

MPC 4d – Attachment 1 – Meeting Notes from June 4, 2004 MPO Summit
Metro Regional Center

1. Meeting Opened at 8:30 by Rod Park
 - a. Welcome and Introductions
 - b. Spoke to our common issues and things we need to be working on in Salem
 - c. Clarified group process – Metro is the host today but not in charge; convening the meeting in hopes of beginning an ongoing dialogue

2. Roundtable discussion
 - a. **Bend – Bill Friedman**
 - i. Commonalities with Metro, despite differences in scale
 - ii. Issues include relationship with ODOT
 - iii. Lack of clarity in relationship with state, and roles and responsibilities of ACT's and MPO's
 - iv. Thanked ODOT for creating the ACT structure to improve consultation with local communities
 - v. Challenges – increasingly rapid growth – how to deal with real world vs. theoretical planning world. Transportation vs. land-use restrictions of state system.
 - vi. Lack of funds always a problem – one positive is OTIA.
 - vii. No clear existing source of funds for maintenance
 - b. **Central Lane – Bonny Bettman**
 - i. Issues – Money
 - ii. Have strategies but have difficulty getting funding to fulfill strategies, especially retrofit projects.
 - iii. Lack of funding for maintenance and preservation
 - iv. Hand-to-mouth – very competitive, projects selected based on funding sources not on projects most needed by community
 - v. Citizen involvement – how to involve in transportation planning process
 - vi. Bonny – Pressure on local government to shift funds to meet funding requirements
 - vii. **Bobby Green** - Challenge of qualitative citizen involvement. Would like to get better understanding from those who have formed ACT's – advantages and disadvantages.
 - viii. **Susan Ban** – Need to make transit a significant part of solving urban growth issues
 - c. **Corvallis – Linda Modrell**
 - i. ACT – 3 counties – has long history of trust, working together
 - ii. When MPO was developed, had to figure out how balance of power wouldn't rest just with city with biggest population
 - iii. Requirement of cross-membership of MPO/ACT
 - iv. Biggest problem is MPO jurisdiction – should include Albany – dictated by state land-use system and needs to be changed

- v. Funding for maintenance and preservation – need funding other than gas tax
- vi. Livability issues require look at alternative transit for personal transport and freight – working on rail
- vii. Huge challenge to work with ODOT
- viii. Need to keep vision broader than MPO or ACT – look at state of Oregon
- ix. Fortunate that public works directors are able to look at broad picture
- x. **Alan Rowe** – Good cooperation between counties and ACT and MPO – required in part by lack of funding, need to work together

d. Rogue Valley – Mike Quilty

- i. Undergone tremendous change – doubled MPO size during last census through expansion – reached out to outlying areas.
- ii. Individual jurisdictions concerned about pooling their funding, some contention about voting – decided not to weight vote by population
- iii. Don't use formulas to distribute money – case by case basis, make decisions based on shared needs and weigh individual jurisdiction needs
- iv. Funding a problem
 - v. Freight – doing a lot of freight planning
 - vi. Looking at expanding UGB
- vii. Central Point planning Transit Oriented Development – put people closer to transit and their jobs
- viii. Requirement that ½ of STIP funds go to transit severely impacts surface street development; should be incentives to plan transit and land-use
- ix. Air Quality – DEQ hasn't finished maintenance programs so even though in containment, aren't able to move forward without DEQ completion
- x. ACT – work very well together, agree to disagree

e. SKATS – Dan Clem

- i. Mature organization – similar to Rogue Valley's situation
- ii. Found that formulas don't work – balance small communities, large communities – tough balancing act
- iii. Don't have any additional benefits/access to legislature by being in Salem!
- iv. Huge growth in Salem area
 - v. Visioning process of integrating land-use and transportation is critical – 3C's (Centers, corridors, circulators)
- vi. Transit-oriented development and Development-oriented transit both important
- vii. Just beginning a corridor between Salem and Keizer – primarily to move people

- viii. Problem of I-5 through Salem – Hatfield funding ran out, problems 15-20 years old
- ix. Rivers cutting through city – bridge funding unlikely, need 3rd bridge
- x. Doing interim, smaller projects in the meantime
- xi. Taking regional approach in ACT planning – look at projects that are ready, cooperation but also competition
- xii. Completed streetcar feasibility study, rail between Salem and Portland
- xiii. Hope to leave today with sense of cooperation and legislative opportunities; work together on common issues and funding

f. SW Washington RTC – Dean Lookingbill

- i. Recreated MPO in 1992 to allocate fed transportation dollars
- ii. RTC is MPO and also regional transportation planning organization (TPO), created by IGA
- iii. Cities, 3 counties, legislators – problematic having state-level officials and local officials, still working on issues. How do you marry state-wide transportation issues with local jurisdiction issues?
- iv. Issues – growth, much of growth occurring in satellite communities
- v. Diminishing transportation investment funds leading to traffic congestion – led to discussions about what they want to be – not Seattle or San Francisco
- vi. Washington state Growth Mgmt Act ties land use with transportation planning – concurrency requirement, must provide capacity to serve communities as they develop
- vii. Credit Federal Transportation Act with enabling them to plan arterial development
- viii. Other top issues – satellite communities becoming a larger player in decision-making process, calling for development, services
- ix. At cross-roads for transit – lost considerable funding through repeal of auto tax, are requesting sales tax increase in the fall (.03=\$3.5 million a year)
- x. Growth defines transportation discussions – becoming more and more urbanized

g. Metro/JPACT – Rod Park and Rex Burkholder

- i. Structure of Metro as MPO with concurrence of locally elected officials represented on JPACT. JPACT does planning, Metro Council approves or disapproves but can't change package
- ii. Metro is land-use oriented first, then look at how transportation helps that along
- iii. Bi-State Committee developed to deal with unique situation of two adjoining states, land-use and transportation. Major focus will be I-5/corridor river crossing. Economies are integrated across state

- boundaries. Looking at developing bi-state compact with both states.
- iv. 2002 UGB expansion of 18,600 acres – focus on land-use
 - v. Planning centers, TOD – how to make communities more livable
 - vi. Air Quality – Raleigh, NC example of non-attainment
 - vii. Lack of funding – huge shortfall between transportation plan and available funding
 - viii. MTIP – similar to high-stakes poker game
 - ix. Light Rail – becomes more successful as lines are added. How do you keep adding capacity (trains are often full)? Interstate line just opened, planning for Phase I and Phase 2 South Corridor light rail.
 - x. Other transit options – street car in NW/SW. Looking at expanding to Eastside, Lake Oswego.
 - xi. **Rod Monroe** – Portland area is shipping/transportation hub, state’s economy depends on movement of goods through this region. Changed thinking – state highways are primarily for moving freight. We’re all in this boat together.
 - xii. **Karl Rohde** – Focus on Metropolitan part of MPO. Must look at regional economy - individual jurisdictions and boundaries don’t drive the economy. Experience with League of Oregon Cities shows him that problems are the same in every city. Challenge is to address regional responsibilities while respecting individual jurisdictions – how do we do that?
 - xiii. **Maria Rojo de Steffey** – Multnomah County, Maintenance and replacement of bridges top issue.

3. **Facilitated Discussion of Common Issues and Possible Action -**

- a. Rex Burkholder introduced Kate Marx, Director of Public Affairs and Gov. Relations who will facilitate the discussion.
- b. Kate – goal is to formalize the issues in common and areas where we diverge, then see if we can agree to next steps. She recapped issues from earlier discussion. She noted the lack of extreme differences between MPO’s issues, more commonalities.
- c. Discussion of strategic intent – hope to get specific plans of action agreed upon by the group

Facilitated Discussion Results

Current State	Strategic Intent/Actions	Desired Future State <i>(How long is long range?)</i>
<p>Largely fragmented (assemblage or jurisdictions is different)</p> <p>Redundant govt. services (urban services planned by city)</p> <p>How we fund large projects w/in region – need guidelines</p> <p>Funding (boom & bust) – no consistency</p> <p>Unintended consequences of entitlements takes TPs</p> <p>Corvallis – feels the MPO is redundant (like ACT because of bigger area)</p> <p>Legislators – one size does not fit all</p> <p>Poor communication from state agencies to MPO’s and between state agencies</p> <p>People talk support of transit but don’t really believe</p>	<p>Form an association of MPOs (Charter will be required)</p> <p>Determine advantages/disadvantages of ACTs</p> <p>Unified approach to project development</p> <p>Determine county roles in MPOs</p> <p>Look at the short rail lines to relieve congestion, move freight, add flex to spending</p> <p>Sec. 115 – better communication, greater voice w/Congressional delegation; figure out how to reconcile 115 “outstanding issues”</p> <p>Educate all benefiting parties about the value of unified transportation planning</p> <p>Secure maximum flexibility of funds for local jurisdictions</p> <p>Get ready for next session – unified approach for fund raising</p> <p>Emphasize economic vitality</p> <p>Look at, align roles of ACTs</p> <p>Get state agencies to communicate among themselves</p> <p>Look for more money</p>	<p>Portland boundaries will have been examined re: abilities to fund MPO projects</p> <p>Have a better collective understanding of market needs as it relates to economic growth</p> <p>Support from DC on the planning functions of MPOs</p> <p>MPOs provide a unified voice across state legis re: funding/project priorities</p> <p>Recognition among all parties that there is an urban agenda, that MPOs are working together</p> <p>Locals will have maximum flex on fund spending</p> <p>Collective desire for transit and choices in funding competition</p> <p>Oregon Great Cities Initiative – land use, transportation as foundation for economic development</p> <p>Added definition of what’s regional and what’s local</p> <p>Operate with a focus on forums that cross interests and political/geographic boundaries</p>

Current State	Strategic Intent/Actions	Desired Future State <i>(How long is long range?)</i>
	<p>Address inter-agency communications specifically re: admin rules as they relate to economic vitality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ** timelines ** criteria ** process rules ** recognition of uniquely urban issues ** consistent standards for land use & transportation intersection <p>Address urban vs rural barriers/opportunities</p> <p>Building great cities (Great Cities Initiative)</p> <p>Understand that whole state economy is dependent on freight system</p> <p>Add flexibility, remove rigidities</p> <p>OTIA IV – Get ready</p>	

4. Stuart Foster, Chair, Oregon Transportation Commission

- a. Commended outstanding process of the summit today and thanked everyone for attending. Feels that this collaboration will result in better decisions by all of us.
- b. Importance of transportation connections – all merge in the Portland region
- c. Challenge – transportation network
 - i. How do we manage trans systems in urban areas – gridlock on I-5, I-205, getting freight through Portland, interstate passenger travel?
 - ii. How do we achieve the appropriate balance statewide (urban/rural, state, international)?
 - iii. How do we anticipate the long-term impact of our choices?
 - iv. How do we deal with limited financial resources?
- d. ODOT’s response to these challenges:
 - i. Established ACT’s – empower local jurisdictions (private and public) to participate in decision-making process. Not perfect system, but better than it used to be – better decisions, more participation, better buy-in

- ii. ACT's give recommendations to OTC – go out of their way to accommodate ACT's recommendations
- e. Currently
 - i. Implementing OTIA III - \$1.3 billion – focused on infrastructure – what happens in rural areas impacts urban areas. Keep in perspective that entire state is interconnected
 - ii. Decentralizing structure – increasingly design is outsourced to private sector
 - iii. Public-private partnership important
 - iv. Need collaborative relationship between MPO's and ACT's – effective joint approach. But it's not the only way to be successful – “one size doesn't fit all”.
 - v. Expectation – have ACT's that cover the entire state, and that ACT's and MPO's will work on a collaborative basis, regional view
 - vi. No reason MPO can't also be ACT (or be part of ACT)
 - vii. ODOT/OTC need to better understand issues of urban areas; MPO's need to better understand issues of rest of state and collaborate with smaller, satellite cities
 - viii. Would like to see MPO policy committees (has been healthy in ACT's) and business representatives on policy boards
 - ix. Most important – we're all ONE Oregon; need to have that vision
 - x. OTC expects ODOT reps on MPO boards to participate, respect local needs
 - xi. Funding needs/shortages aren't limited to urban areas – shared by whole state. Current funding constraints statewide. Focus is to maintain regional equity – means no one is happy.
 - xii. Goal is to get Legislature to fund modernization projects in 2007 – not realistic in 2005. Need to work as a team to get funding, generate revenue. Need every vote we can get
 - xiii. Have to figure out a way to improve freight rail. Get congressional reps to push at federal level. Truck travel is going to double on I-5 by 2020 – only solution is to improve freight rail system. Fuel prices will continue to push that as well.
 - xiv. Need to figure out how to get local trips off of state highways and interstates – results in increasing interchanges in urban areas which diminishes capacity of highways
 - xv. Example of Vancouver, BC – ideas include dedicated freight lanes, HOV, etc.
 - xvi. Land-use and transportation are interrelated but too often transportation is overlooked as a growth tool
 - xvii. TPR has done a good job but we need to take a good look at it. Concurrency is a good idea, but development and density won't occur if you have to have infrastructure developed at the same time
 - xviii. Bill Friedman, Bend – expressed concern about non-electeds on ACT's.

- xix. Anne Ballew questioned prioritizing freight over passenger travel. Stuart clarified that getting local traffic off interstates would reduce congestion – improve local conductivity. Much of interstate traffic is freight and needs to continue to be

5. The Emerging Role of ACT's – how will MPO's fit in?

- a. Bill Wagner, Corvallis - Need to get rid of “THEM” perspective of ACT's. Change term - “urban caucus” doesn't go over well in other areas. Perhaps “population centers caucus”?
- b. Richard Schmid, SKATS – Salem has had MPO since 1960's. 3 counties, over 30 cities. When funding dried up, things got more difficult. Now process works well – don't use formulas. Blue Ribbon Committee with reps from 3 counties formed and selected MPO reps to serve on ACT. Outlying cities were concerned that MPO's would take control – that hasn't happened. MPO brings issues to ACT; ACT reminds MPO that there are needs outside the MPO area. Funding is a frustration. Good interaction between MPO and ACT – no formal agreement between the two. ACT charter mentions the role of the MPO.
- c. Dan Moore, Rogue Valley – Josephine and Jackson counties. ACT when ODOT updates STIP. Process outlined for prioritization – use same process for MPO and rural area projects. Advisory committees prioritize projects for MPO and non-MPO jurisdictions, achieves regional consensus. He's been through 4 STIP updates and hasn't seen any major problems – have always achieved regional consensus. (Referred to handout for resolution and ACT guidelines - enclosed.)
- d. Ali Bonakdar, Corvallis – One of largest & oldest ACT's in the state. 3 counties, all can be members if they want to be. Rough start – neither MPO nor ACT was used to working with each other. Developed ACT/MPO coordination protocol (see handout enclosed), requiring each to collaborate with the other. ACT charter requires that they cooperate with the MPO's. Large-ticket projects and those that go beyond MPO area require cooperation with ACT. Joint session required if any party departs from prioritization agreed upon – need to iron out any differences. Members of MPO policy board are also members of the ACT – this has helped tremendously with coordination efforts. Technical staff also overlap between two organizations.
- e. Dean Lookingbill, RTC – Need clear channel of state and federal funding and who makes those decisions.
- f. Question about ranking process of Salem – Entire policy group ranks projects by criteria. Those that move forward are those that are most ready.
- g. Question about land-use authority of MPO – Metro does exert land-use authority when making transportation planning decisions. Other MPO's do not have land-use authority – local jurisdictions do - but ACT's have to abide by state land-use requirements. MPO and non-MPO's use same criteria, but variances occur. Metro is in the process of deciding whether

to become an ACT – have asked ODOT to take the lead in approaching surrounding cities and determining what is a rational boundary. Metro’s authority was granted by a vote of the people to create a regional government. Eugene/Lane County has not pursued ACT status because it would simply be another layer of government involving all the players who are already at the table. They feel that they have same access to OTC as ACT’s and should have same chance at funding if they follow the same criteria as ACT’s.

6. Concluding/Next Steps

- a. Staff of MPO’s meeting in July. (They meet quarterly in Eugene so that no one has to travel over 3 hours. They encouraged this summit to look at policy level issues.)
- b. Important to prepare a common agenda for the legislature
- c. Asked each MPO to designate a representative to put together a list of issues for the legislature. (Have representatives meet to start working on joint list of priorities.)
- d. Topic on agenda for next meeting – citizen involvement.
- e. Plan meeting in the fall in Eugene to continue discussion.