of nitrogen oxides and one pound of particulates, annually.

Safety

The highway death toll—46,644 in 1988—can be reduced, along with 1.8 million annual auto-related injuries.

Economic Growth

Every $10 million in transit capital investment supports 770 jobs; every $10 million in transit operating investment supports 960 jobs.

Every $10 million in transit capital investment produces $33 million in business revenues.

Every $10 million in transit operating investment produces $30 million in business revenues.
THE FUTURE MISSION AND ROLE OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

The mission of public transportation in the years ahead must parallel closely new national goals and policy directions. Public transportation must serve to enhance mobility and, in the process contribute in a major way to the solution of problems that threaten our economy and quality of life.

In pursuing this mission, transit agencies and professionals will be faced with new and difficult challenges that will require often significant adaptations. The most important adaptations involve broadening the definition of public transit, diversifying services, and shouldering a clear responsibility to manage mobility.

“Viewed from a state’s perspective, it is unacceptable that the federal government should, on one hand, insist upon stringent clean air standards for urban and suburban areas while, on the other hand, reduce its commitment to mass transit.”
—Robert A. Innocenzi, Acting Commissioner, New Jersey Department of Transportation

“Massive highway construction will not ease traffic congestion — but only spread sprawl and congestion to new areas, and increase time lost in congestion, fuel consumption, and smog.”
—Dr. John Holtzclaw, Sierra Club

Diversification of Services

To promote enhanced mobility through increased transit use, the conventional definition of transit must be broadened to include a wider range of services tailored to particular markets and drawing on the full range of available resources. High-occupancy, shared-ride services of all types must be incorporated into our concept of public transportation and encouraged, coordinated, and supported through a new federal program.

Managing Mobility: Transit as a Catalyst

Transit agencies and professionals also must act aggressively as catalysts in the community and play a broader role as managers of mobility. This responsibility requires actions beyond the direct operation and management of on-street services. Coordinating, advising, and promoting better management of the supply of and the demand for transportation services are all part of this larger responsibility, including active participation in economic development and land use decisions.

Expanding and diversifying public transit and formalizing the responsibility for managing mobility must be basic strategies for the industry and national policy in the years ahead.

Measuring Success: A Two-Tiered Approach

Improved quality of service, increased performance and greater efficiency remain essential in the provision of transit services, and in the operation of our entire transportation system. The success and value of public transit, however, must be measured in broader terms through a new, two-tiered approach. At the national level, the focus should be directly on how well our transportation investments support achievement of major national goals. At the local level, direct attention must be paid to how those investments serve the unique and varied circumstances, goals, and priorities of the local communities and region. New national policies and programs must emphasize a more strategic view of what must be accomplished both nationally and locally, and provide a framework for measuring progress that is consistent with these broader views.
TEN PRINCIPLES TO GUIDE NATIONAL

As an initial step in reformulating national transportation policy and recrafting federal transportation programs, consensus must be reached on basic principles. To pursue the policy directions highlighted on page 3, the following 10 principles should be used to guide reformulation of the nation's surface transportation programs.

1. The federal surface transportation program should be restructured substantially in order to address more intelligently the mobility needs of the nation and ensure progress in meeting other national goals.

*Rationale:* Current highway and transit programs do not have the necessary responsiveness nor the flexibility to address current and emerging needs and problems; substantial restructuring makes sense only if done in combination with the addition of significantly increased federal resources.

2. The concept of transit should be broadened to encompass and promote increased availability and use of transit and other high-occupancy, shared-ride services in order to better serve diverse travel needs, and to reduce growth in vehicle-miles of travel while accommodating increased passenger-miles of travel.

*Rationale:* Federal goals must be stated clearly. Doing so invites closer linkage between mobility goals and broader national goals, it broadens the transit constituency, promotes investment in new mobility strategies and a broader range of services, and promotes relaxation of existing program restrictions. Each step, in turn, increases the attention paid to serving people rather than vehicles.

3. Existing regional decision-making authority over the use of federal transportation funds should be enhanced and strengthened.

*Rationale:* The local ability to assess needs, set priorities, and deploy resources in a regional context must be strengthened to better serve transportation and other major national and regional goals.

4. Greater flexibility should be allowed in the use of federal funds and a stronger multi-modal approach to planning, funding, and decision-making must be established.

*Rationale:* Better integration of transportation decisions, planning, and funding is necessary to make appropriate trade-offs between multiple goals and objectives on the local and regional level, to make more cost effective use of resources, and to reduce federal micro-management of resource decisions and administrative actions that restrict our ability to respond to emerging needs and problems.
TRANSPORTATION POLICY AND PROGRAMS

5. The reliability and predictability of federal funding must be improved through increased reliance on formula allocation, increased reliance on dedicated funding at the federal level, and expanded use of multi-year federal funding commitments.

Rationale: Recipients of federal funds must be able to project and depend on stable sources of support in order to design and carry out multi-year projects and programs; annual uncertainty and delays in establishing the level of federal support for transit and highways must be eliminated.

6. The costs associated with mandated federal actions and the substantial contribution of public transportation to the achievement of other major national goals provides justification for continuing federal support from all sources.

Rationale: The costs of measures required by federal law or policy are substantial and increasing; all sources of support for transit investment should be brought to bear in the years ahead; the linkage of mobility goals to other federal goals is made stronger by the commitment of both dedicated and general funds to support mandated actions.

7. Substantial additional federal funding should be provided for public transportation to fully carry out the goal of significantly increasing the provision and use of high-occupancy, shared-ride services.

Rationale: Federal transit funding has been reduced 50% in the last eight years, in real terms; all indications are that historic disinvestment in transportation, the current condition of facilities, and future travel demands require a doubling of the total investment; the increase should be borne by all funding partners.

8. An immediate gasoline tax/motor fuels tax increase should be enacted concurrent with reauthorization of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act, and federal motor fuel taxes should be made permanent to support needed transit and highway investment; full revenues from the tax should be committed annually.

Rationale: Needs are immediate; the traditional source of transportation funding should continue to be the basic resource for increased investment; aggressive claims will be made by other interests on gasoline tax increases; and, action on federal revenue increases, including the gasoline tax likely will take place sooner rather than later.

9. The federal tax code should be revised to promote private and non-federal investment in transit, and to eliminate the taxation of employer-transit subsidies and other disincentives to transit use.

Rationale: Other federal policies should strongly support direct investment in and use of public transportation, rather than frustrate achievement of the goals that federal funding is intended to meet.

10. Federal transportation policies and programs should require closer integration of transportation investments and land use decisions in order to provide an environment that is conducive to and encourages increased provision and use of high-occupancy, shared-ride services; other federal policies affecting transportation demand and investment should incorporate this same objective.

Rationale: Unless development practices and policies at the local level are consistent and supportive with basic federal transportation goals, the effectiveness of federal investment will be diminished greatly along with the opportunity to advance other national goals. Federal attention to how land uses and development are arrayed across the landscape is necessary to reinforce these linkages.
The Metropolitan Program

A new Metropolitan Transportation Program at the federal level is proposed to support transit and highway investments in the nation's urbanized areas of greater than 50,000 population. The Metropolitan Program is composed of four elements:

1. A federal source of formula funds for major expansion of either transit or highway capacity, giving local officials the flexibility to decide what mix of projects and investments best suit the local need to expand capacity;

2. A formula program to support continuing reinvestment in existing public transit systems and services;

3. A formula program to support continuing reinvestment in our highway system; and

4. A federal discretionary program targeting federal investment to major capital projects, either transit or highways.

A specific metropolitan focus has become essential and the federal-local relationship in meeting emerging needs must be strengthened. At the metropolitan level the complex interrelated issues of central city and urban-suburban development and travel can be attacked comprehensively, and the full spectrum of regional economic, social, and environmental relationships can be brought most effectively into balance. Also, at the metropolitan level we have the greatest breadth of data and information with which to shape our strategies and gauge our success.

“Dollars put into transit infrastructure create growth and wealth. On the other hand, failure to invest will lead to non-competitiveness at home and in world markets.” — Roger Tauss, Transport Workers Union, Philadelphia

“Mobility and productivity are synonymous.” — John A. Miller, Chairman and CEO, Provident Mutual Life Insurance Company, Philadelphia
Targeting Modal Reinvestment—The federal program must provide resources specifically targeted for critical maintenance and reinvestment. In doing so, it is appropriate to continue to allocate funds directly by mode.

Providing separate transit and highway reinvestment funding recognizes that one of the most profound problems facing our nation’s transportation system is the degree of deterioration that has been allowed to take place. Very simply, we are failing to adequately maintain our current systems and facilities. The backlog of investment requirements for maintenance and upkeep is both staggering and mounting.

As importantly, both transit and highway reinvestment needs are easily measured, have high public visibility, and have far-reaching consequences if not aggressively addressed.

The proposed Metropolitan Program, therefore, includes separate program elements to provide federal funds specifically for both transit and highway reinvestment.

The major features of each of the four major components of the metropolitan program are described in the accompanying figures.
Expanding Capacity—In addition to funds provided specifically for reinvestment, the proposed Metropolitan Program includes a separate source of funds to directly support major capacity expansion on metropolitan systems. Unlike metropolitan funds provided for reinvestment, federal funds for capacity expansion would be available to the metropolitan area as a shared or pooled resource, for use without regard to mode.

The single, multi-modal source of funds for major capacity expansion is intended to encourage stronger integration of transit and highway planning, to promote more rational trade-offs between various types of investments, and to encourage more highly integrated multi-modal project design.

Long-deferred reinvestment needs cannot be pursued to the exclusion of efforts to expand both transit and highway capacity. Travel demands already are overwhelming our systems and will continue to increase in the years ahead. Additional passenger-carrying capacity will be essential to maintain a mobile America into the next century and beyond.

THE MAJOR CAPACITY EXPANSION AND DISCRETIONARY PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCRETIONARY PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR CAPACITY EXPANSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SINGLE, SHARED RESOURCE FOR HIGHWAY/TRANSIT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIMITED TRANSFERABILITY FOR TRANSIT REINVESTMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIMITED TRANSFERABILITY FOR HIGHWAY REINVESTMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- COMBINED FEDERAL RESOURCE; NO DISTINCTION REGARDING MODES; ALLOW TRANSIT/HIGHWAY MIX OF CAPACITY EXPANSION INVESTMENTS/PROJECTS TO BE DETERMINED LOCALLY
- DEFINE MAJOR CAPACITY EXPANSION TO INCLUDE:
  - Transit new starts and extensions (rail, transitway, HOV, etc.)
  - Highway extension and expansion (i.e. added lanes, new facilities on new rights-of-way)

• FORMULA DISTRIBUTION BASED ON:
  - Need: Travel demand growth, using annual data in an easily auditable form, e.g. motor vehicle fuel sales, federal gasoline tax revenues, attributable motor vehicle registrations, etc.
  - Transit Use: Proportion, amount or increase in travel accommodated on transit and other forms of high-occupancy, shared-ride services, using annual data in an easily auditable form, e.g. ridership, farebox revenue/base fare, increase in average vehicle occupancy, etc.
  - Weight the transit use factor more heavily as the preferred outcome to be rewarded/encouraged

• FEDERAL DISCRETIONARY RESOURCE
  - Devoted to projects that serve directly to improve or address issues of national significance, e.g. congestion, safety, air quality, economic development, infrastructure, energy, etc.

Federal Discretionary Investment—The proposed Metropolitan Program is designed to function predominantly through a formula allocation of federal funds drawn from motor fuel and related federal user fees. For a variety of reasons, however, it will remain important to maintain a discretionary program at the federal level.

Federal discretionary funds should be available to support either reinvestment or capacity expansion projects. Federal discretionary funds should be directed to projects that cannot be accomplished with formula funding alone and which provide demonstrable, positive impacts in the solution of problems declared to be of national significance. Obvious examples include projects that reduce vehicle-miles of travel, provide congestion relief, reduce mobile source emissions, relieve safety hazards, directly spur economic development, expand service to the elderly, those with disabilities, or disadvantaged persons, or attract added sources of non-federal funds.
Increased Flexibility—One of the principle features of the Metropolitan Program is the greatly increased flexibility that is provided in the use of federal transportation funds. The added flexibility occurs at several levels within the program.

By eliminating most current federal categorical programs, existing constraints on the use of federal funds are relaxed considerably, creating a more responsive and effective federal program. In addition, the provision of a single, multi-modal source of funds for major capacity expansion greatly increases the variations in how federal funds can be deployed within the metropolitan region.

Increased flexibility also is provided by allowing a degree of transferability between funds specifically dedicated for reinvestment and funds provided for capacity expansion. In addition, a significant degree of flexibility is provided in the use of funds within each of the major program elements.

Finally, a continued federal discretionary program provides the flexibility needed to carry out major capital projects beyond the scope of formula programs.

A Rural Public Transportation Program

The transportation needs of residents of small urban and rural areas across the country are as immediate and as compelling as those that confront the residents of our largest metropolitan areas.

While significant restructuring of the current federal transit program serving small urban and rural areas below 50,000 population may be necessary, there are some changes in federal policy that are evident today that will be essential in making the rural transit program more effective, and would allow for more efficient use of federal funds.

The most important change is an increase in the level of federal support. The federal small urban and rural transit assistance program could easily benefit from at least a doubling of federal investment.

In addition to increased direct federal investment, one of the most important actions that can be taken to increase the effectiveness of available funds is to streamline and coordinate the use of federal transportation funds with the massive amounts being spent through federal (and state and local) human services programs for transportation of specific client groups.

Updating national policy and programs directed at the mobility needs of small urban and rural residents must go hand-in-hand with enactment of a new metropolitan transportation program.

“We’re coming up against the physical limits”. . . “The goal has got to be shifted away from moving vehicles to moving people.”—Ross Sandler, NYC Transportation Commissioner—New York Times, July 17, 1988

“If we allow urban and suburban congestion to squeeze the life out of America’s cities, we cannot expect to have a healthy and internationally competitive economy.”—Bruce T. McDowell, Transportation Institutions in the Year 2020

“The preservation of our existing network of commuter rail services is essential to our economic future. We must have a stable funding base for capital needs and operations.”—Charles Seymour, Chairman, Jackson-Cross Company, Real Estate Development, Philadelphia

“It is vital that the federal government continue its partnership with local, state, and private entities to ensure the mobility of our nation.”—Jim Sims, Los Angeles County Transportation Commission
FEDERAL INVESTMENT: THE METROPOLITAN PROGRAM

Transit 2000 estimates confirm the need to increase combined federal investment in transit and highways by 100% or more. Today U.S. Department of Transportation spending includes $16.7 billion annually, $3.2 billion for transit and $13.5 billion for highways. The recommended Metropolitan Program calls for a total federal transportation investment of not less than $25 billion per year and as much as $34 billion, based on combined estimates of transit and highway needs.

Transit Investment Requirements

As part of the Metropolitan Program, federal investment for public transportation should be increased to at least $11 billion annually, including roughly $5.7 billion for essential reinvestment and $5.2 billion for capacity expansion.

This estimate has been derived from well-defined reinvestment requirements that reflect the mounting backlog of repair, replacement, and rehabilitation needs of our public transit systems.

Added to the essential reinvestment needs are the costs of expanding transit capacity to meet the goal of substantially increasing the use of transit and other forms of high-occupancy, shared-ride services. Capacity expansion needs have been estimated from analyses that generally target a level of transit use that is double or triple the current level. Increases of this order of magnitude or greater represent a reasonable goal for the nation and would, for instance, reflect a commitment to achieve per capita transit use at levels equal to those currently experienced in Canada.

The basic assumptions used in arriving at the transit investment requirements are conservative. They reflect:
- a commitment to reduce the current backlog of transit reinvestment requirements;
- a parallel commitment to reinvest adequately in our transit systems and facilities in the future to support a regular cycle of rehabilitation and replacement;
- pursuit of future per capita transit ridership goals that, at a minimum, double current levels;
- substantial increases in the proportion of transit trips on non-traditional, shared-ride types of services; and
- cost factors that reflect the current median costs of various service options.

TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT REQUIREMENTS

The most important tool in addressing the goals and objectives of a new federal transportation program is the level of direct investment made in our systems and services—both transit and highways.

National policy must be focused on restoring the priority of transportation investment, nationwide. To do so, the federal government must re-establish its leadership role in providing increased investment in future years.

Today there is strong consensus and justification for the proposition that overall transportation investment should be increased substantially and that the share of the investment from federal sources should not be reduced from levels reflected in current federal policy.

“Our federal tax system promotes the use of the single-occupant vehicle as the best way to get to work. We are sending a mixed signal to commuters. The single-occupant vehicle is no longer the mode of choice.” —Rep. Roger Roy, Chairman, Transportation Committee, State House of Representatives, Dover, Delaware

“More, not less public money needs to be spent at the federal, state, and local levels for the improvement, maintenance, and expansion of mass transit . . . Mass transit is something positive government can do to protect air quality, conserve energy, promote desirable land use patterns, and provide access to jobs and convenient, safe travel. It’s hard to think of a government spending program where so much bang can be gotten for the buck.” —Joanne R. Denworth, Executive Director, Pennsylvania Environmental Council, Inc., Philadelphia

TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT REQUIREMENTS

The most important tool in addressing the goals and objectives of a new federal transportation program is the level of direct investment made in our systems and services—both transit and highways.

National policy must be focused on restoring the priority of transportation investment, nationwide. To do so, the federal government must re-establish its leadership role in providing increased investment in future years.

Today there is strong consensus and justification for the proposition that overall transportation investment should be increased substantially and that the share of the investment from federal sources should not be reduced from levels reflected in current federal policy.

“Our federal tax system promotes the use of the single-occupant vehicle as the best way to get to work. We are sending a mixed signal to commuters. The single-occupant vehicle is no longer the mode of choice.” — Rep. Roger Roy, Chairman, Transportation Committee, State House of Representatives, Dover, Delaware

“More, not less public money needs to be spent at the federal, state, and local levels for the improvement, maintenance, and expansion of mass transit . . . Mass transit is something positive government can do to protect air quality, conserve energy, promote desirable land use patterns, and provide access to jobs and convenient, safe travel. It’s hard to think of a government spending program where so much bang can be gotten for the buck.” — Joanne R. Denworth, Executive Director, Pennsylvania Environmental Council, Inc., Philadelphia
A more ambitious set of ridership goals and cost estimates adjusted for future inflation would require a level of federal investment in transit significantly above the $11 billion annual figure.

Even without a national commitment to increased transit ridership, however, the federal transit program must be increased from $3.2 billion to a range of $6 billion to $8 billion per year. This *minimum* level of federal transit investment is necessary to meet the reinvestment requirements of existing systems and services, to continue major new projects that already are in the advanced stages of planning and development, and to fulfill new federal requirements and mandates in a host of areas. The $6 billion to $8 billion annual level of investment is necessary to restore recent declines in the purchasing power of federal assistance as a result of inflation and program reductions since 1981. In 1981, federal transit assistance totaled $4.6 billion. Simply adjusting that level of support to 1989 dollars would require a minimum federal program of $6.5 billion annually to meet a minimum combination of reinvestment and capacity expansion needs.

**Highway Investment Requirements**

Depending on the assumptions used, figures compiled by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) indicate a need for federal highway reinvestment that ranges from over $8 billion annually to nearly $13 billion. Federal support for highway capacity expansion could require an additional $10 billion per year if scenarios for ‘fully improved service’ on the nation's highways are to be pursued.

**FEDERAL INVESTMENT: THE RURAL TRANSIT PROGRAM**

As indicated earlier, the need for public transportation services in our nation's small urban and rural areas far exceeds current resources. Federal assistance directly to rural public transit should be at least double the $70 million to $80 million now provided annually. In addition, the substantial amounts of transportation spending from federal human services programs should be combined more effectively with direct investment by the federal Department of Transportation.

The scope of our transportation needs is enormous. The consequences for the nation of not acting aggressively to meet them is increasingly serious. As a result, the federal government must be called on once again to take the lead role, not only in setting goals and establishing new policy direction, but in providing the necessary financial resources to spur overall transportation investment.

**NON-FEDERAL FINANCE**

While increased direct federal transportation investment must be the centerpiece of a new national policy, overall transportation investment has been, and must remain, a partnership among federal, state, and local governments, the private sector, users, and others that benefit from enhanced mobility and high quality systems and services.

Direct federal investment in transit and highways must serve two purposes. First, it must directly underwrite major projects and improvements. As importantly, however, federal investment must serve as a catalyst to attract stable and reliable financial commitments from each of the other partners. The goal of bringing added non-federal resources to transportation should be a prominent part of new national policies and programs.

The most effective way to serve this goal is to incorporate into federal policy and programs a comprehensive series of fair and equitable incentives to attract greater state and local funding, increased financing from private sources, and increased financial participation by users and beneficiaries. As part of this effort, consideration should be given to new pricing mechanisms that recover more of the costs of services and facilities, particularly for automobile and highway use, and federal allocation mechanisms that reward increased investment without placing at a disadvantage communities that may be struggling economically.

In addition to the provision of more effective financing incentives, an effort must be made to remove the current disincentives to increased transportation investment that exist in federal policy. Transit agencies, for instance, must be allowed, encouraged, and rewarded for seeking increased revenues from non-traditional sources, including new types of services, real estate and development activities, etc.

Our future transportation needs—both transit and highways—require a comprehensive financial strategy guided and underwritten by the federal government.
Federal Tax Provisions

Current federal tax provisions limit overall investment in and the effectiveness of transportation facilities, particularly public transportation services. A host of federal tax provisions discourage private investment in transportation facilities, greatly restrict the financing powers and options available to state and local governments, and raise the cost of state and local borrowing for infrastructure investment.

Current tax provisions governing state and local bonding ceilings, private participation limitations, arbitrage restrictions, sale/leaseback transactions, etc. should be reviewed carefully and made consistent with new national transportation goals and policies.

In addition, fringe benefit provisions of the federal tax code provide a significant economic incentive to automobile users and a disincentive to increased transit use. Current tax law allows employer-subsidized free parking to go totally untaxed while those who receive employer-subsidized transit passes are taxed fully, once the value of monthly employer support exceeds $15 dollars. This imbalance must be remedied.

As part of the effort to rewrite federal transportation programs and policies, federal tax law must be rewritten to support rather than undermine greater investment and use of public transportation.

Land Use and Development Coordination

Land development patterns dictate the nature of our travel demands. To enhance mobility and freedom of movement, greater attention, therefore, must be paid to how land uses and development are arrayed across the landscape. It is imperative that we aggressively promote and provide incentives for development that can be served more easily and effectively by public transportation. Concentrating development, more mixed-use development, supportive parking requirements, policies, and pricing, and attention to a host of critical site and building design features are all required.

Better coordination of transportation and private development through local planning and development controls presents enormous opportunities to manage travel demand, reduce public investment requirements, share costs, and achieve greater use and efficiency from all our transportation facilities and services.

Across the country there are a growing number of examples of how this is being done. New federal transportation programs should promote these efforts and ensure that both transit and highway investments are premised on broad-based strategic plans for the region and on the existence and implementation of effective land use plans and development controls.
National Energy Policy

Among the most significant factors affecting our choice of transportation options is the cost of various modes of travel, both to the rider and to the community as a whole. Today, as an expression of unstated national policy, we price gasoline at levels far below those that exist in other countries around the world. We in essence subsidize and, therefore, directly encourage low-occupancy automobile use.

At the same time that we are providing an economic incentive for increased low-occupancy automobile use, we fail to recover the full cost of automobile use or account fully for the consequences of reliance on personal vehicle use. We have held the price of energy artificially low and have grossly underestimated the costs that must be borne.

National transportation and energy policy must be closely coordinated and brought into synch with respect to these two crucial points before the marketplace will promote the type of activity and behavior that is required to achieve our mobility goals as well as other major national goals linked to transportation.

Human Resources, Technology and Research and Development

Human resources, technological change, and our approach to basic research and development all will have substantial impacts on transportation demands, travel behavior, and the success of strategies we select to meet future transportation needs.

Human Resources.—Public transit will continue to be dominated by its human resource and human service character. Two dimensions are of critical concern with respect to national policy: the way in which demographics will influence travel demand, and how transit’s work force can be shaped to best meet those demands.

Socio-economic and demographic trends indicate a serious, across-the-board labor force shortage in future years. The problem is compounded by the increasing separation of willing workers from the job opportunities. Labor force mobility will become an increasingly important issue throughout the entire country under these conditions. As a consequence, greater attention must be paid to: land use and transportation strategies that bring jobs and housing locations into better balance; and make expanded transportation options available to the work force.

Because of the labor-intensive nature of public transportation, the quality of transit services is dependent directly on the skills that are brought to bear by both labor and management, the price paid for those skills in a highly competitive environment, and the degree to which those skills are used to their greatest potential.

A variety of new recruitment, education, and retraining strategies as well as benefit and compensation programs may need to be tailored to an increasingly heterogeneous work force that will be more multi-lingual and will be seeking a new balance between household, family, and job-related responsibilities.

National transportation policy and the transit industry must value and serve this increasing diversity to ensure the successful pursuit of the transit mission.

Technology.—New technologies will also affect public transportation in two ways: by influencing changes in travel and communications patterns; and, by effecting the nature of transit equipment and the skills necessary to put it to its most effective and efficient use.

A central feature of national concern is the strength of the domestic transit supply industry. The responsibility of transit managers is to get greatest value and reliability for their investment. This basic requirement must be balanced against both the need to maintain strong, competitive domestic suppliers, and the need to reduce the nation's mounting trade deficit.

Transportation policy must be integrated with national and international economic policy, and the federal government should take a more active role in joint efforts to support and promote the domestic transit supply industry here and abroad.

Research and Development.—Common to both the human resources and technology issues is the chronic underinvestment in research and development in the transportation field, generally, and in public transportation specifically. One of the most effective means to reinforce a strong market for goods and services is to ensure the existence of a strategically-targeted research and development program.

Today, there is limited incentive, however, for domestic suppliers or for potential workers to commit themselves to participate in the growth and evolution of the nation’s transit industry. National policy must, through a greatly expanded emphasis on research and development, help provide the incentives and bolster the market for innovative services, management, and technologies.
We have reached a point as a nation where the host of policies that guide and impact future transportation investment must be reformulated. The proposals made by the Transit 2000 Task Force represent a fundamentally new and broad-based approach to ensure that future transportation investment more effectively serves national and local goals. Substantial progress in crafting a new set of policies and programs consistent with the directions proposed by the Task Force will help ensure the vitality of our economy and the quality of life in our communities in the decades ahead.

**SUMMARY**

**Transit 2000 Task Force**

---

**American Public Transit Association**

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.

Washington, DC 20005
COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE: SPPACT
DATE: 2-8-90 7:15 a.m.

NAME

M- Earl Shumway
M- Mike Pagdign
S- Andy Coogan
M- Keith Ahola
M- Paukise Anderson
M- Diwia Knudsen
M- Bonnie L. Hayes
M- Nick Nikkila
M- Scott Collin
M- Clifford Clark
M- Wade Byers
M- Bob Bothman
M- Bob Post
M- Ed Hippenhein
M- George Van Eyken
M- Dave Sturdevant
S- Keith Lorenz
G- Tel Senna
G- Molly O'Reilly
G- Richard Ross
G- Mary A. Weber
G- Michael Hereford

AFFILIATION

Portland

METRO

WSDOT

Metro

320 Main

Washington County

DEQ

city of Vancouver

Washington County Cell

CITIES OF CLACKAMAS COUNTY

Tri-Met

Clackamas Co.

CITIES OF E. MULT. CO.

Trulliston Valley, Eberly Corp.

NORTHWEST STRATEGIES INC.

CITY OF PORTLAND
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Williams</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny Moore</td>
<td>ODOT - Trunk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Mulvihill</td>
<td>Wash Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Sanders</td>
<td>Clackamas Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom VandeZanden</td>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Goldfield</td>
<td>Multf. of Comms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Parneter</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Feeney</td>
<td>JLI - Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Chin</td>
<td>C-TRAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bebe Rucker</td>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Nourse</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Gardner</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Shackleton</td>
<td>Metro Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Devlin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE:  
DATE: 2-8-90  
NAME:  
AFFILIATION:  