

Ballot Measure 32 - LRT Bonds - Unofficial Final

Clackamas County

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

Multnomah County

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

Washington County

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

Total Tri-County

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

Statewide

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

Balance of State

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

Revised
on 11/14/96

Ballot Measure 32 - LRT Bonds - Unofficial

Clackamas County

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

Multnomah County

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

Washington County

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

Total Tri-County

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

Statewide

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

Balance of State

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

Oregon Transportation Initiative (OTI)

Process Timeline

January 19, 1996

Governor announces Initiative

Phase I

February - June

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

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

July 11, 1996

Statewide Advisory Committee Report

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

Oregon Transportation Initiative (OTI)

Phase II

July - December

Transportation Action Agenda

I. Efficiency Initiatives

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

II. Preservation and Maintenance of a "Base System"

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

III. Linking to Livability and Economic Opportunity

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

IV. Regionalize and Streamline Decision-Making

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

V. Funding

October -
November

Working Groups

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

October 24 and
November 8 & 15

SAC Reviews Working Group Reports /
Makes Recommendations

Phase III

January 1997

Legislature Convenes

Oregon Transportation Initiative (OTI)

Key Findings / Recommendations

Base System Working Group

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

Livability / Regionalization Working Group

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

Oregon Transportation Initiative (OTI)

Key Findings / Recommendations

Efficiencies Working Group

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

Funding Options Working Group

Oregon Transportation Initiative (OTI)

Emerging Proposal

Two “Funds”

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

Operations Maintenance and Preservation Fund

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

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

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

MEMORANDUM

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

A. OBJECTIVES AND PRINCIPLES

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

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

B. WORK SCOPE

PHASE I: DEVELOPMENT (NOVEMBER - DECEMBER 1996)

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

PHASE II: RESEARCH (JANUARY - MAY 1997)

- Research on "Type of Improvement Package"

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PHASE V: APPROVAL PROCESS (MAY - JULY 1997)

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

C. COST

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

Consultant:

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

Staff Support:

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



METRO

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

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

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

ACC:lmk

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE SPACT

DATE 11-14-96

NAME

AFFILIATION

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

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE SPACT

DATE 11-14-96

NAME

AFFILIATION

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