

Meeting:		Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC)							
Date:	Friday, June 29, 2012								
Time:		9:30	a.m. to 12 p.m. (noon)						
Place:	Metro, Council Chambers								
9:30 AM	1.		Call to Order and Declaration of a Quorum	Elissa Gertler, Chair					
9:35 AM	2.	#	<ul> <li>Comments from the Chair and Committee Members</li> <li>Regional Parking Management Requirements</li> </ul>	Elissa Gertler, Chair					
9:40 AM	3.		Citizen Communications to TPAC Agenda Items						
9:45 AM	4.	*	Consideration of the TPAC Minutes for May 25, 2012						
9:50 AM	5.	*	<ul> <li>Recommendation to JPACT on Amending the 2012-15 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program to Add: <ul> <li>Crescent Connection: Cedar Hills Blvd.</li> <li>Denney Road;</li> <li>Construction phase to the I-84 EB to I-205 Auxiliary Lane project; and</li> <li>Kellogg Lake Pedestrian and Bicycle Connection</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Ted Leybold					
10 AM	6.	*	<ul> <li><u>Purpose</u>: Adding new projects and project construction phase to 2012-15 MTIP.</li> <li><u>Outcome</u>: Recommendation to JPACT to amend the 2012-15 MTIP.</li> <li>Proposed changes to the State Transportation Improvement Program Funding Allocation and Project Selection Process – <u>INFORMATION/DISCUSSION</u></li> <li><u>Purpose</u>: Review proposed changes to the ODOT process for selecting projects and allocating funds.</li> <li><u>Outcome</u>: Alternatives provided on JPACT consideration of comments to OTC.</li> </ul>	Ted Leybold Rian Windsheimer, ODOT					

10:30 AM	7.	*	Comment Letter on Draft Oregon Statewide Transportation Strategy (STS) – <u>DISCUSSION AND</u> <u>RECOMMENDATION TO JPACT</u>	Mike Hoglund
			• <i>Purpose</i> : Present updated draft letter commenting on the draft STS vision and next steps.	
			• <u><i>Outcome</i></u> : TPAC recommendation to JPACT.	
			Note: TPAC members and alternates will receive an email from Survey Monkey in regards to the draft STS providing an additional comment opportunity. Input provided through the survey will help the Oregon Transportation Commission form strategic priorities and develop the STS implementation plan.	
10:50 AM	8.	*	Climate Smart Communities – Phase 1 Sensitivity Analysis and Draft Scenario Options – <u>DISCUSSION</u>	Kim Ellis
			• <i>Purpose</i> : Present sensitivity analysis and updated scenario options framework.	
			• <u>Outcome</u> : TPAC input on draft scenario options framework and implications of sensitivity analysis for scenarios options.	
11:20 AM	9.	#	Hole-in-the-Air Reporting Back – <u>INFORMATION</u>	Tom Kloster
			• <i>Purpose</i> : Update TPAC on the ORS 366.215 issue, including a report on the June 11 TPAC workshop.	
			• <u><i>Outcome</i></u> : Identify next steps (if any) for TPAC on this issue.	
11:40 AM	10.		ADJOURN	Elissa Gertler, Chair
* ] ** ] # ]	Material a Material v Material v	availal will be will be	ble electronically. e distributed in advance of the meeting. e distributed at the meeting.	
For a	<i>genda an</i> To	<i>d sche</i> checl	edule information, call Kelsey Newell at 503-797-1916, e-mail: <u>kelsey.new</u> k on closure or cancellations during inclement weather please call 503-7	<u>ell@oregonmetro.gov</u> . 797-1700.
Future TF           •         M           •         Hi           •         Cc           •         A           •         Cc	PAC disc OVES up gh Spee ontext se briefing ongestio	cussi odate ed Rai ensiti on th n Pri	on items: il ve design and least cost planning ne Metro Auditor's <i>Tracking Transportation Project Outcome</i> cing Pilot Study	s report

#### 2012 TPAC Work Program 6/22/12

<ul> <li>June 29. 2012 - Regular Meeting <ul> <li>Comment Letter on draft Oregon Statewide Transportation Strategy - Discussion and Recommendation to JPACT</li> <li>Climate Smart Communities - Discussion of Phase 1 sensitivity analysis and draft scenario options</li> <li>Proposed changes to the State Transportation Improvement Program Funding Allocation and Project Selection Process - Information/Discussion</li> <li>Hole-in-the-Air Reporting Back</li> <li>Recommendation to JPACT on Amending the 2012-15 MTIP to Add: <ul> <li>Crescent Connection: Cedar Hills Blvd. Denney Road;</li> <li>Construction phase to the I-84 EB to I- 205 Auxiliary Lane project; and</li> <li>Kellogg Lake Pedestrian and Bicycle Connection</li> </ul> </li> </ul></li></ul>	<ul> <li>July 27. 2012 - Regular Meeting <ul> <li>Climate Smart Communities - Discussion of scenario options</li> <li>Contextual Influences on Trip Generation (OTREC report) - Information</li> <li>HOLD: STARS presentation - Information</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<ul> <li>August 31, 2012 - Regular Meeting         <ul> <li>Oregon Sustainable Transportation Initiative (OSTI) - LCDC Rulemaking on selection of preferred scenario - Informational</li> <li>Climate Smart Communities Scenarios - Discussion</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>September 28, 2012 - Regular Meeting</li> <li>Oregon Sustainable Transportation Initiative (OSTI) - LCDC Rulemaking on selection of preferred scenario - Discussion</li> </ul>
October 26, 2012 – Regular Meeting <ul> <li>Climate Smart Communities Scenarios – Discussion</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>November 30, 2012 – Regular Meeting</li> <li>Climate Smart Communities Scenarios – Discussion</li> </ul>

#### Parking Lot:

- MOVES update
- High Speed Rail
- Context sensitive design and least cost planning
- A briefing on the Metro Auditor's *Tracking Transportation Project Outcomes* report
- Congestion Pricing Pilot Study
- Metropolitan Planning Area boundary update
- Sustainable Transportation Analysis and Rating System (STARS)

# 🚯 Metro | Making a great place

#### TRANSPORTATION POLICY ALTERNATIVES COMMITTEE MAY 25, 2012 Metro Regional Center, Council Chamber

#### MEMBERS PRESENT

Karen Buehrig Elissa Gertler, Chair Carol Gossett Heidi Guenin Nancy Kraushaar Alan Lehto Margaret Middleton Satvinder Sandhu Karen Schilling Charlie Stephens Rian Windsheimer

#### MEMBERS EXCUSED

Chris Beanes Brent Curtis David Eatwell John Hoefs Katherine Kelly Scott King Dean Lookingbill Dave Nordberg Paul Smith Sharon Zimmerman

#### ALTERNATES PRESENT

Andy Back Steve Bloomquist Lynda David John Dorst Courtney Duke Phil Healy

#### AFFILIATION

Clackamas County Metro Community Representative Community Representative City of Oregon City, Representing Cities of Clackamas Co. TriMet City of Beaverton, Representing Cities of Washington Co. Federal Highway Administration Multnomah County Community Representative Oregon Department of Transportation

#### AFFILIATION

Community Representative Washington County Community Representative C-TRAN City of Gresham, Representing Cities of Multnomah Co. Port of Portland Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Committee Oregon Department of Environmental Quality City of Portland Washington State Department of Transportation

AFFILIATION Washington County Port of Portland Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Committee City of Gresham, Representing Cities of Multnomah Co City of Portland Port of Portland

<u>STAFF:</u> Anthony Butzek, Kim Ellis, Daniel Kaempff, Nuin-Tara Key, Tom Kloster, Ted Leybold, Robin McArthur, Lake McTighe, Brian Monberg, Josh Naramore, Deena Platman, Deb Redman, Dylan Rivera, Marc Week.

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

Chair Elissa Gertler declared a quorum and called the meeting to order at 9:34 a.m. Chair Gerlter introduced Mr. John Dorst of the City of Gresham representing Cities of Multnomah County and Mr.

Steve Bloomquist representing the Port of Portland. Mr. Dorst and Mr. Bloomquist would be representing their respective jurisdictions but would not hold voting rights.

#### 2. <u>COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS</u>

Mr. Rian Windsheimer of the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) reminded the committee that construction season is starting and that ODOT will be conducting safety awareness. He provided a map of construction projects in Northwest Oregon.

Mr. Tom Kloster of Metro brought to the committee's consideration the option to add a new member to TPAC. Metro staff would like the committee to consider the addition of the Oregon Transportation Research and Education Consortium (OTREC) director as a member to TPAC. Metro has already been working with OTREC and believes that the Committee would benefit from a research presence. Committee members expressed to desire to broaden the conversation to a general membership additions.

#### 3. <u>CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO TPAC ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS</u>

There was none.

#### 4. CONSIDERATION OF THE TPAC MINUTES FOR APRIL 27, 2012

<u>MOTION</u>: Mr. Andy Back moved, Ms. Heidi Guenin seconded, to approve the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) minutes for April 27, 2012.

ACTION TAKEN: With all in favor, the motion passed.

#### 5. <u>INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS</u>

#### 5.1 Oregon Freight Plan Amendments

Mr. Windsheimer and Mr. Kloster discussed comments on Oregon Freight Plan Amendments. At the April TPAC meeting, members agreed to hold a TPAC subcommittee workshop to draft comments for the freight plan amendments. The work group drafted a list of questions for ODOT concerning ORS 366.215 to which ODOT has responded with answers. ODOT has not answered every one of the subcommittee's questions but the conversation is ongoing. Mr. Kloster noted that the questions that the subcommittee drafted were not on the amendments themselves but on guidelines that are administrative in nature. Mr. Kloster proposed another workshop on June 11, 2012 and to wait for the process to move forward to draft comments on the administrative process.

The committee discussed the following items:

- The timeframe that the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) will adopt the amendments. The Guidance themselves will move ahead at the OTC July meeting but the administrative guidance will be under further consideration.
- The committee expressed concerns on specific texts to which they agreed to provide to Metro staff for a comment memo.
- The committee appreciated the extra time to be involved in the issues and have analysis on the impact these changes could make.

#### 5.2 Climate Smart Communities – Project Update and Discussion on Framing Scenario Options

Ms. Kim Ellis of Metro provided an update on the Climate Smart Comminutes project. The Climate Smart Communities project is a multi-year, collaborative effort to help communities in the Portland metropolitan region achieve the planning efforts they want and achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals. Metro is implementing the Envision Tomorrow tool to allow local communities to develop their tangible vision of their communities. Ms. Ellis invited the committee members to a brownbag presentation demonstrating the Envision Tomorrow program on June 12, 2012 at Metro. Ms. Ellis overviewed four-example investment-based scenarios, which compared current plans to new ambitions and investments or state and federal actions. The scenario options framework will continue to be refined prior to being brought forward to MPAC and JPACT in July. The Oregon Transportation Commission released the draft Oregon Statewide Transportation Strategy was on May 18 for public comment through July 20. ODOT staff will present the strategy to TPAC and MTAC at a special meeting on June 18, MPAC on June 27<sup>th</sup> and JPACT in July.

The committee discussed the following items:

- The committee expressed concern that the only option for local communities could be through new ambitions and/or new state and federal actions.
- Members noted the emphasis on design and roadways. Members discussed other areas of greenhouse emissions such as fleet, technology and car sharing.
- Members expressed that more concrete examples of how things will be implemented would be helpful, particularly examples of projects that are already underway so policy makers can see the opportunity for integrating and coordinating investments to achieve what communities all want and are already pursuing.
- The challenge of attracting investors to invest in the area and need for subsidies.

# 5.3 Regional Safety Action Plan – Discussion of Recommendations and Framing of Implementation

Mr. Anthony Butzek and Mr. Josh Naramore of Metro discussed the Regional Safety Action Plan. Since fall 2009, responding to a Federal Highway Administration recommendation, Metro has been working with the Regional Safety Workgroup to better integrate safety into the transportation planning process. The Workgroup has been working on a Regional Transportation Safety Plan (RTSP), the first of its kind for this region with the goal to help the region meet the RTP target for reducing fatalities and serious injury crashes. The Regional Safety Workgroup identified the most significant findings from the State of Safety report focusing on trends that are clearly apparent from the crash data and presented in detail in the State of Safety in the Region report. The report identified short and long-term recommendations to improve safety in the Metro Area. Mr. Naramore elicited comments from the committee on how to frame discussion for the July JPACT meeting.

The committee discussed the following items:

- The committee expressed excitement for the program, stated that Metro can be a national leader in traffic safety, and advocated intergrading safety into the Regional Transportation Plan.
- Members suggested putting regional funds in local pilot programs to obtain data and learn from it.
- Members expressed the need to have a broader and more robust discussion on how safety improvement would be paid for and if it would require taking away funding from other areas.

- Members discussed resources available to fund safety improvements including local, regional and federal.
- Driver and public education is important because it its cost effective.
- Members noted that updating street lighting could be cost effective when you look at energy savings.
- Have an attorney involved in the safety planning process to address liability and language use.

#### 5.4 East Metro Connections Update

Mr. Brian Monberg of Metro provided an update on the East Metro Connection Plan (EMCP). EMCP is a Metro-led corridor refinement plan that identified transportation improvements in East Multnomah County. EMCP is the first mobility corridor refinement plan identified in the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to be implemented in our region. As opposed to past corridor plans, a mobility corridor refinement plan aims to better integrate land use, community and economic development, environmental and transportation goals. This two-year effort analyzed present and future transportation needs and opportunities and identified key investments that support north/south mobility, downtowns and employment areas and regional mobility. The plan will be completed in June, 2012, with local council actions scheduled in June and July 2012. Metro will initiate a process to amend the Regional Transportation Plan in the fall of 2012.

The committee discussed the following items:

- The committee expressed satisfaction related to the comprehensive approach taken.
- The committee discussed how the projects fit into local Transportation System Plans and the Regional Transportation Plan given the current financial constraints.
- The project maximizes the currents system by emphasizing multiple routes using existing arterials to provide better access and connections.

# 5.5 Formation of a Regional Travel Options / Transportation System Management & Operations Work Group

Mr. Kloster, Ms. Deena Platman, and Daniel Kaempff of Metro discussed the formation of a Regional Travel Options / Transportation System Management & Operations work group. Metro currently administers two formal sub-committees of TPAC to support regional system and demand management activities: the TransPort coordinates system and operations management activities and the Regional Travel Options subcommittee. Metropolitan Planning Organization/Metro related policy and funding allocation activities currently performed by TransPort and the RTO Subcommittee will now be developed in consultation with an ad-hoc work group of TPAC members and stakeholders engaged in system and demand management activities.

#### 6. <u>ADJOURN</u>

Chair Gertler adjourned the meeting at 11:57 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maker

Marcus Week Recording Secretary

5.25.12 TPAC Minutes

# ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR May 25, 2012 The following have been included as part of the official public record:

ITEM	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT NO.
2.0	Booklet	2012	ODOT Construction Map	052510t-01
4.0	Memo	05/25/12	Climate Smart Communities - Proposed Framework	052510t -02
5.2	PPT	05/25/12	CSC - Framing the scenarios	052510t -03
6.1	РРТ	5/25/12	Regional Transportation Safety Plan	052510t -04
6.2	РРТ	5/25/12	East Metro Connections Plan	052510t-05

EARL BLUMENAUER THIRD DISTRICT, OREGON

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH

COMMITTEE ON BUDGET



WASHINGTON OFFICE: 1502 LONGWORTH BUILDING WASHINGTON, DC 20515 (202) 225-4811 FAX: (202) 225-8941

DISTRICT OFFICE: 729 N.E. OREGON STREET SUITE 115 PORTLAND, OR 97232 (503) 231-2300 Fax: (503) 230-5413

website: blumenauer.house.gov

# Congress of the United States House of Representatives Washington, DC 20515-3703

June 6, 2012

Oregon Department of Transportation ODOT Flexible Funds Program 555 13<sup>th</sup> NE Suite 2 Salem, OR 97301

RE: ODOT Flexible Funds Project: City of Milwaukie pedestrian and bike trail under the proposed light rail bridge over Kellogg Lake

Dear Internal Review Committee Members,

I am writing in support of the City of Milwaukie's grant application to ODOT's Flexible Funds program for \$2.1 million to construct a pedestrian and bike trail under the proposed light rail bridge over Kellogg Lake.

The proposed trail connection would provide an unmatched multi-modal experience for persons walking or biking between downtown Milwaukie and communities west of Hwy 99E in the Island Station, Oak Grove and Jennings Lodge neighborhoods. The trail connection includes a multi-use path and bridge over Kellogg Lake and through the undeveloped Kronberg park and TriMet-owned right-of-way in the City of Milwaukie. The trail also ties into the soon to be completed Trolley Trail to the south and on-street bike lanes in downtown Milwaukie leading to the Springwater Trail to the north.

The Kellogg Lake bridge superstructure is being funded separately as part of the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail project and is structurally designed to accommodate a lower deck for pedestrians and bicycles to replace a long-gone footbridge across the lake that fell into disrepair in the mid 20<sup>th</sup> century. By building concurrently with the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail bridge over Kellogg Lake in late 2012/early 2013, the City of Milwaukie can implement a long neglected need to reconstruct the pedestrian bridge in this location with virtually no adverse impacts to fish or wildlife. Additionally, the majority of the environmental permitting necessary to authorize the work has been completed as part of the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail project in anticipation of this opportunity for the City of Milwaukie.

It is my understanding that the trail connection through Kronberg Park and on the bridge would provide a safe, comfortable, and convenient connection, particularly for students at Milwaukie High School, which is located at the north end of the path connection. Milwaukie High School students regularly cross Kellogg Lake to the Island Station neighborhood via an old, wooden railroad trestle on the Tillamook Branch which lacks adequate pedestrian facilities for public use. There have been recent tragic accidents on this trestle.

This project will dramatically improve pedestrian safety and ensure a safe, non-highway transportation route to school for residents in nearby neighborhoods. This project would also lay the foundation for future connections with the 21-mile Springwater Corridor on the northern edge of Milwaukie. Its construction would be a significant addition to the regional trail network. Lastly, this crucial link over two major barriers, Kellogg lake and Hwy 99E, would be built using re-used lumber from local sources.

I am glad to lend my support for this vital transportation improvement project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Earl Blumenauer Member of Congress



PARKS & RECREATION DISTRICT

Administration

150 Beavercreek Rd. Oregon City, OR 97045 503.742.4348 phone 503.742.4349 fax ncprd.com

June 5, 2012

**Internal Review Committee Members Oregon Department of Transportation ODOT Flexible Funds Program** 555 13<sup>th</sup> NE Suite 2 Salem, OR 97301

RE: Kellogg Lake Pedestrian/Bike Bridge and Mutli-Use path Grant Proposal

**Dear Committee Members:** 

North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District (NCPRD) encourages your support for the City of Milwaukie's Kellogg Lake Pedestrian/Bike Bridge and Mutli-Use path project. This project helps establish a complete transportation network and supports several other important recent or planned investments in the area, including the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project and the Trolley Trail. The project will provide improved multi-modal access for people walking or biking between downtown Milwaukie and communities west of Highway 99E.

NCPRD is completing construction of the 6-mile regional Trolley Trail that would connect to the proposed Kellogg Lake Pedestrian and Bicycle Bridge and Multi-Use path project. This proposed project supports the creation of a more vibrant and livable community by providing a direct a connection between the Light Rail, Trolley Trail, Kronberg Park, Dogwood Park, local businesses and other destinations in downtown Milwaukie.

NCPRD encourages funding the City of Milwaukie's Kellogg Lake Pedestrian/Bike Bridge and Mutli-Use path project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Michelle Dealy

Michelle Healy **Deputy Director** 



CAROLYN TOMEI STATE REPRESENTATIVE DISTRICT 41 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Internal Review Committee Members Oregon Department of Transportation ODOT Flexible Funds Program 555 13<sup>th</sup> NE Suite 2 Salem, OR 97301

Dear Internal Review Committee Members,

As a State Representative, and former Mayor of the City of Milwaukie, I write in support of the building of the Kellogg Lake Pedestrian/Bike Bridge and Multi-Use path.

I feel that this crossing will be essential to the safety and convenience of the community for the following reasons:

1. The bridge would provide a legitimate, direct connection across the lake via a signalized crossing of HWY 99E at SE River Road. This will help ensure a safe route for all pedestrians heading to school, the public library, work, and other transit connections. It will provide a non-highway, non-motorized transportation option for residents of adjacent neighborhoods to meet their travel needs.

2. With such a close proximity to Milwaukie High School the bridge would provide a lit, safe, and convenient connection to and from school. The current path that students use consists of an old, wooden railroad trestle which lacks adequate pedestrian facilities. Recently, an individual experienced a fatal fall from this trestle while attempting to cross it.

3. The trail will act as a transit hub for people walking or biking in the communities west of HWY 99E in the Island Station, Oak Grove, and Jennings Lodge neighborhoods going over Kellogg Lake and through the underdeveloped Kronberg Park. The trail would also link-up with the new Trolley Trail to the South that is being completed and bike lanes in downtown Milwaukie eventually leading to the Springwater Trail to the North.

By funding this work you will be ensuring the safety of our community and helping to make the City of Milwaukie, Oak Grove, Jennings Lodge, and Island Station a more comfortable, pedestrian friendly place. I urge you to fund the Kellogg Lake Pedestrian/Bike Bridge and Multi-Use path.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Tomei

State Representative House District 41

Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Internal Review Committee ODOT Flexible Funds Program Planning Section 555 13th St. NE, Suite 2 Salem, Oregon 97301

June 5, 2012

Dear Internal Review Committee Members,

The North Clackamas Urban Watersheds Council would like to express our support for the Kellogg Lake Multi-Use Bridge and Trail Connection project submitted by the City of Milwaukie for funding by ODOT's Flexible Funds Program. This project is important to our council in that it supports healthy ecosystems and green recreation through encouraging alternative modes of transportation as well as promotes citizens of the watershed to get outside.

The council recognizes that as more citizens engage in recreation activities in our watershed, they are more likely to promote the restoration projects we pursue. Without this trail, many residents will drive instead of walk or bike which increases pollution from motor vehicles as well as decreases habitat quantity and quality.

We are enthusiastically supporting this project and the opportunity for education and outreach that will arise from it. Thank you for considering the Kellogg Lake Multi-Use Bridge and Trail Connection project for funding by ODOT's Flexible Funds Program.

Sincerely,

Cara Mico Coordinator for the North Clackamas Urban Watersheds Council



June 8, 2012

Internal Review Committee Members Oregon Department of Transportation ODOT Flexible Funds Program 555 13th NE, Suite 2 Salem, OR 97301

Dear Internal Review Committee Members,

The Milwaukie Park and Recreation Board would like to encourage you to fund the Kellogg Lake Pedestrian/Bike Bridge and Multi-Use path. Funding this project now will allow the pedestrian bike path to be constructed during the construction of the light rail bridge, saving time and expense in the long run.

Milwaukie and North Clackamas County residents have waited for years for a connection between the Island Station and Oak Grove areas and Milwaukie's downtown. The pedestrian/bike bridge proposed by the City would provide a vital link to recreational trail users, commuters biking or walking to the downtown light rail station, and residents going to the Sunday Farmers Market or enjoying a downtown restaurant or retail establishment.

The Park Board has long been an advocate for the development of Kronberg Park at the southern end of the proposed bridge. We believe that the bridge will provide an important connection to Kronberg Park for those wanting to visit the park from the downtown area and other parts of the City. In addition, the path will provide excellent viewing opportunities for users as they cross Kellogg Lake and, after the Kellogg dam removal, the restored riparian area and natural habitat.

We strongly urge you to fund this important link in our City's pedestrian and bike network.

Sincerely,

Hughes

Mart Hughes Chair, Milwaukie Park and Recreation Board



June 11, 2012

Internal Review Committee Members Oregon Department of Transportation ODOT Flexible Funds Program 555 13th NE Suite 2 Salem, OR 97301

Dear Internal Review Committee Members,

The Milwaukie Riverfront Task Force would like to express our strong support for the Kellogg Lake Pedestrian/Bike Bridge and Multi-Use path. The proposed trail connection would provide an much needed multi-modal experience for persons walking or biking between downtown Milwaukie and communities to the south of Hwy 99E, including the Island Station neighborhood, Oak Grove and Jennings Lodge.

In addition to championing the development of Milwaukie's Riverfront Park, the Riverfront Task Force is a strong advocate of the Kellogg Dam removal and restoration of the lake bed and Kellogg Creek riparian area. The construction of this pedestrian/bike bridge can only enhance the public understanding of this important restoration area.

We hope that you will fund this important project so that its construction may benefit from the light rail bridge construction to begin this summer.

Sincerely,

Dave Green Chair, Milwaukie Riverfront Task Force

			Phase 1					Phase 2				
Prelim	inary Engineering	Unit	Price	Quantity	Unit	E	xtended	Notes	Quantity	Unit	Extended	Notes
1	Project Administration							Included in item #2				Included in item #2
2	Engineering and Administration		1	18%	LS	\$	117,196		18%	LS	\$ 18,923	
								NEPA complete;				NEPA complete;
								local permits				local permits
3	Environmental							included in item #2				included in item #2
4	Coordination							Included in item #2				Included in item #2
5	Information.Interpretive							Included in item #2				Included in item #2
6	Other Development/PE							Included in item #2				Included in item #2
Right o	of Way (ROW)											
								Value of permanent				Value of permanent
								easement on				easement on
7	Easements	\$	0.35	3750	SF	\$	-	TriMet right-of-way	5476	SF	\$-	TriMet right-of-way
								Already in public				Already in public
8	Acquisitions							ownership				ownership
9	Relocations							NA				NA
10	Litigation							NA				NA
Constr	ruction											
11	Construction Administration							Included in item #2				Included in item #2
12	Site Preparation							Included in items #13-15				#13-15
								includes				includes
								excavation, AC -				excavation, AC -
								2.5", aggregate				2.5", aggregate
								base, drainage,				base, drainage,
13	Asphalt Path	\$	83.86		LF	\$	-	and labor	1194	LF	\$100,129	and labor
								Includes boardwalk				Includes boardwalk
14	Boardwalk Path	\$3	74.04		LF	\$	-	materials and labor		LF	\$-	materials and labor
		<u> </u>			~ -	•	<b></b>	Includes materials		~ -	<u>^</u>	Includes materials
15	Bridge Structure	\$1	97.50	3290	SF	\$	649,775	and labor		SF	\$ -	and labor
		<u> </u>				•		Includes fixtures			<u>^</u>	Includes fixtures
16	Lighting	\$5,5	00.00		ΕA	\$	-	and poles only		ΕA	<b>þ</b> -	and poles only
47	Other Electrical	¢	05 00		. –	¢		includes wiring,		. –	¢	includes wiring,
17	Other Electrical	\$	25.00		LF	\$	-	metering, conduits		LF	<b>ф</b> -	inetering, conduits
								nouces mugation				nonuces mitigation
10	Londoopping	¢	45.00			¢		planting and	A A E A		¢ = 000	planting and
18	Lanuscaping	ð.	40.00			\$	-	nonioning Romovable bellerd	1454		φ 5,000	Romovable bellerd
								with key at each				with key at each
10	Other Elements/Pollarda	¢ 0	00 00			¢		and			¢	and
19	Other Construction	ъэ	00.00		сA	φ	-			сA	φ -	
20												
21	Contractor OH Profit & Risk			25%		¢	162 ///		25%		\$ 31 000	
21				25/0		Ψ	102,444	Based on	23/0		ψ 51,000	Based on
								concentual design				concentual design
22	Contingency			20%		\$	129 955	nhase	20%		\$ 24 800	nhase
22	Contingency			2070		Ψ	120,000	phuse	2070		ψ 27,000	phuse
				Ph1 Subte	otal	\$1	059.370	1	Ph2 Subt	otal	\$179,852	1

				Converts 2010			Converts 2010
				estimate to 2013			estimate to 2015
				construction			construction
23 Year of Expenditure Escalation	10%	\$	105,937	(3%/yr)	10%	\$ 17,985	(3%/yr)

Ph1 Total \$1,165,306

Ph2 Total \$197,837

\$ 649,775 \$ 405 Phase 1 Construction Only Phase 2 Construction Only

\$ 105,129

#### Transportation Enhancement Program Implementing Procedures for the Discretionary Account Adopted December 2005

The Transportation Enhancement (TE) Discretionary Account is allocated about \$2 million per year for FY 2006 through 2011. This allows ODOT to apply TE funds directly to qualified projects as needs become known, separate from the competitive project selection process. The Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) approves funds for these projects based on requests from the ODOT Director. Projects funded this way are subject to the same eligibility criteria and selection priorities used in the competitive selection process, and some additional conditions specific to the Discretionary Account.

On November 16, 2005 the OTC authorized the TE Advisory Committee to adopt implementing procedures for the Discretionary Account, consistent with current policy guidelines in place for those funds. The following procedures implement the "Transportation Enhancement Program Policy for Discretionary Funding" which the OTC approved on November 17, 2003.

#### I. Purpose

The purpose of the TE Discretionary Account is to allow ODOT to apply TE funds directly to qualified projects as needs become known, separate from the competitive selection process. It provides a means for funding TE activities that have a desired delivery time less than the typical two to four years, and it allows ODOT to leverage TE funds with other funding when opportunities arise outside the defined TE application period.

Most TE funds are awarded through a statewide competitive process on a two-year cycle. The TE Discretionary Account allows for expedited consideration and funding of projects that cannot wait for the next selection cycle. These funds are not meant for projects that could have competed in the previous selection cycle, or that can likely be completed with other funds. They may be used only when other sources of financial support are unavailable or insufficient.

#### II. Intended Projects

TE Discretionary funds are primarily for start-up or "gap" funding on multi-agency projects, though stand-alone projects advanced by a single applicant can also qualify. Projects must be ready to proceed. Most will have design or development efforts already in progress. Projects that directly support tourism or economic development receive preferential consideration.

Prospective projects must meet the same eligibility and technical requirements as TE projects awarded through competitive selection. They must fit the existing "project selection criteria" and represent an effective use of funds for efforts that promote the intent of the TE program. Projects must also demonstrate:

- A clear sense of urgency, including a convincing reason why the project cannot wait for the next selection cycle, and why it was not submitted in the last cycle.
- Strong local support for advancing the project immediately.

Part V (Project Requirements) contains further detail on the eligibility factors noted above.

#### III. Funding Levels

<u>Annual Allocation</u>: The OTC determines available funding for the TE Program, including the Discretionary Account. TE Discretionary funding for FY 2006-2011 is expected to average \$2.2 million per year. The actual amount expended in a given year will vary based on project needs and on priorities determined by the TE Program Manager and Highway Finance Office.

<u>Award Limit</u>: Due to limited funds and the expected volume of requests, the maximum award is \$1 million per project. This is typically the upper range of awards for TE projects funded through competitive selection.

<u>Matching Funds</u>: TE Discretionary projects are subject to the same local match requirements as other TE projects, set forth in the current *TE Program Policy and Procedures* for Oregon.

#### IV. Program Criteria

TE Discretionary projects are subject to the *TE Program Policy and Procedures* adopted by the TE Advisory Committee. Pertinent sections of that policy are amended as needed to incorporate these implementing procedures for the TE Discretionary Account.

#### V. Project Requirements

Prospective projects are judged against several criteria including TE eligibility criteria, technical merit, and how well a project fits the intent and focus of the TE Discretionary program. To qualify for TE Discretionary funds, a project must:

- Meet federal and state TE eligibility criteria.
- Demonstrate urgency, readiness, and local support sufficient to justify immediate funding.
- Pass the ODOT Technical Review with a rating of "adequate" or better.
- Represent an appropriate use of TE funds, comparable to recently approved projects (determined by the project's score using the current TE project selection criteria).

<u>Eligibility</u>: The eligibility determination occurs in two parts. First is deciding if the project is *eligible* for TE funding. The *TE Program Policy and Procedures* (most recent update) provides the basis for eligibility determinations. The TE Program Manager makes the determination, with assistance from the Federal Highway Administration and ODOT staff if needed.

In the second step, the TE Advisory Committee assesses whether the project *qualifies* for TE Discretionary funds, based on the degree of urgency, need, and local support. A project qualifies as *urgent* if it <u>cannot</u> or <u>should not</u> wait for the next competitive selection cycle. The TE Advisory Committee returns an opinion on urgency based on information in the Notice of Intent (NOI) submitted for the project. The NOI narrative must explain why the project is urgent, based on one or more of the following reasons:

- 1. Essential funds from other sources will no longer be available.
- 2. Partnerships or agreements essential to the project will no longer be in effect.
- 3. The physical condition of the project site will change or deteriorate beyond what can be reasonably addressed without major reconstruction.
- 4. A critical event that drives the timing of the project will have already passed.
- 5. The project is closely linked to a STIP project or other investments in the area, and it would be too expensive or disruptive to do the TE work later as a separate project.

<u>Readiness and Local Support</u>: The TE Advisory Committee evaluates readiness and support based on information in the Notice of Intent. Projects must be ready to proceed immediately if approved for funding. Most will have coordination efforts and some level of design (beyond planning reconnaissance and concept drawings) already under way before requesting the TE funds. The NOI must show that there is strong political and public interest in advancing the project immediately, and indicate the amount of local financial support.

<u>Technical Review</u>: The TE Program Manager coordinates a technical review by ODOT staff from appropriate region offices and technical specialties. The reviewers rate a project on feasibility, readiness, and adherence to standards. The rating system is the same as in the most recent competitive selection cycle. To pass, the project must receive predominant ratings of "adequate" or above, and have no serious project delivery concerns.

<u>Scoring</u>: Proposals are judged against the current TE project selection criteria. If time allows, the proposal is distributed to members of the TE Advisory Committee for scoring and the composite score applies. If a decision is needed immediately the TE Program Manager may score the project without Committee assistance. To pass, the project must achieve a composite score of 70 or higher *or* comparable to the scores for projects on the most recent Reserve List.

Part of the score considers how well a project fits identified focus areas, including how it supports tourism and economic development. A significant part of the score considers whether the project represents an effective use of funds for activities that promote the intent of the TE program. For this purpose:

*Effective use* means the investment will produce a complete project that meets applicable standards for the type of work and clearly provides a benefit to transportation or the travel experience. The TE project may be a segment, phase or element of a larger project provided it has a use and benefit independent of the other work.

**Promote the intent** means the investment is truly an enhancement—transportation related, but not a routine or required element of transportation projects or programs. For example: TE funding is not for basic bicycle and pedestrian facilities on projects subject to Oregon "Bike Bill" requirements, and is not meant to subsidize recreation, urban renewal, or road widening projects or correct the effects of neglected maintenance and poor urban planning.

#### VI. Application and Review Process

The TE Program uses a two-step application process, starting with a Notice of Intent (NOI). If the project passes initial reviews, the second step requires submitting sufficient detail and documentation for the technical review and scoring process. This includes project description and purpose, relationship to transportation, cost estimate and funding, maps or drawings, and pertinent support documents. The format should be similar to applications in the most recent competitive selection cycle.

The NOI form, a standard application form, and instructions for both are available from the ODOT web site for the TE Program or by request from the TE Program Manager. Since TE Discretionary funding is not tied to a time-constrained competitive process, applicants may revise or supplement their proposal during the review process.

The list below shows the application and review process. Decision criteria and responsibilities are described in Part V above. The TE Program Manager informs the ODOT Director about a proposal's status throughout its review. If the proposal fails to advance at any point in the process, the TE Program Manager will notify the applicant and provide an explanation.

#### 1. Notice of Intent

Applicant submits a NOI to the TE Program Manager. The narrative must explain the elements of urgency, readiness, and local support that justify immediate action.

#### 2. Eligibility Determination

TE Program Manager determines if the proposal is eligible for TE funding.

#### 3. Urgency/Need Determination

TE Advisory Committee considers the project's urgency, readiness and local support to determine if TE Discretionary funds are appropriate. They then decide to endorse or oppose advancing it for technical review and scoring.

#### 4. Application and Supporting Documents

Applicant provides a complete application, with detail and supporting documents sufficient for technical review and scoring.

#### 5. Technical Review and Scoring

ODOT staff conducts a technical review, and with that information the TE Advisory Committee scores the proposal according to pre-established selection criteria.

#### 6. **ODOT Director Review**

TE Program Manager forwards the proposal to the ODOT Director. Director may endorse it as is, or return it to Committee or applicants for clarification and revisions.

#### 7. Request to OTC

ODOT Director submits the funding request for OTC approval.

#### 8. OTC Approval

OTC approves TE Discretionary funds and approves adding the project to the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

## NOTICE OF INTENT for Transportation Enhancement Discretionary Program

FAX completed Notice to: (503) 986-3290 or email to: patricia.r.fisher@odot.state.or.us

#### **INSTRUCTIONS:**

- 1. Enter project information in the boxes below.
- Attach a letter or narrative (1 page max.) explaining the <u>need</u> for the project, type and extent
  of <u>proposed work</u>, property <u>ownership</u> status, <u>funds requested</u> and <u>matching funds</u> available, and
  the role of any <u>co-applicants or partners</u>. For TE Discretionary funds, also discuss: <u>why the project
  is urgent</u> and its level of <u>readiness and local support</u>.
- 3. Attach a vicinity map and site map or other appropriate graphics—1 or 2 pages.

APPLICA	NT					
Agency	City of Milwa	aukie	Contact	Kenny Asher		
Address	6101 SE Jo	hnson Creek Blvd.	Title	Director, Community		
	Milwaukie, O	DR 97206		Development		
				503-786-7654		
			Email	AsherK@ci.milwaukie.or.us		
CO-APPL	ICANT (if any)		-	-		
Name	TriMet		Contact	Dan Blocher		
Address	710 NE Holl	aday St.	Title	Executive Director-Capital		
	Portland, Ol	R 97232		Projects		
			Telephone	503-962-2201		
PROJECT (name, location, and one-line description) Kellogg Lake Pedestrian and Bicycle Connection, City of Milwaukie Construction of a pedestrian and bicycle connection over Kellogg Lake to link downtown and adjacent						
COST SU	IMMARY		RIGHT-OF-WAY NEEDS			
TE Funds	Requested:	\$1,000,000	Property to	be purchased?		
Matching	funds	\$165,306	[]yes [	X]no []don't know yet		
Non-TE c	osts	N/A	Easements	or donated property?		
Total Proj	ect Cost	\$1,165,306	[X] yes [	] no [] don't know yet		
COORDINATION ISSUES (mark all that apply)						
[X] Projec (metro	ct located in MP opolitan area wit	O jurisdiction h population >50,000)	[ ] Pro [X] Pro	ject on railroad property ject at or near a railroad crossing		
[] P [X] U	roject within sta se of land own	te highway right-of-way ed by another agency	[] Co [] Ma	ntribution from other than applicant intenance by other than applicant		



### Proposed Multi Use Path at Kellogg Lake





June 12, 2012



To Whom It May Concern:

The City of Milwaukie has long sought to re-establish a direct bike/ped connection between its downtown and neighborhoods to the south, which are separated by 99E, an undeveloped park, and Kellogg Lake. This direct connection would allow employees, students, and residents to safely reach their jobs, schools, public services, buses and restaurants in downtown Milwaukie. For decades, bicyclists and pedestrians have been making due walking and riding along 99E (lacking sidewalks in some locations), behind the Kellogg Wastewater Treatment Plant (out-of-direction to the downtown), or tragically, across an active freight rail trestle which recently resulted in a fatal fall. In the 1950's, a footbridge across the lake allowed access to and from the historic downtown; today, derelict wood pilings are all that remain of this transportation link. Kronberg Park, just south of Kellogg Lake, also awaits improvements. Today, the park is hemmed in by the highway and the lake – a difficult place to access, let alone enjoy.

A multi-use bridge over Kellogg Lake has been envisioned to resolve all of these transportation challenges, while extending the recently constructed six-mile North Clackamas Park and Recreation District's Trolley Trail into downtown Milwaukie. By connecting trails, parks, neighborhoods and commercial centers, the multi-use bridge would result in a significant transportation enhancement for the community in terms of travel options, safety and economic development.

The project has a rapidly closing window of opportunity in which to get done. Unless constructed as part of the Portland-Milwaukie light rail (PMLR) project, the inevitable increases in cost, environmental impacts and construction complexity will likely preclude the bike/ped bridge from ever being built.

The PMLR project is a short-lived opportunity to cost-effectively restore this bike/ped connection. A light rail bridge over Kellogg Lake has been structurally designed to carry a lower deck for pedestrians and bicyclists, provided construction can occur simultaneously with the light rail project. Construction crews can utilize a light rail work bridge and staging area, saving the multi-use bridge considerable expense. The temporary work bridge is scheduled for removal in the summer of 2013. In order to achieve maximum cost efficiencies, therefore, the multi-use bridge must be installed on or around April 1, 2013 -- after the vertical supports of the light rail bridge are in place, but prior to fastening the light rail deck above. The City and TriMet need a funding commitment by September 1, 2012 to allow negotiation, design, fabrication , and procurement of the multi-use structure.

The City of Milwaukie and TriMet are project partners. The work will be performed by TriMet's light rail contractor as a design/build change order to quickly meet the required timeframe. The total construction cost is estimated at \$1,165,306 and includes \$165,306 in approved local match from the City of Milwaukie. The City and TriMet will complete the non-schedule constrained connections to SE McLoughlin Boulevard (Highway 99E) and Main Street prior to the opening of the light rail bridge and as soon as feasible (not part of this grant application).

National Environmental Policy Act clearances, state and federal environmental approvals, and local permits have been secured to allow construction of the multi use bridge to commence within the timeframe described above. Additionally, all property required for this project is already in public ownership. Public support for this project is strong and includes all affected neighborhood associations, the Milwaukie City Council and its boards and commissions, TriMet, elected state and federal representatives, North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District, and the North Clackamas Urban Watersheds Council. I strongly urge your careful consideration of this project for the Transportation Enhancement Discretionary Account.

espectfully Yours,

Kenneth Asher Community Development & Public Works Director

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BUILDING • ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT • ENGINEERING • PLANNING 6101 SE Johnson Creek Blvd., Mihvankie, Oregon 97206 P) 503-786-7600 / F) 503-774-8236 www.cityofmilwaukie.org



# Changing ODOT's Funding Allocation & Project Selection Processes

# **DRAFT** Recommended Scenarios

June 2012 OTC Meeting

#### Introduction

This document continues the ongoing conversation on the development of new funding allocation and project selection processes at ODOT. At prior meetings the OTC has given direction in the development of scenarios for funding, Fix-It and Enhance Category parameters, and supporting assumptions. The enclosed materials address the next steps in this evolving process.

#### Included in this packet you will find:

- A recommended funding level (range) to be used as a baseline scenario.
- Recommended funding approaches for three funding levels.
- A recommended funding 'split' for the Enhance and Fix-It Categories.
- A recommended funding 'split' within the Enhance Category to allocate funding to the ODOT Regions and a set-aside for the OTC to address state priorities or unintended gaps left in the implementation of this new process.
- Listings of project types eligible for the Enhance and Fix-It Categories.
- A listing of descriptions and assumptions pertaining to the recommendations.
- An allocation worksheet that shows total projected funding for the three funding levels and the resulting dollar allocations from the recommendations.
- Several spreadsheets with supporting details of the: a) STIP allocations (blue),
   b) Enhance and Fix-It Category allocations (orange), and c) the region and state level allocations of the Enhance funds.

#### Reminders:

- Project selection and prioritization for the Enhance funding will be conducted by the ACTs.
- Project selection for the Fix-It funding will be done via ODOT management systems and staff in alignment with the Guiding Principles developed for that purpose. A subsequent report will be developed showing results of the project selection and impacts on system condition and service delivery.

#### Direction sought from the OTC at its June meeting

Does the information that is provided in this packet provide the OTC with the necessary information to make a decision in July regarding the following:

- Enhance and Fix-It Category allocations at the three funding levels
- Funding splits between the Enhance and Fix-It Categories, using the baseline funding scenario
- Potential range for baseline funding recommendation
- Funding splits for Regions and a portion set aside for OTC allocation
- Confirm decisions from the April OTC meeting regarding TGM and IOF, which were to maintain their existing budgets and program responsibilities.
- Confirm decision from the April OTC meeting regarding CMAQ, which was to have this
  program continue as it currently exists for this STIP update, and have a further discussion
  on this program and these funds prior to future funding allocation decision making.
- Acknowledge that there may be a decision needed regarding recreation trails / Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

Direction and decisions sought from the OTC at its July meeting:

Approval of funding allocation packet. Approval of application and criteria. At the April 2012 OTC meeting, several high level scenarios were reviewed. Those scenarios were based on two variables: 1) Funding Levels and 2) Allocations to the Enhance and Fix-It Categories

#### I. Funding Levels

A. Background

The three funding levels used are based on estimated likelihoods of actions taken by federal government. The three assumptions for federal funding are as follows. Funding Level 1:

This level is based on a Congressional Budget Office estimate assuming potential Congressional actions adding \$10B-\$15B annually to the Federal Highway Trust Fund to preserve current funding levels.

Funding Level 2:

This level is the midpoint between Levels 1 and 3 and also represents a general continuation of the 2012-15 STIP funding levels extended to 2015-18.

#### Funding Level 3:

This level assumes Congress does not provide additional revenues for the Federal Highway Trust Fund, requiring deep cuts.

#### B. Staff Recommendation

Use Funding Level 2 as the baseline funding level scenario given the rationale below:

- conservative and reasonable
- high likelihood that funding will not fall short of this level
- should additional funding become available it is a relatively simply process to move additional Fix-It projects forward

			Funding Level 1		
Reco	ommei	nded	Funding Level		
	acolin	۵	2		
B	aseiiii	C	<b>4</b>		
	aseiiii	с 	Funding Level		

This baseline funding level scenario assumes that funding available for Enhance and Fix-It 'Orange" project types will be approximately \$1,352M. That figure, as stated above for Funding Level 2, is a projection between the Congressional Budget Office estimate assuming Congressional actions to add to the Federal Highway Trust Fund and an estimate that assumes no additional revenue to the Federal Highway Trust Fund.

For comparison purposes, this number for the 2012-15 STIP would be approximately \$1,316. For additional detail, see page 9.

C. OTC Direction Sought

Is there concurrence that this level of funding seems reasonable as the baseline assumption? If not, what are the concerns or questions?

#### II. Category Allocations

A. Background

In the previous discussions, category allocations for Fix-It and Enhance have been percentage-based. The three allocation assumptions used in the April scenarios were as follows:

Category Allocation A:

10% increase in the amount allocated to Fix-It compared to the current allocation percentage.

Category Allocation B:

An extension of the current allocation percentages to both Fix-It and Enhance. Category Allocation C:

10% increase in the amount allocated to Enhance compared to the current allocation percentage.

(A) 10% Additional to Fix-It	(B) Current ratio (20%, 80%)	(C) 10% Additional to Enhance	
x			Funding Level 1 Additional \$
		Rec'd Baseline	Funding Level 2
	X		Funding Level 3 Reduced \$

#### Category Allocations

#### B. Staff Recommendation

The recommendation brought forward here is a hybrid of the original allocation options. It is recommended that initially there is an approximate 10% increase in funds to Enhance as compared to the 2012-15 percentage allocation to those types of projects. The guidance this would give to the Agency, assuming a baseline funding level of \$1,352M available to Enhance and Fix-It (orange funding), would be:

- 1. If funding available is within a 10% range either direction of \$1,352M, the percentage allocated to Enhance would be 24% and 76% to Fix-It. That range translates to \$1,217 to \$1,487.
- 2. Should additional funding become available between the assumed baseline scenario range, above, and the assumed Funding Level 1 amount of \$1,5872M, those additional funds would go to Fix-It.
- Should less funding become available between the assumed baseline range in 1 (above) and the assumed Funding Level 3 amount of \$1,117M, reductions will be made to Categories to move toward the central 2012-15 allocation percentages of 20% to Enhance and 80% to Fix-It.

Baseline Recommendation for State Funds: Assume state funding will continue to provide funds equivalent to the 2012-15 levels for: Bike/Ped, IOF, Rail-Highway Crossings and Site Mitigation, totaling \$47M over four years.

#### C. OTC Direction Sought

Agreement to hybrid approach of funding allocations to Enhance and Fix-It.

#### III. Project Types Eligible for Enhance Category Funds

- A. This recommendation on project types eligible for Enhance Category Funds is consistent with earlier discussions. Projects proposed via the application process with the ACTs do not need to self-identify as any specific project type. The list below is simply for illustration and clarification. A proposed project might include elements from several of the above project types.
  - Bicycle and/or Pedestrian facilities on or off the highway right of way
  - DSTIP projects development work for projects that exceed the 4 year window of the STIP
  - Flex Funds
  - Modernization
  - Protective Right of Way purchases
  - Public Transportation (capital projects only, not for ongoing operations)
  - Recreational Trails
  - Safe Routes to Schools
  - Scenic Byways
  - Transportation Enhancement
  - Transportation Demand Management
- B. OTC Direction Sought

Agreement as to project types eligible for Enhance Category funds

#### IV. Enhance Category Funding Splits to Regions and Statewide Priorities

- A. The staff recommendation on allocating Enhance Category Funds, totaling \$324M using the baseline scenario of Funding level 2 and Category Allocation C as described on previous pages, is as follows:
  - 20% of the funds are set aside for OTC obligation to state priorities.
  - 80% of the funds will be allocated to the 5 ODOT Regions using the "modernization split" formula.
  - Using the funding assumptions from the recommended scenario, the funding allocations would be:

20% to state priorities = approximately \$64.8M for the 2015-2018 timeframe 80% to regions using the 'modernization split' formula = approximately \$259.2M

Region 1 = 38%	approximately \$98.5M
Region 2 = 29%	approximately \$75.2M
Region 3 = 15%	approximately \$38.9M
Region 4 = 10%	approximately \$25.9M
Region $5 = 8\%$	approximately \$20.7M

See the spreadsheet on page 10 for more detail.

B. OTC Direction Sought

Level of support for the concept of an OTC set-aside amount Level of support for the 80% / 20% split for Regions / OTC Level of support for using the Modernization Equity Split formula for determining Region allocations

#### V. Project Types Eligible for Fix-It Category Funds

- A. This recommendation on project types eligible for Fix-It Category Funds is consistent with earlier discussions.
  - Bridges state
  - Culverts
  - High Risk Rural Roads
  - Illumination, signs and signals
  - Landslides and Rockfalls
  - Operations (includes ITS)
  - Pavement Preservation
  - Rail-Highway Crossings
  - Safety
  - Salmon (Fish Passage)
  - Site Mitigation and Repair
  - Stormwater Retrofit
  - TDM to Regions (part of Ops)
  - Workzone Safety (project specific)
- B. OTC Direction Sought

Agreement as to project types eligible for Fix-It Category Funds

#### VI. Fix-It Category Funding Allocations

A. Funding allocations for project types eligible for the Fix-It Category funding will be determined via ODOT management systems and staff in alignment with the Guiding Principles developed for that purpose. A subsequent report will be developed showing results of the funding allocation and project selection and resulting impacts on system condition and service delivery.

### Enhance and Fix-It Funding Allocation Process for 2015-18 Staff Recommended Scenario

6/5/2012 Draft - for discussion purposes only

#### Descriptions

- 1) Dollar amounts are in millions and are the four year totals for the 2015-2018 STIP timeframe, unless noted otherwise.
- 2) Program allocation amounts that are federal dollars do not include the state match. There will be approximately 10% state match on top of this.
- 3) Programs and funding *not* included: OTIA, ARRA, JTA, *Connect* Oregon, nor earmarks.
- 4) Blue highlighting = Programs included in the STIP, but not included in the 2015-18 Enhance & Fix-It Project Selection process.
- 5) **Orange highlighting** = Programs included in the STIP and **are** included in the 2015-18 Enhance & Fix-It Project Selection process.
- 6) Directed Minimums (DM): directed minimum allocations per federal or state regulations or legislation; OTC direction; or in-place agreements.

#### Assumptions

- a) Federal plus state funding level assumption: Baseline amount available for orange highlighted programs in Enhance & Fix-It = \$1,352M
- b) State funding level assumption: The amount of state funds in the 2012-15 STIP available for the Bike/Ped, IOF, Rail-Highway Crossings and Site Mitigation programs was \$47M. The recommended scenarios assume that level will be held constant.
- c) For planning/project selection purposes, the funding levels of the scenario approved by the OTC at its July meeting will remain in place until the 2017-2020 STIP update.
- d) There will, at minimum, be an annual internal review of the projected funding as compared to actuals/revised projections to validate allocations or bring recommendations to the OTC.

## Enhance and Fix-It Funding Allocation Process for 2015-2018

Staff Recommended Scenario June 5, 2012 Draft - for discussion purposes only

#### Blue highlighting: Programs included in the STIP, but are not included in the 2015-18 Enhance & Fix-It Project Selection process

**Rec'd:** The recommended funding assumption - based on federal funding projections and static state funding.

Directed Minimums (DM): directed minimum allocations per federal or state regulations or legislation; OTC direction; or in-place agreements.

\* indicates a funding decision subject to OTC direction for 2015-18

Outside of Enhance / Fix-It Categorization (for the 2015-2018 project selection process)

MPO Planning	\$18
SPR (State Planning & Research)	\$40

#### Enhance = Enhancing, expanding or improving the System

Enhance	Rec'd	Notes
CMAQ	\$82.4	DM = OTC direction to fund this program. (2012-2015=\$63.2)
IOF *	\$14.0	IOF funding is being kept separate from the funds to be allocated from the Enhance Category per discussion at April 2012 OTC meeting. State funds only. Recommendation is to continue recent funding level of \$3.5/year.
Rec Trails *	n/a	It is unlikely that the next Federal Authorization will include this program. These type of projects could be eligible for Enhance category funding. Historically these program funds have been passed through to the Oregon Parks & Recreation Department. (2012-2015=\$5.6)
Public Transit	\$42.0	DM = State Legislative direction regarding allocation of federal funds for Elderly & Disabled (2012-2015=\$42.0)
TGM *	\$17.1	TGM funding is being kept separate from the funds to be allocated from the Enhance Category per discussion at April 2012 OTC meeting. Funds are allocated by biennium; project selection is done annually. This figure includes all of TGM (grants, code assistance, quick response, outreach and staff). Recommendation is to continue recent funding level of \$17.1 over four years.
TMAs -pass throughs, in MTIPs	\$134.1	TMA funds may, but do not have to be, spent on the state system. Direct pass through of federal dollars. (2012-2015=\$102.8)

#### **Fix-It** = Fixing or preserving the System

Fix It	Rec'd	Notes
Bridge - local	\$87.4	DM = amount of allocation increases or decreases in relation to total allocation to state. Per 2006
		agreement with AOC/LOC. (2012-2015=\$77.7)
Public Transit - FTA	n/a	Funding amounts determined by Federal Transit Administration. (2012-2015=\$56.2)
Rail-Highway crossings-state funds	\$2.8	DM = ORS 824.018. State Funds. (2012-2015=\$2.8)
Rail-Highway crossings-federal funds		It is unlikely that the next Federal Authorization will include this program. These type of projects could
	n/a	be eligible for Fix-It category funding.
Safety (Sec. 164)	n/a	DM = per federal legislation. Amount is set based on a % of allocation (2012-2015=\$27.3)
STP Allocation to Cities/Counties	\$92.8	DM = amount of allocation increases or decreases in relation to total allocation to state. Per 2006
		agreement with AOC/LOC. (2012-2015=\$89.2)
Total Blue Funds	\$531	7

### Enhance and Fix-It Funding Allocation Process for 2015-2018

Staff Recommended Scenario

June 5, 2012 Draft - for discussion purposes only

**Orange highlighting** = Programs included in the STIP and **are** included in the 2015-18 Enhance & Fix-It Funding Allocation process **Directed Minimums (DM):** directed minimum allocations per federal or state regulations or legislation; OTC direction; or in-place agreements.

	Enhance	Rec'd	Notes
O	Bike/Ped-\$29M includes \$15M SWIP		DM = 1% of ODOT's share of the State Highway Fund. (2012-2015=\$29) State Funds only.
Ĕ			SWIP=Sidewalk Improvement Program.
p	Flex Funds		
an	Modernization		
Ts	DSTIP	\$324	
AC	Protective ROW purchases		
, yd r	Recreational Trails (non Parks Dept)		It is unlikely that the next Federal Authorization will include this program. These type of projects could be eligible for Enhance category funding
ectior	Safe Routes to Schools		It is unlikely that the next Federal Authorization will include this program. These type of projects could be eligible for Enhance category funding
ect sel	Scenic Byways		It is unlikely that the next Federal Authorization will include this program. These types of projects could be eligible for Enhance category funding. This program is not funded beyond 2012.
Ō	TE-Transportation Enhancement		
٩	TDM - to Public Transit Division		
		24%	Percentage of total "orange" funds for Enhance & Fix-It that would be allocated to Enhance Category.

Enhance = Enhancing, expanding or improving the System

#### **Fix-It** = Fixing or preserving the System

	Fix It	Rec'd	Notes
าร	Bridge - state		
en	Culverts		
syst	High Risk Rural Roads		It is unlikely that the next Federal Authorization will include this program. These type of projects could be
Ę			eligible for Fix-It category funding.
ne	illumination, signs and signals		
Je	Landslides and rockfalls		
l∰ ag	Operations (includes ITS)		
sta	Pavement Preservation	\$1,028	
ΣP	Rail-Highway Crossings		
ar	Safety		
ţi	Salmon (Fish Passage)		DM = 1997 Commitment between ODOT and Governor's office re: Oregon Plan for Salmon and
e G			Watersheds. (2012-2015=\$11.5)
sel	Site Mitigation and Repair		State funds only.
ğ	Stormwater Retrofit		DM = Requirement ends at the end of 2014. (2012-2015=\$6.3) Funds were from Fish Passage program.
õ	TDM - to Regions (part of Ops)		
2	Workzone Safety (project specific)		
		76%	Percentage of the total "orange" funds for Enhance & Fix-It that would be allocated to Fix-It Category.
	Total Orange Funds	\$1,352	

# Enhance and Fix-It Funding Allocation Process for 2015-2018Staff Recommended ScenarioJune 5, 2012 Draft - for discussion purposes only

Funding Allocation Worksheet for June 2012 OTC Meeting

	Level 1	Baseline Scenario =	Level 3
	(increased federal funds)	Level 2	(reduced federal funds)
Federal Funds	\$2,071	\$1,836	\$1,601
Plus State program funds <sup>(1)</sup>	\$47	\$47	\$47
Total Fed & State	\$2,118	\$1,883	\$1,648
Less Total Blue	\$531	\$531	\$531
Available for Orange (for comparison purposes, this number for the 2012-15 STIP would be approximately \$1,316)	\$1,587	\$1,352	\$1,117
smaller fluctuations. The alternate recommended range. That range for the Baseline Scenario fundit	scenarios for increased/decreas ng of \$1,352 is \$1,217 to \$1,487	sed funding would 'kick in' when	n revenues fall outside of that
Total Orange for Enhance @ 24%		\$324	
Total Orange for Fix-It @ 76%		\$1,028	
Increased federal funds assumption:	For illustration purposes, using \$1,587		
Total Enhance held at baseline	\$324		
Total Fix-It = balance	\$1,263		
Reduced federal funds assumption:			For illustration purposes, using \$1,117

Total Orange for Enhance @ 20%

Total Orange for Fix-It @ 80%

\$ are in millions

<sup>(1)</sup> Baseline for State Funds: Assume state funding will continue to provide funds equivalent to the 2012-15 levels for: Bike/Ped, IOF, Rail-Highway Crossings and Site Mitigation, totaling \$47M. State funds for matching federal dollars are not included.

\$223

\$894

### Enhance and Fix-It Funding Allocation Process for 2015-2018 Staff Recommended Scenario June 5, 2012 Draft - for discussion purposes only

### Recommended Allocation to Regions and State - Using Baseline Funding Scenario

Each Region determines the process for funding with their ACTs.

#### **Enhance** = Enhancing, expanding or improving the System

	Enhance	Rec'd	Notes		
s	Bike/Ped-\$29M includes \$15M SWIP		-		
CT	Flex Funds		\$64.8	20% for OTC allocation t	o state priorities
< ک	Modernization				
م ن	DSTIP	J	\$259.2	80% to Regions using 20	012-15 Mod Split formula:
OT	Protective ROW purchases	\$324 <		Region 1 = 38%	\$98.5
g le	Recreational Trails (non Parks Dept)			Region 2 = 29%	\$75.2
al	Safe Routes to Schools			Region 3 = 15%	\$38.9
ect	Scenic Byways			Region 4 = 10%	\$25.9
roj	TE-Transportation Enhancement		_	Region 5 = 8%	\$20.7
ц <u>с</u>	TDM - to Public Transit Division		-		

**Fix-It** = Fixing or preserving the System

	Fix It	Rec'd
	Bridge - state	
nt	Culverts	
me	High Risk Rural Roads	
Ige	Illumination, signs and signals	
ana taff	Landslides and rockfalls	
m d st	Operations (includes ITS)	
by an	Pavement Preservation	\$1,028
ion	Rail-Highway Crossings	
ect	Safety	
svs	Salmon (Fish Passage)	
ğ	Site Mitigation and Repair	
jē	Stormwater Retrofit	
<u> </u>	TDM - to Regions (part of Ops)	
	Workzone Safety (project specific)	
#### Orange highlighting = Programs included in the STIP and are included in the 2015-18 Enhance & Fix-It Funding Allocation process

Directed Minimums (DM): directed minimum allocations per federal or state regulations or legislation; OTC direction; or in-place agreements.

**Enhance =** Enhancing, expanding or improving the System

	Enhance	Rec'd	Notes
ГС	Bike/Ped-\$29M includes \$15M SWIP		DM = 1% of ODOT's share of the State Highway Fund. (2012-2015=\$29) State Funds only.
б			
σ	Flex Funds		
an	Modernization		
Ts	DSTIP	\$324	
AC	Protective ROW purchases		
by	Recreational Trails (non Parks Dept)		It is unlikely that the next Federal Authorization will include this program. These type of projects could be
n			eligible for Enhance category funding.
ctic	Safe Routes to Schools		It is unlikely that the next Federal Authorization will include this program. These type of projects could be
ē			eligible for Enhance category funding.
Se	Scenic Byways		It is unlikely that the next Federal Authorization will include this program. These types of projects could be
ect			eligible for Enhance category funding. This program is not funded beyond 2012.
Dj	TE-Transportation Enhancement		
٩	TDM - to Public Transit Division		
		24%	Percentage of total "orange" funds for Enhance & Fix-It that would be allocated to Enhance Category.

#### Fix-It = Fixing or preserving the System

	Fix It	Rec'd	Notes
รเ	Bridge - state		
En .	Culverts		
it syst	High Risk Rural Roads		It is unlikely that the next Federal Authorization will include this program. These type of projects could be eligible for Fix-It category funding.
Jer	Illumination, signs and signals		
leu	Landslides and rockfalls		
lag Iff	Operations (includes ITS)		
sta	Pavement Preservation	\$1,028	
n pr	Rail-Highway Crossings		
a a	Safety		
itio	Salmon (Fish Passage)		DM = 1997 Commitment between ODOT and Governor's office re: Oregon Plan for Salmon and
			Watersheds. (2012-2015=\$11.5)
se	Site Mitigation and Repair		State funds only.
ect	Stormwater Retrofit		DM = Requirement ends at the end of 2014. (2012-2015=\$6.3) Funds were from Fish Passage program.
ō	TDM - to Regions (part of Ops)		
۵.	Workzone Safety (project specific)		
		76%	Percentage of the total "orange" funds for Enhance & Fix-It that would be allocated to Fix-It Category.
	Total Orange Funds	\$1,352	

# Blue highlighting: Programs included in the STIP, but are **not** included in the 2015-18 Enhance & Fix-It Project Selection process **Rec'd:** The recommended funding assumption - based on federal funding projections and static state funding.

Directed Minimums (DM): directed minimum allocations per federal or state regulations or legislation; OTC direction; or in-place agreements.

\* indicates a funding decision subject to OTC direction for 2015-18

#### Outside of Enhance / Fix-It Categorization (for the 2015-2018 project selection process)

MPO Planning	\$18
SPR (State Planning & Research)	\$40

#### Enhance = Enhancing, expanding or improving the System

Enhance R		Notes		
CMAQ	\$82.4	DM = OTC direction to fund this program. (2012-2015=\$63.2)		
IOF *	\$14.0	IOF funding is being kept separate from the funds to be allocated from the Enhance Category per discussion at April 2012 OTC meeting. State funds only. Recommendation is to continue recent funding level of \$3.5/year.		
Rec Trails ( <i>Parks Department</i> ) * It is unlikely that the eligible for Enhance n/a Oregon Parks & Re		It is unlikely that the next Federal Authorization will include this program. These type of projects could be eligible for Enhance category funding. Historically these program funds have been passed through to the Oregon Parks & Recreation Department. (2012-2015=\$5.6)		
Public Transit	\$42.0	DM = State Legislative direction regarding allocation of federal funds for Elderly & Disabled (2012-2015=\$42.0)		
TGM * \$17.1 TGM discus This f Reco		TGM funding is being kept separate from the funds to be allocated from the Enhance Category per discussion at April 2012 OTC meeting. Funds are allocated by biennium; project selection is done annually This figure includes all of TGM (grants, code assistance, quick response, outreach and staff). Recommendation is to continue recent funding level of \$17.1 over four years.		
TMAs -pass throughs, in MTIPs	\$134.1	TMA funds may, but do not have to be, spent on the state system. Direct pass through of federal dollars. (2012-2015=\$102.8)		

#### **Fix-It** = Fixing or preserving the System

Fix It Rec'd		Notes			
Bridge - local	\$87.4	DM = amount of allocation increases or decreases in relation to total allocation to state. Per 2006			
		agreement with AOC/LOC. (2012-2015=\$77.7)			
Public Transit - FTA	n/a	Funding amounts determined by Federal Transit Administration. (2012-2015=\$56.2)			
Rail-Highway crossings-state funds		DM = ORS 824.018. State Funds. (2012-2015=\$2.8)			
	\$2.8				
Rail-Highway crossings-federal funds		It is unlikely that the next Federal Authorization will include this program. These type of projects could be			
	n/a	eligible for Fix-It category funding.			
Safety (Sec. 164)	n/a	DM = per federal legislation. Amount is set based on a % of allocation (2012-2015=\$27.3)			
STP Allocation to Cities/Counties		DM = amount of allocation increases or decreases in relation to total allocation to state. Per 2006			
		agreement with AOC/LOC. (2012-2015=\$89.2)			

Total Blue Funds	\$531
------------------	-------

#### NEW FUNDING ALLOCATION AND PROJECT SELECTION TIMELINE FOR 2015-2018 - DRAFT

			Jan 2012	EAR	EAR	EAR	
		2012	Feb	JAR YE	CAL YE	CAL YE	900
expanded	Regions can be scoping projects as warranted through the end of June 2013.		Mar	ALENC	AL FISC	LE FISC	D in n
	April 26. Letter from Chair Egan to ACT chairs sent.		Apr	0	EDER/	STAI	13 STI
s on e	OTC reviews draft app/criteria. Concurrently, the draft goes thru ODOT forms review and QA/QC.		May		ш		10-20
roles	OTC reviews recommended scenario.		June			2012	10 have
2	July 18. OTC sets category allocations: Enhance; Fix-It; Statewide priority set-aside. Approves		build			13	Annre
	Lenhance application/criteria. July 20. Assuming OTC approval on July 18, release application to potential project eligible entities.		July			20,	Einal
	Enhance/ACT application process.		Aug				
	October 1. Applications due to ODOT Regions. Set 150% target (Regions? ACTS?) (Who? How?)		Sept		2012		
	October 10. Applications sent to the appropriate ACTs. October 16. OTC meeting with ACT chairs.		Oct		2013		
	Regions begin scoping Fix-It projects.						
	Fix-It project information to the ACTs.	_	Nov	2			
			Dec	2012	-		
	January 10. ACTs submit ( <i>prioritized?</i> ) 150% Enhance list to Region for scoping by Region Tech Center.	NO	1 0040	2013			
		SESSI	Jan 2013 Feb				
		TIVE :	Mar	-			
	April 15. Region Tech Centers complete project scoping for both categories (FIX-It and Enhance). Results for Enhance category forwarded to Area Manager and ACT Chair	EGISLA	Apr				
	June 30. ACTs complete 100% list project selection and prioritization process. Getting to the Region 100% list may involve 'super act' or equivalent Region process.	2013 L	June			2013	
	July 1. ACTs are 'done' until review of public comments in December. July 31. Deadline for Region STIP Coordinators to complete upload of project list into PCSX or ne system application.		July			2014	1000
	August 1. Salem staff begins compilation of info from PCSX into the Draft STIP document.		Aug				
	OTC Approves Draft STIP for public review		Sept Oct		2013		LO 3 10
					2014		0 0100
	Public Review process complete.		Nov				C Posto
	Public comments reviewed by OTC, ACTs, MPOs, regions, programs, planning		Dec	2013			A not
	Adjust as necessary based on OTC direction	1	Jan 2014	2014			Ë
aling Sling	Air quality conformity determinations and modeling begins (entire draft STIP packet needed to do the modeling)	2014	Feb				
nform			Mar				
and Co			May	-			
	Final STIP prepared for review.		June			2014	
	Final STIP reviewed with ACTs, MPOs, other stakeholders.		July			2015	
			Aug	-			
			Sept		2014		
	OTC Review and Approval of Final STIP.	1	Oct		2015	İ	DILO
			Nov				010
		1	Dec	2014			15.0

OTC = Oregon Transportation Commission ODOT = Oregon Department of Transportation DOT = Department of Transportation PCSX = Project Control System Data Entry Screen

## Metro comments on STIP Allocation Process Proposal - 2015-2018

- 1. The proposal is a good policy direction but the process should continue to develop details based upon feedback from outside stakeholders: The draft proposal by ODOT staff is a promising start to implement the Governor's objectives. The details of how it would be implemented, however, could benefit from input from stakeholders for clarity and refinement. What follows are initial comments from Metro staff. However, time to work through the proposal with additional stakeholders from the regions, modal committees and the STIP Stakeholder Committee would identify additional comments that could improve the program direction and execution of the Governor's direction for state transportation investments. Recognize that this is a work in progress and review prior to the next STIP update will be informed by this experience and take into account actions by the Oregon Legislature and US Congress.
- 2. **Allocate 2016-2018 funds, not 2015:** 2015 funding allocation is already committed through the 2012-2015 STIP. Funding targets for the Enhance and Fix-it categories through this process should be clarified as the 3-year amounts associated with 2016-2018.
- 3. **Review and refine funding split between "Fix-It" and "Enhance" programs:** The proposal recommends a 76% split to the "Fix-It" category given a conservative revenue estimate. It further recommends that if revenues are lower than estimated, the funding split for Enhance projects be reduced and that if revenues are higher than estimated, that additional revenues be added to the Fix-It category (the rational being that there would be many shovel-ready Fix-It projects). We would recommend that regions be directed to prepare additional Enhance projects as shovel ready so that if funding is higher than estimated, revenues could also be applied to additional Enhance projects. The policy framework should be if there is less funds, emphasis on Fix-it is imperative. If there are more funds, then funding capacity for more Enhance projects is available.
- 4. **Set highway and non-highway minimums within the Enhance category:** the proposed Enhance category is created based upon the premise that there is sufficient flexibility to select projects without regard to "color of money." However, there are real limitations and past policy decisions to set-aside funds for certain purposes. For example, TE funds are restricted to certain eligible purposes and cannot be flexed to

highways; highway trust fund dollars have constitutional restrictions and cannot be flexed to transit; past decisions have been made to "flex" a portion of the state's federal funds and that policy commitment should be maintained. Consider setting a minimum highway and minimum nonhighway amount based upon these restrictions with the remainder being flexible either way (Note: this builds upon the "Directed Minimum" information in the staff proposal).

- 5. **Update the sub-allocation formula of Enhance funds to the ODOT Regions:** a new policy objective is to support a multi-modal transportation system. The needs factors should be reviewed and updated to include multi-modal factors that determine how much Enhance funding each ODOT Region is allocated.
- 6. **Statewide Enhance allocation direction:** The 20% statewide Enhance funding should be used to supplement projects selected in the ODOT regions or to fund the next best unfunded projects from the regions, rather than be used for a separate statewide competitive process. Connect Oregon provides a good model whereby regional priorities and modal priorities feed up to statewide priorities that are selected with the minimum regional allocations in mind.
- 7. **Regional collaboration on selection of Safety and Management projects and programs:** ODOT staff has participated in the development of local Safety, System Management and Demand Management plans in the Metro region. These inherently involve the whole transportation system, not just the state highways. As such, STIP funding for these projects and activities needs a higher degree of collaboration than is currently described as a part of the Fix-It category.
- 8. **Clarify collaboration expectations for Fix-It category:** Getting the most value out of STIP investments requires strong collaboration with local transportation agencies. Ability to leverage Enhance category funds or local funding should be a prioritization factor in selecting among eligible Fix-It category project options. This requires guidelines for early consultation with local agency partners. Furthermore, the guidelines should be clarified to reflect that management systems are tools that inform decision makers who prioritize projects, not decision-making tools in themselves. Professional review of data outputs, project scope definition to address the identified needs, and other prioritization factors such as leverage and project readiness are also used in defining and prioritizing projects in the Fix-It category.

- 9. Setting direction for future CMAQ policy discussions: The proposal should state that future discussions about CMAQ funding should recognize federal CMAQ funding is based on reducing exposure to ozone, carbon monoxide and small particulate matter pollutants and must be spent in geographic areas designated as eligible for funding. As such, these factors do not follow the Enhance "Mod splits" and should therefore be allocated accordingly. It is also important to recognize that the Portland metro area has bonded debt (GARVEE bonds) against future CMAQ revenues through 2027, an innovative finance practice that has been used to help fund the Metro region's passenger rail system. Revenues pledged to retire debt should not be subject to this process (similar to the set-aside of debt payments in ODOT's financial plan).
- 10. **Role of ACTs:** The proposed process relies heavily on ACTs to prioritize projects. Region 1 does not have an ACT for the metropolitan area and rural Clackamas and Hood River County areas. The Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), however, has considerable experience in multi-modal project selection. Please clarify that JPACT would be entity responsible for project selection within its boundaries.

600 NE Grand Ave. Portland, OR 97232-2736 503-797-1700 503-797-1804 TDD 503-797-1797 fax

🔊 Metro	Memo
Date:	June 21, 2012
To:	TPAC and interested parties
From:	Mike Hoglund, Research Director Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner
Re:	ODOT Draft Oregon Statewide Transportation Strategy – Recommendation to JPACT

#### **Action requested**

Metro staff are seeking final input on the attached draft letter commenting on the draft Oregon Statewide Transportation Strategy (STS) vision and next steps. A recommendation to JPACT is requested.

#### **Background and Purpose**

The Oregon Transportation Commission is seeking public comment on the attached draft Oregon Statewide Transportation Strategy by July 20, 2012. On June 14, JPACT received a presentation on the draft STS vision and requested an opportunity for more discussion at their July 12 meeting. The strategy was presented and discussed on June 18 at a special TPAC and MTAC meeting.

The attached draft comment letter reflects input provided to date. MPAC and JPACT will discuss the comment letter on June 27 and July 12, respectively.

#### **Oregon Statewide Transportation Strategy**

The Oregon Statewide Transportation Strategy (STS) is part of a larger effort known as the Oregon Sustainable Transportation Initiative (OSTI), resulting from two bills passed by the Oregon Legislature to help the state meet its 2050 goal of reducing transportation-related greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

The STS identifies the most effective GHG emissions reduction strategies in transportation systems, vehicle and fuel technologies, and urban land use patterns in three key travel markets: ground passenger and commercial services, freight, and air passenger. The strategies serve as the best tools available to help meet the state's goals while supporting other community goals such as clean air, safe and healthy neighborhoods, economic vitality and jobs close to home.

The STS was developed over 18 months through extensive research and analysis as well as policy direction and technical input from state agencies, local governments, industry representatives, metropolitan planning organizations, and others. Metro Councilors Collette and Burkholder have each served on the Policy Advisory Committee. The STS is not regulatory and does not assign responsibility for implementation, but rather points to promising approaches to be further considered by policymakers at the state, regional, and local levels.

- <u>Materials are posted on ODOT's website</u>: http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/OSTI/STS.shtml
- Links to the draft documents are:
  - http://www.oregon.gov/0D0T/TD/0STI/docs/sts/executivesum.pdf
  - http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/OSTI/docs/sts/strategy.pdf
  - http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/OSTI/docs/sts/appendices.pdf

#### Attachments

Date (DRAFT – 6/20/12)

Pat Egan, Chair Oregon Transportation Commission c/o Oregon Dept. of Transportation Planning Unit, Attn: Kristina Evanoff 555 13<sup>th</sup> Street NE, Suite 2 Salem, OR 97301

#### Subject: Metro Council/JPACT Comments on the Draft Statewide Transportation Strategy

Dear Chair Egan and Members of the Oregon Transportation Commission:

On behalf of the Metro Council and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the May 2012 draft of the Statewide Transportation Strategy (STS) for greenhouse gas emissions. We appreciate the hard work of the Oregon Department of Transportation staff, the consultant team, and the STS Policy Committee in compiling this forward looking and innovative document.

We feel the document compliments the Metro region's Climate Smart Communities (CSC) effort underway in the Portland Metro region that responds to HB 2001 requirements to reduce lightduty vehicle emissions by the year 2035. The draft STS is particularly important for our region as it closes an important gap in the transportation sector GHG reduction strategy by addressing freight and statewide ground transportation and air travel-related emissions. The statewide strategies will be key to the Metro region's ability to meet our targets for light-duty vehicles and to begin to address all aspects of GHG emissions.

Following is the Metro region's STS recommendation followed with key lessons we feel should be folded into future STS phases and a listing of areas where we see the need for follow-up action and collaboration.

#### Recommendation

The Metro region recommends the OTC adopt the *Oregon Statewide Transportation Strategy, A* 2050 Vision for Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction. We also recommend that Phase II of the effort commence immediately and that the OTC, ODOT, and state agencies work with their regional and local partners and other stakeholders to initiate implementation of the most promising strategies.

#### Common Lessons/Themes: Metro CSC and ODOT STS

Similar to the work the Metro region is undertaking to address light-duty vehicle GHG emission reduction targets, there are a number of emerging themes developing to address the statewide responsibilities defined in the STS. Principal among them are:

Pat Egan, Chair Oregon Transportation Commission July 20, 2012 Page 2 of 4

- 1. <u>Build on existing plans at the state, regional, local levels</u>. Aspirations and strategies in those plans are most feasible and analysis shows they provide a strong baseline for progress in reducing GHG emissions.
- <u>A multi-faceted approach is necessary to reach targets and state goals.</u> While technology improvements will move us in the right direction, particularly for ground transportation, no single strategy will meet Metro GHG emission reduction targets or the state goals. A comprehensive, multi-faceted strategy is necessary, one that includes implementing land use visions, building walkable, transit/bike friendly communities, sharpening our system and demand management efforts, and developing the infrastructure to accommodate clean vehicles.
- 3. <u>Partnerships and collaboration work best</u>. A multi-faceted approach to meeting our climate targets and goals will also require collaboration with our current partners at the local, regional, state, and federal levels; and with new partners including utilities, the private sector, and new partners in government and non-government sectors. These partnerships must be responsible for addressing a number of broad-based GHG emission reduction approaches such as revamping federal and state transportation finance policies, promoting energy-efficient fleet technologies and cleaner fuels, and leading ongoing research efforts, among others.
- 4. <u>Any GHG reduction approach should be "outcomes based</u>." The Metro region has adopted six key outcomes as critical to successful long-range planning efforts: Vibrant Communities; Equity; Economic Prosperity; Safe and Reliable Transportation Choices; Clean Air & Water; and Climate Leadership. We are pleased to see that the STS process is recognizing the need to optimize a wide variety of outcomes and measures as it works through the next phase of its process. We look forward to working with our state partners and others to develop a consistent evaluation framework between the STS and our Climate Smart Communities.

#### Areas for State/Metro Region Collaboration

Both the STS and Metro's Climate Smart Communities projects are multi-phased efforts continuing into 2013 and 2014. To the degree possible and appropriate, project schedules and timelines should continue to be aligned and managed to ensure maximum efficiencies in the following areas:

- <u>Policy Development.</u> Metro has established working relationships with ODOT, DLCD, the Global Warming Commission, other state agencies and Oregon MPOs, and others on a number of policy fronts to discuss alternative strategies to best meet GHG targets and goals. This work should continue and we see a number of areas for shared work, particularly in the next phase in the areas of implementation and evaluation.
- <u>Public Outreach and Education</u>. As the OTC is aware, climate change is a complex, often controversial, subject. We feel the topic is best approached not only through the global benefits of meeting climate goals, but also as it relates to community and individual benefits. Many climate reduction strategies will result in walkable, mixed-use

Pat Egan, Chair Oregon Transportation Commission July 20, 2012 Page 3 of 4

places that mix shopping and work within or near residential areas; and are desirable to local residents.

• <u>Implementation</u>. The Draft STS provides a significant step forward to better understand the full range of options and the most promising actions that can both result in reductions in the transportation sector GHG emissions and begin to address other statewide and community needs.

However, significantly more needs to be done to turn the STS into a reality. The Metro region looks forward to working with ODOT, state agencies and others to develop an implementation plan for the STS that further evaluates the available options and results in a broad range of actions that are necessary to meet state GHG goals. As noted above, the state and MPOs cannot be responsible for all aspects of implementation. Existing and new partners (federal governments, port and transit districts, private industry, health providers, universities, non-profits, and private industry) will be required to provide expertise for many aspects of a comprehensive, multi-faceted emission reduction approach.

Two key elements of an implementation plan must include: 1) establishing priorities, processes, and timelines/next steps for moving forward on the most promising initiatives. This would include identifying key actions (e.g., legislation), needs, and deliverables to move on a priority recommendation; and 2) identifying and acting quickly on policies and actions that have multiple positive outcomes for the state, regions, and local communities. We appreciate that ODOT has begun evaluating actions for their full costs (direct and indirect) and benefits, and would suggest moving quickly on those actions with net societal and economic benefits in addition to their GHG emission reduction potential.

- <u>Monitoring Results.</u> The implementation plan should also include a program to evaluate and monitor performance and to keep current assumptions around our ability to deliver on actions or key necessary investments. We suggest a program that both includes real-time evaluation of travel behavior and trends and GHG emissions, but also include a checklist or reporting on successful implementation of key strategies. Such monitoring can provide a basis for ongoing review and revision of the STS, as necessary.
- <u>Aligning Plans, Policies, and Programs/Transportation Finance</u>. The Metro region supports the Phase II STS recommendation to evaluate and revise, where appropriate, current plans, policies and programs that may inhibit successful implementation of STS strategies. In particular, we support continued efforts to move toward a transportation finance approach that best allows the state of Oregon and its regions and communities to best meet desired outcomes, including those for greenhouse gas goals and targets.
- <u>Other Emission Sectors</u>. As part of the Metro region CSC work on light-duty vehicles, the issues surrounding other GHG emission sectors have arose. We suggest that the timeframe to develop a coordinated, integrated approach across emission sectors (transportation, buildings, energy production, etc.) is likely sooner, than later. Such an integration strategy should be given consideration in the next phase of the STS. One

Pat Egan, Chair Oregon Transportation Commission July 20, 2012 Page 4 of 4

area for collaboration between emission sectors would be integrating actions, where possible, between Governor Kitzhaber's recently released Energy Strategy and the STS.

- <u>Technical Tools</u>. The Metro region has appreciated the development of new tools in cooperation with ODOT. Many of the tools (e.g., GreenSTEP) have allowed for advancements in scenario planning and allowed for greater efficiencies while allowing for broader evaluation of alternatives. Such tools will also be effective for a number of other planning activities underway both in the Metro region and elsewhere throughout the state. We look forward to continue to cooperate on these analytical tools with ODOT and our state partners.
- <u>Research and Analysis.</u> Similarly, shared research has allowed for greater efficiencies for both Metro's CSC and the STS, particularly in the areas of outreach, analysis, and scenario planning. We look forward to continuing to collaborate in those areas as future phases of the CSC and STS proceed.

Again, we appreciate the groundbreaking work of ODOT and its partners on the development of the STS recommendations, and we look forward to further collaboration as the effort moves into the next phase and toward implementation.

Sincerely,

Jerry Willey, Chair

MPAC

Carlotta Collette, Chair

JPACT

# **Draft Oregon Statewide Transportation Strategy**

A 2050 Vision for Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction

# **Executive Summary**











# Oregon Sustainable Transportation Initiative (OSTI)

May 2012





Dedicated to the legacy of Gail Achterman's leadership for Oregon's natural resources and sustainable transportation.



## For more information, contact:

**Barbara Fraser** Planning Unit, STS Outreach Lead Barbara.K.Fraser@odot.state.or.us (503) 986-2927

Kristina Evanoff Planning Unit, Senior Transportation Planner Kristina.Evanoff@odot.state.or.us (503) 986-6576

www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/OSTI/STS.shtml



The Oregon Department of Transportation Transportation Planning Unit 555 13th Street NE, Suite 2 Salem, Oregon 97301

# The Statewide Transportation Strategy

The Statewide Transportation Strategy (STS) for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction looks out to the year 2050 and explores how transportation and land use choices made over the coming decades might affect Oregon's long-term future. It is part of a larger effort known as the Oregon Sustainable Transportation Initiative<sup>1</sup> (OSTI), an integrated statewide effort to reduce GHG emissions from Oregon's transportation sector.

OSTI is the result of two bills passed by the Oregon Legislature, House Bill 2001<sup>2</sup> (2009) and Senate Bill 1059<sup>3</sup> (2010), which were crafted to help the state meet its 2050 goal of reducing transportation-related GHG emissions.<sup>4</sup> OSTI takes into consideration how the energy landscape is changing, as well as the need to sustain a strong economy while creating healthier, more livable communities and greater economic opportunity.

#### The STS addresses the following key question:

What actions and strategies will be effective in reducing transportation-related GHG emissions in Oregon while supporting other societal goals such as livable communities, economic vitality, and public health?

The STS is the product of an effort involving extensive research and analysis as well as policy direction and technical input from state agencies, local governments, industry representatives, metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), and others. It is intended to identify the most effective GHG emissions reduction strategies in transportation systems, vehicle and fuel technologies, and urban land use patterns, which will serve as the best tools available to help meet the state's goals.

The STS is neither directive nor regulatory, but rather points to promising approaches that should be further considered by policymakers at the state, regional, and local levels. It constitutes a framework for future work to reduce transportation-related GHG emissions in three key travel markets: Ground Passenger and Commercial Services, Freight, and Air Passenger.

The movement of people and goods produces emissions that account for a significant portion of all GHGs produced by Oregonians, so reducing emissions from transportation can make a sizeable contribution to overall GHG reduction goals. While the focus of OSTI



STS Policy Committee Chair Ken Williamson

"We are not talking about getting people out of their cars. This is about a clear economic opportunity – creating industry, creating jobs. Leadership will be essential."

— Ken Williamson, Oregon Environmental Quality Commission, Oregon State University

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> OSTI; http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/OSTI/General.shtml

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 2}$  Section 37 to 39, Chapter 865, Oregon Laws 2009; http://www.leg.state.or.us/09<br/>orlaws/sess0800. dir/0865.htm

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Chapter 85, Oregon Laws 2010 Special Session; http://www.leg.state.or.us/10ssorlaws/0085.htm

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> ORS 468A.205; http://www.leg.state.or.us/ors/468a.html

is on transportation, the Oregon Global Warming Commission and others are addressing GHG from other sources, such as electrical power generation, to help Oregon meet the state's ambitious goal of reducing GHG emissions to 75 percent below 1990 levels by 2050.<sup>5</sup> Achieving this

#### Why Do Greenhouse Gas Emissions Matter?

GHG emissions result in part from the combustion of fossil fuels like oil, coal and natural gas. These gases trap extra heat in the atmosphere. According to scientists, this leads to increases in average global temperatures, extreme weather events, and other changes in the global climate, commonly referred to as climate change. Global climate changes can lead to extended warm spells and drought, as well as more frequent flooding. These changes have consequences for Oregon agriculture, hydropower, public health, watershed and forest health, and infrastructure vulnerability.

Scientists can't say exactly how intense these effects will be, how rapidly they will emerge or what exactly their geographic distribution will be, but there is broad agreement that GHG emissions must be reduced, and societies must prepare to react to some of these effects even if timely reductions are achieved.

If the climate change trend continues, Oregon could experience a range of negative impacts, including:

- Higher sea levels and stronger storm surges that could threaten coastal areas with greater risk of floods and damage to buildings, roads, bridges, and other infrastructure.
- Changes in precipitation patterns such as more severe rain and snowstorms, less and more rapidly melting snowpack, which could threaten supplies of water for drinking, recreation, irrigation, and fisheries.
- Diminished water supply and agricultural productivity that could affect Oregon's crops and livestock.
- Adverse health impacts including increases in heat-related illnesses, chronic disease and fatalities due to more heat waves.
- Suffering ecosystems, including forests, grasslands and watersheds, where native species will suffer as temperatures rise.

statewide goal will require planning, innovation, and coordination among many sectors and communities across the state.

The findings and recommendations documented in the STS is the first phase in a multi-year process. Following the adoption of the STS by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC), the next phase will be the collaborative development of an implementation plan. The third and final phase will consist of monitoring and adjusting the strategy over time.

# **The Cost of Inaction**

Undertaking the recommendations in the STS will not be easy. They will require assuming new responsibilities, such as committing to providing more pedestrian, bicycle, and public transportation options in urban areas, and potentially reallocating and securing additional funds. However, the alternative is likely to be even more costly. On the current path, the results of the STS analysis suggest there will be a multitude of new costs and challenges. One way or another, projected increases in population and travel demand, funding constraints, and the need to repair or replace aging infrastructure will require some significant changes to Oregon's transportation system in the decades ahead. Inaction is neither cheap nor desirable.

# What Will It Take to Change Course?

Long-term projections of the "business as usual" approach to transportation show that without decisive and timely action, GHG emission levels will rise steadily into the future. Further progress will result from existing policies, but much additional work is needed to put Oregon on track to meet emissions reduction goals and mitigate future impacts of climate change.

<sup>5</sup> ORS 468A.205; http://www.leg.state.or.us/ors/468a.html

Achieving the state's goals will require a multi-faceted approach and significant cooperation between state agencies, regional planning entities, local governments, the private sector, and the public. While Oregon is prepared to be in the forefront in addressing climate change, it cannot face this challenge alone. Limiting the impacts of climate change must ultimately be a global effort, requiring actions from other states, the federal government, other countries, and private industry.

# What's In It for Oregon?

The benefits of reducing GHG emissions from transportation extend beyond arresting the impacts of climate change. Many actions that can be taken to reduce GHG emissions may also help create new jobs while positioning Oregon to compete in a changing global economy. Over the next forty years – the planning horizon of the STS – Oregon will face a number of challenges that will require creative solutions. Factors such as population growth, a changing economy, and aging transportation infrastructure will all require attention whether or not there is comprehensive action on climate change.

# www.oregon.gov/ ODOT/TD/OSTI

See how to be

involved -

As the STS demonstrates, the same actions that are employed to reduce GHG emissions also will:

- Reduce delay and inefficiency on Oregon's roadways;
- Support clean air and protect natural resources;
- Improve public health;
- Accommodate new state residents;
- Provide for the efficient movement of goods and services;
- Reduce Oregon's dependency on foreign energy sources; and
- Reduce the percentage of income the average Oregon household spends on transportation.

# The 2050 Vision

In setting the context for a statewide transportation strategy to address transportation-related GHG emissions reduction, it is necessary to envision a future Oregon that accommodates an expanding population and maximizes the potential for a thriving economy, while maintaining Oregon's quality of life and natural beauty. Planning for a cleaner and more sustainable transportation and land use system also supports a multitude of societal benefits including: more efficient transportation systems that help people and goods travel more quickly and easily; reduced

transportation costs for individuals and businesses; and increased travel choices such as bicycling, walking, and public transportation.

The Statewide Transportation Strategy envisions a future Oregon that features:

• Walkable mixed-use communities, where a large share of residents live within walking distance of jobs, stores, services, entertainment, and transit stops. Communities across the state are recognized for vibrancy, livability, and safety.



"This is also about protecting Oregon business – how are we as governments responding? Can we facilitate change, or be nimble enough to respond?"

> — Onno Husing, Oregon Coastal Zone Management Association

- **Improved public transportation service, bicycling and walking** throughout the state, provide all Oregonians with better access to a range of transportation options. Communities feature welllit walking paths, bicycle facilities, and more frequent transit service, encouraging physical activity and overall improvements in public health.
- Fuel-efficient/alternative energy vehicles, created through great strides in technology, allow widespread adoption of cleaner and more efficient passenger vehicles. Heavy-duty freight vehicles run on liquefied natural gas, and commercial aircraft run largely on biofuels. These changes improve air quality dramatically while reducing dependency on foreign oil.
- Enhanced information technology allows Oregonians to easily plan and update their travel routes using multiple modes as needed such as transit, bicycling and walking. Improved communication systems enable individuals and organizations to meet and collaborate virtually, while reducing the need for physical travel. Collision avoidance systems in cars and trucks greatly reduce the number and severity of crashes, and eliminate hundreds of hours of roadway delays each year.
- More efficient movement of goods results from reduced congestion on Oregon roadways, shifts to more efficient modes such as rail and water, and lower emissions from new technologies in freight-hauling vehicles.



# Benefits of the 2050 Vision

The potential benefits of achieving the Statewide Transportation Strategy 2050 Vision extend far beyond the critical goal of limiting the adverse effects of climate change. In fact, bringing about these advancements could result in a broad array of positive impacts to society when compared to business as usual. The 2050 Vision offers the following potential benefits for Oregonians:

 Household savings resulting from fewer vehicle miles traveled, lower household vehicle ownership rates, and improved access to public transportation,

bicycling and walking. Savings allow households to spend a lower percentage of their incomes on transportation. Related benefits of more compact development include reduced per capita costs associated with providing electricity, water and other utilities, and lower health care costs as a result of improved public health. • A stronger economy with a shift to more diverse fuel sources, reduced congestion, and improved travel reliability. Employers,

employees, and shippers experience cost savings, time savings, and greater travel predictability. Substantial reductions in the amount of fossil fuels consumed per capita result in household cost savings and more investment in the state economy.

• **Safer roads**, through bicycle and pedestrian improvements designed to maximize visibility to motorists. On Oregon's roadways, lower rates of vehicle travel and new intelligent transportation systems significantly reduce crash rates.



- A healthier public, as mixed-use communities with transit and more transportation options, lead to more active and healthy communities, lower obesity rates, and lower incidences of asthma and other related diseases.
- **Energy savings** from improved vehicle efficiency, new alternative fuels, and lower vehicle usage.
- **Cleaner air and water** as heavy trucks, aircraft and private vehicles increasingly run on cleaner and more efficient energy, resulting in cleaner air and fewer environmental impacts from the extraction, refining, and transportation of fossil fuels.

Viewed from 2012, the 2050 Vision for transportation may seem ambitious. Indeed, many of its components will require significant advancements in technology and infrastructure. Yet each of the elements in the STS was selected for plausibility based on existing research, development, and practice. In fact, much of the groundwork for the 2050 Vision has already been laid through advances in alternative fuels and electric vehicles, intelligent transportation systems (ITS) applications to passenger and freight travel, modernization of the nation's air traffic control system, and significant improvements in freight vehicle fuel economy.

Fully realizing the benefits of some of these advancements will require investment and innovation by the federal government and private industry. Developing new and ongoing funding sources for infrastructure will remain difficult, as unforeseen circumstances and other societal priorities continue to compete for attention and dollars. Overcoming these obstacles will require a range of actions at state, regional, and local levels, as well as cooperation from public and private entities beyond Oregon's borders. The challenges will be great, but the opportunities are greater. Achieving the 2050 Vision will help continue Oregon's legacy of leadership and yield far-reaching benefits for generations to come. "We know that as walking goes up, crime goes down."

— Ken Williamson, Oregon Environmental Quality Commission, Oregon State University, STS Policy Committee Chair



# **Recommendations**

The STS explores all aspects of the transportation system including the movement of both people and goods. The transportation sector consists of a diverse variety of modes and markets that for the purposes of the STS analysis were divided into three distinct travel markets: Ground Passenger and Commercial Services, Freight, and Air Passenger.

Although some actions (e.g., advancements in fuel technologies and deployment of intelligent transportation systems technologies) may affect multiple markets, by and large these three travel markets are subject to unique GHG emissions reduction strategies. Therefore, recommendations are presented separately for each travel market.



#### Ground Passenger and Commercial Services Travel Market Recommendations

Within the transportation sector, currently the largest share of GHG emissions (more than 50 percent) is generated from the Ground Passenger and Commercial Services travel market.<sup>6</sup> This travel market facilitates the movement of people for work, recreation, and personal business and includes all ground passenger travel on roads and rail, as well as ground commercial deliveries and service trips. It includes passenger cars and light trucks (pick-up trucks, SUVs, delivery vehicles, etc.) as

well as public transportation vehicles (e.g., bus and train), motorcycles, pedestrians, and bicycles.

In exploring ways to reduce GHG emissions for the Ground Passenger and Commercial Services travel market, efforts were made to look at strategies that:

- Improve fuel economy and shift to lower-carbon fuels;
- Result in lower overall emissions;
- Help reduce delay;
- Provide travelers with transportation choices other than driving alone in a car; and
- Facilitate access to jobs and services closer to home.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Based on GHG inventory methods explained further in Appendix A

Recommendation G1 - Transition to lower emission vehicles, such as plug-in hybrids and electric cars, and encourage the purchase of newer technology vehicles that are more fuel-efficient or are not dependent on higher emission fuels.

**Recommendation G2** – Support development of cleaner fuels.

**Recommendation G3** – Promote compact, mixed-use development to reduce travel distances, facilitate use of zero- or low-energy modes (e.g., bicycling and walking) and transit, and enhance transportation options.

**Recommendation G4** – Encourage communities to accommodate most expected population growth within existing Urban Growth Boundaries (UGB) through infill and redevelopment.

**Recommendation G5** – Enhance fuel efficiency by fully optimizing the transportation system through operations and Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) deployment.

**Recommendation G6** – Promote Pay-As-You-Drive Insurance (PAYD) programs that allow drivers to pay per-mile premiums, encouraging less driving through insurance savings.

**Recommendation G7** – Move to a more sustainable funding source that covers the revenue needed to maintain and operate the transportation system.

**Recommendation G8** – Encourage local trips, totaling six miles or less per round-trip, to shift from single-occupant vehicle (SOV) to bicycling, walking, or other zero-emission modes.

**Recommendation G9** – Promote investment in public transportation infrastructure and operations to provide more transportation options and help reduce single-occupancy vehicle travel.

Recommendation G10 – Design road expansions to be consistent with the objectives for reducing future GHG emissions by light duty vehicles.

**Recommendation G11** – Reduce the number of single-occupant vehicles on roadways by promoting and encouraging participation in carpool/vanpool (Rideshare) programs.

**Recommendation G12** – Reduce the need for households to own multiple vehicles and reduce household vehicle miles traveled by



"It seems exotic but it's just applying common

thorough way – looking

at all costs and benefits,

not only the near-term

- Angus Duncan, Chair of the Oregon

**Global Warming** 

Commission

sense in a really

economic ones."

enhancing the availability of carsharing (short-term self-service vehicle rental and/or peer-to-peer) programs.

**Recommendation G13** – Develop and improve information and support programs that make it easier for people to choose transportation options.

**Recommendation G14** – Promote better management and use of parking in urban areas to support compact, mixed-use development and use of other modes, including transit, walking and bicycling.

### **Freight Travel Market Recommendations**

Freight transportation represents the second largest source of transportation-related GHG emissions at about 30 percent of all transportation emissions.<sup>7</sup> The Freight travel market analysis considers the GHG emissions of all modes of transportation used to move commodities and finished products for consumption in Oregon, including heavy-duty trucks, trains, ships and barges, cargo aircraft, and pipelines. Freight



transportation in this context involves larger, heavier vehicles that usually travel longer distances to serve both regional and national markets.

Of real concern is the finding that vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and GHG emissions in the Freight travel market have been growing faster than in the Ground Passenger and Commercial Services travel market. If steps are not taken to reduce the emissions from this sector of the economy, the freight market share of transportation GHG emissions could represent the majority of all transportation emissions in the future.

As in the Ground Passenger and Commercial Services travel market, strategies were evaluated to reduce Freight travel market GHG emissions in a way that would also produce other benefits, such as reducing fuel costs and encouraging the proliferation of technology to improve freight movement efficiency. Key strategy focus areas include improving the operating efficiency of the freight system, shifting commodity shipments to less carbon-intensive modes, implementing vehicle and fuel technology improvements, and enacting pricing strategies designed to support these other strategies. More than 80 percent of all Freight travel market GHG emissions are produced outside of the state as goods and commodities make their way to Oregon homes and businesses. While outside the scope of the STS, to be successful in GHG reduction, Oregon's consumption of goods and materials should be addressed. Strategies will be needed at multi-state, national, or even international levels.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Based on GHG inventory methods explained further in Appendix A

**Recommendation F1** – For the commodities and goods where lowcarbon modes are a viable option, encourage a greater proportion of goods to be shipped by rail, water, and pipeline modes.

**Recommendation F2** – Encourage a diverse economy with growth in high-value density industries such as electronics, precision manufacturing, and aerospace.

**Recommendation F3** – Encourage and incentivize more efficient use of industrial land through closer proximity of shippers and receivers, consolidated distribution centers, and better access to low-carbon freight modes.

**Recommendation F4** – Regulate operation of freight vehicles at speeds that optimize GHG emissions reductions and provide incentives for technology improvements that provide drivers and operators with real-time information on fuel consumption and operating costs.

**Recommendation F5** – Support industry transition to more efficient engine technologies, vehicle designs, and rail car/truck trailer designs.

Recommendation F6 – Reduce the carbon intensity of freight fuel.

**Recommendation F7** – Implement idle reduction technologies at ports, freight terminals, and truck stops.

**Recommendation F8** – Impose a fee on carbon and other environmental costs to account for the full costs of freight travel and to encourage the adoption of more carbon-efficient technologies and less impactful freight modes and shipping patterns.

## **Air Passenger Travel Market Recommendations**

The Air Passenger travel market generates an estimated eight percent of the total GHG emissions in the transportation sector.<sup>8</sup> GHG emissions in this travel market are emitted by aircraft on the ground and during flight, from ground support equipment at airports such as luggage carts and gate equipment, and from all vehicles accessing the airport including private vehicles, taxis, shuttles, transit vehicles, and trucks. Air passenger travel moves at much faster speeds and typically over much longer distances than ground passenger travel. In addition, unique fuels are required to propel aircraft.

"In a trade dependent state like ours, this strategy focuses on dramatically reducing greenhouse gases while efficiently moving the state's goods and people."

> — Marla Harrison, Port of Portland



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Based on GHG inventory methods explained further in Appendix A

In exploring ways to reduce GHG emissions for air passenger travel, strategies were investigated that:

- Reduce overall demand for air passenger trips through improving alternative modes or eliminating entirely the need for some trips through advanced telecommunications;
- Reduce air passenger demand by assigning a fee that manages demand and/or encourages mode shift;
- Improve the efficiency of public transportation and nonmotorized access to the airport;
- Improve the efficiency of all vehicles and equipment operating on airport property;
- Reduce delays and improve overall efficiency of the air transportation system; and
- Reduce the carbon intensity of air passenger travel through improved aircraft and engine technologies and use of low-carbon aviation fuels.

**Recommendation A1** – Support sponsored research and partnerships with aircraft and engine manufacturers to help meet NASA's Environmentally Responsible Aviation (ERA) and Ultra Efficient Engine Technology (UEET) program goals.

**Recommendation A2** – Reduce the carbon intensity of aviation fuels.



**Recommendation A3** – Accelerate and complete implementation of the FAA "Next Generation" Air Transportation System.

**Recommendation A4** – Institute a carbon fee for all commercial air passenger services, with scheduled fee increases over the long-term.

**Recommendation A5** – Broadly support and deploy technologies for virtual meetings and other communication technologies to decrease business air travel demand.

**Recommendation A6** – Increase efficiency in all airport terminal access activities, including shift to low- and zero-emission vehicles and modes for passengers, employees, and vendors.

**Recommendation A7** – Deploy efficient operations and maintenance practices and use low- or zero-emission equipment for all airport ground service operations.

**Recommendation A8** – Set aviation fuel charges at a level sufficient to pay for non-climate change related externalities associated with fuel consumption. Non-climate change related externalities include energy security, air pollution, and surface environmental impacts.

**Recommendation A9** – Prioritize passenger rail improvements in the Eugene to Vancouver, BC corridor, ensuring service that is performanceand cost-competitive with air travel.

**Recommendation A10** – Increase passenger fees for air travel with both an origin and destination in the Eugene to Vancouver, BC corridor to encourage mode shift to passenger rail or other lower-carbon modes such as express intercity bus.

# The STS: A Path to Oregon's Future

Climate change is a global issue and cannot be addressed by Oregon alone. Still, Oregon's Statewide Transportation Strategy is a critical element in moving Oregon forward on path to a more sustainable future. Many existing and ongoing efforts have helped to inform and compliment the STS, including the Governor's Advisory Group on Global Warming (2004), the Governor's Climate Change Integration Group (2008), the Oregon Global Warming Commission's "Roadmap to 2020" (2010), and the Governor's 10-Year Energy Plan (2012). This document is intended to compliment these efforts.

Within ODOT's planning structure, the STS supports the Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) and its goal to provide a safe, efficient and sustainable transportation system that enhances Oregon's quality of life and economic vitality. Many of the recommendations in the STS align with other broad policies in the OTP as well as policies identified in other plans, such as the Oregon Freight Plan.

# Challenges

Each recommendation presented in the STS has its own opportunities and challenges. The cost, level of effort, and type of actions needed will vary by recommendation and element. Some of the potential challenges are discussed below.

**Financing/Funding Sources:** There is a need for new and/or more flexible revenue streams in order to build, operate and maintain the transportation infrastructure that is consistent with the 2050 Vision.

"We need to reach for the economic opportunities that will come from improved technologies, products associated with a low carbon economy. This will create new economic sectors."

> — Rex Burkholder, Metro

**Adoption Rate of Technology:** The development and adoption of new technology – for cleaner fuels, more efficient vehicles, intelligent transportation systems, etc. – may require research and development costs, incentives to encourage their use, and significant investment to build and operate appropriate infrastructure. Some actions may have slow implementation and start-up periods.



Land Use: Oregon faces the challenges of accommodating increases in population and supporting economic growth. New development that supports land uses to accommodate more infill and redevelopment, discourages sprawl and preserves industrial lands in areas with access to transportation options will be important. Some of these actions may require consideration of policy and code changes to allow jurisdictions flexibility in changing land uses and providing appropriate infrastructure.

**Public Acceptance and Participation:** Some of the recommendations may be controversial, especially in the short-term, making it challenging to find public support and acceptance. For example, users may find it difficult to accept the concept of paying the full cost of transportation through user fees or have privacy concerns.

**Support of Decision-Makers:** Lack of incentives, and the need for regulatory changes and new funding mechanisms to implement some of the STS actions will require legislative action to create regulatory context, establish incentive programs, encourage program exploration and participation, or change standards and policies. Federal legislative action may be essential to implement certain strategies, particularly those targeting the freight and aviation sectors.

**Multi-Jurisdiction Coordination and Collaboration:** The mix of public and private ownership and multiple jurisdictions responsible for the transportation system makes it a challenge to find shared goals. Transportation-related GHG emissions reduction will require close collaboration between jurisdictions across the national, state, and local levels. It will be necessary to balance these relationships so that Oregon is not at an economic disadvantage, and to find synergies and collaborations that enable progress on recommendations for the greater good. The process of further defining the STS recommendations and addressing these and other challenges must be inclusive and engage stakeholders from diverse backgrounds to allow a variety of perspectives to be shared and considered. Members of the committees, agencies and other participants in the state's efforts to plan for reductions in transportation-related GHG emissions recognize that there are many unknowns and that there will be a need to monitor and adapt as the work moves forward. This work will require strong partnerships and close collaboration with local, regional, state and federal partners as well as with individuals and businesses. Key to achieving the goals is an agile and iterative process to respond to and take advantage of what is learned along the way.

# **Next Steps**

Development of the STS is the first major step in a multi-year planning and implementation process to reduce transportation-related GHG emissions from the transportation sector. Following the adoption of the STS by the OTC, work will begin to develop an implementation plan. During this collaborative process, many of the recommendations will be analyzed in greater detail to understand potential economic impacts and opportunities. Also through development of the implementation plan, the roles and responsibilities of the federal, state, regional, local, and private sectors will be identified. Lastly, the STS will be monitored and adjusted over time, as needed.

The three phases of the STS are summarized below and illustrated in the graphic on the following page:

- **Phase I:** This phase includes development of the STS document, including establishing a vision, identifying the recommendations for helping to reduce emissions, and conducting public outreach. Phase I began in fall 2010 and will be completed when the OTC adopts the final STS, scheduled to occur in fall 2012.
- **Phase II:** The implementation phase will involve defining specific implementation actions, roles, and

responsibilities. This phase also includes a more detailed assessment and analysis of potential economic impacts and opportunities. Phase II is anticipated to start in fall 2012 and continue for approximately one year.



"Towns of all sizes can reap the benefits of many of these strategies."

— Chris Hagerbaumer, Oregon Environmental Council **Phase III:** The monitoring and adjustment phase includes tracking of performance measures over time and the periodic assessment and modification of the STS and timelines as elements of the STS are implemented. Phase III is anticipated to begin in fall 2013 and will be an ongoing process.





www.pedbikeimages.org /Laura Sandt

A special thank you to the following committee members for their contributions during the development of the STS. We also wish to thank the citizens of Oregon, including policy board members and their staff who provided valuable comments and assistance on the STS.

# **STS Policy Committee Members**

Chair: Ken Williamson Oregon Environmental Quality Commission (2004-2012), Professor Emeritus – Oregon State University Jerri Bohard Oregon Department of Transportation **Rex Burkholder Metro** Craig Campbell AAA of Oregon/Idaho Mark Capell Bend City Council Kelly Clifton Portland State University Angus Duncan Oregon Global Warming Commission **Diana Enright** Oregon Department of Energy **Chris Hagerbaumer** Oregon Environmental Council Marla Harrison Port of Portland **Onno Husing** Oregon Coastal Zone Management Association John Ledger Associated Oregon Industries John Oberst City of Monmouth **Bob Russell** Oregon Trucking Association John VanLandingham Land Conservation and Development Commission John Vial Jackson County

# **Oregon Transportation Commission**

*Chair:* Pat Egan David Lohman Mary Olson Mark Frohnmayer Tammy Baney



"I am really looking forward to Phase 2, to doing something on the ground."

> — Mark Capell, Bend City Councilor

# For the most current information go to: www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/OSTI/STS.shtml

# To Comment on the Draft Statewide Transportation Strategy

**Comments may be provided electronically at:** www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/OSTI/STS.shtml

#### Written comments may be submitted to:

The Oregon Department of Transportation Transportation Planning Unit 555 13th Street NE, Suite 2 Salem, Oregon 97301

Written comments on the Draft STS must be received by Friday, July 20, 2012.

# **Draft Oregon Statewide Transportation Strategy**

www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/OSTI/STS.shtml



600 NE Grand Ave. Portland, OR 97232-2736 503-797-1700 503-797-1804 TDD 503-797-1797 fax



Date:	June 21, 2012
То:	TPAC members and interested parties
From:	Nuin-Tara Key, Senior Regional Planner Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner
Re:	Climate Smart Communities: Phase 1 Metropolitan GreenSTEP scenarios sensitivity analysis

### **ACTION REQUESTED**

This information provides additional background information to supplement the Phase 1 Findings report. As part of TPAC's discussion, staff will be requesting your input and recommendations on:

- What questions do these findings raise?
- How does this information influence your thoughts about potential scenario options and implementation of strategies in your community, the region and the state?
- How should this information be shared with the region's policymakers?

## PURPOSE

To better understand the effectiveness of the individual strategies that make up the six policy areas within Metropolitan GreenSTEP, Metro staff conducted sensitivity analysis of individual strategies developed during Phase 1 of the Climate Smart Communities Scenarios Project. This memo summarizes the results of the sensitivity analysis.

#### BACKGROUND

Phase 1 of the Scenarios Project focused on understanding the region's land use and transportation choices by conducting a review of published research and testing 144 regional scenarios. Phase 1 was designed to accomplish two things: 1) to understand the GHG emissions reduction potential of current plans and policies and 2) to understand the combinations of plausible land use and transportation strategies that reduce GHG emissions from light duty vehicles to 1.2 MT CO2e per capita by 2035.

The Phase 1 Metropolitan GreenSTEP scenarios tested combinations of six different policy areas, each representing a number of individual strategies. Each of the six policy areas were tested at either two or three levels of implementation, or ambition, as shown in **Table 1**.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> More information on the Phase 1 Scenarios can be found through the project website at http://www.oregonmetro.gov/climatescenarios.

#### **Table 1: Phase 1 Scenarios input assumptions**

	Reference case					
		2010		2035		
Stra	itegy	Base Year Reflects existing conditions	Level 1 Reflects current plans and policies	Level 2 Reflects more ambitious policy changes	Level 3 Reflects even more ambitious policy changes	
	Households living in mixed-use areas and complete neighborhoods (percent)		GreenSTEP	calculates		
sign	Urban growth boundary expansion (acres)	2010 UGB	7,680 acres	7,680 acres	No expansion	
ty d€	Bicycle mode share <sup>1</sup> (percent)	2%	2%	12.5%	30%	
iuni	Transit service level	2010 service level	2035 RTP service level	2.5 times RTP service level	4 times RTP service level	
Comm	Workers/non-work trips paying for parking (percent)	13% / 8%	13% / 8%	30% / 30%	30% / 30%	
	Average daily parking fee (\$2005)	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$7.25	
	Pay-as-you-drive insurance (percent of households participating and cost)	0%	0%	100% at \$0.06/mile		
cing	Gas tax (cost per gallon \$2005)	\$0.42	\$0.48	\$0.18	No change from Level 2	
Pri	Road use fee (cost per mile \$2005)	\$0	\$0	\$0.03		
	Carbon emissions fee (cost per ton)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$50	
es	Households participating in eco-driving	0%	0%	40%		
centiv	Households participating in individualized marketing programs (percent)	9%	9%	65%		
and in	Workers participating in employer-based commuter programs (percent)	20%	20%	40%		
keting	Car-sharing in high density areas (target participation rate)	Participation rate of 1 member/100 people	Participation rate of 1 member/100 people	Double participation to 2 members/100 people		
Mar	Car-sharing in medium density areas (target participation rate)	Participation rate of 1 member/200 people	Participation rate of 1 member/200 people	Double participation to 2 members/200 people	No Level 3	
ads	Freeway and arterial expansion	2010 system	2035 financially constrained system	No expansion		
Roa	Delay reduced by traffic management strategies (percent)	10%	10%	35%		
eet	Fleet mix (proportion of autos to light trucks and SUVs)	auto: 57% light truck/SUV: 43%	auto: 56% light truck/SUV: 44%	auto: 71% light truck/SUV: 29%		
Ē	Fleet turnover rate (age)	10 years	10 years	8 years		
ygy	Fuel economy (miles per gallon)	auto: 29.2 mpg light truck/SUV: 20.9 mpg	auto: 59.7 mpg light truck/SUV: 41 mpg	auto: 68.5 mpg light truck/SUV: 47.7 mpg		
lour	Carbon intensity of fuels	90 g CO <sub>2</sub> e/megajoule	81 g CO <sub>2</sub> e/megajoule	72 g CO <sub>2</sub> e/megajoule		
Tech	Light-duty vehicles that are electric or plug-in electric vehicles (percent)	auto: 0% light truck/SUV: 0%	auto: 4% light truck/SUV: 1%	auto: 8% light truck/SUV: 2%		

**Table 2** demonstrates the effect of applying each policy area at each level of implementation beyond the Reference Case (Level 1).

The estimated percent reduction represents the average reduction in per capita roadway GHG emissions for each policy area, while considering all possible combinations of policy areas. While this analysis demonstrates the relative effectiveness of each policy area, it does not address the extent to which each of the individual strategy options within each policy area is contributing to the percent reductions. In other words, the scale of the analysis does not facilitate an understanding of the primary drivers within each policy area.

## Table 2.

# **Comparison of Phase 1 policy areas**

Policy area	Level	Estimated percent reduction from 1.8 MTCO <sub>2</sub> e*
Community design	2	18%
Community design	3	36%
Pricing	2	13%
Pricing	3	14%
Marketing and incentives	2	4%
Roads	2	2%
Fleet	2	11%
Technology	2	14%

Estimated reductions in roadway GHG emissions from current plans and policies

\*MT CO<sub>2</sub>e percent change from 2035 Reference Case (current plans and policies)

To address this information gap and to help refine the scope and range of options to be considered in Phase 2, Metro staff completed sensitivity analysis for all policy strategies. These additional sensitivity runs provide estimates on the relative effectiveness of each strategy within a policy area.

## **Community Design**

The Phase 1 community design strategy inputs demonstrated the greatest reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. These strategy options also represent some of the most investment intensive strategies for local and regional policymakers. To facilitate a regional conversation about implementation, while also considering relative cost effectiveness, it is

important to prioritize these strategy options in terms of their individual effectiveness on regional greenhouse gas emissions reductions.

### Pricing

The combination of pricing strategies tested in the Phase 1 scenarios are attributed with the second largest emission reduction potential. These strategy options reflect a policy area that Metro and the region have not examined in great detail and more work is needed to understand their effectiveness and the potential benefits and impacts they bring, including effects on households of modest means and businesses. In addition, these strategies may provide an opportunity to explore potential revenue generation options. Given these considerations pricing strategies represent a priority area to focus attention.

### **Marketing and incentives**

Relative to the other policy areas tested during Phase 1, the Marketing and Incentive policy area had the second smallest effect on reducing regional greenhouse gas emissions. Marketing and Incentive policy options still play a critical role in managing the region's transportation system.

### Roads

Relative to the other policy areas tested during Phase 1, the Roads policy area in Metropolitan GreenSTEP had the smallest effect on reducing regional greenhouse gas emissions. Similar to marketing and incentive programs, roadway expansion and connectivity, as well as demand management programs, are all critical to managing the region's transportation system.

## Fleet

The two policy options within the Fleet policy area are fleet mix and age. The analysis from both the Statewide and Metropolitan GreenSTEP scenarios demonstrate that transitioning to a greater proportion of light autos over trucks and increasing the fleet turnover rate both have a positive effect on reducing roadway emissions. However, these policy options are less directly within the sphere of control of Metro and local governments. While marketing and education campaigns can help to inform public opinion around these issues, and Metro and local governments can work to transition their own fleet over, it is ultimately a private consumer choice that will drive changes to these strategies.

## Technology

The technology options tested in the Phase 1 scenarios represent the third greatest reduction potential of all policy areas. These policy strategies, similar to pricing, reflect a relatively new area for Metro and local governments. While efforts to influence light vehicle technology shifts will take international, federal, state and local actions, there are a number of activities Metro and local governments can take to influence changes in these areas (e.g. supporting a local EV charging network that connects to the West Coast Green Highway network, advocating for Federal CAFÉ standards and implementation of Oregon's

Low Carbon Fuel Standard). Also, given potential shifts in fuel economy and technology may help the region meet its greenhouse gas reduction target.

## ANALYSIS RESULTS

All sensitivity runs evaluate the strategy inputs developed during Phase 1 of the Scenarios Project; *no policy strategy inputs were changed for this analysis*. The analysis results represent the effects of individual strategies in isolation and do not capture any variations that may occur from synergies between multiple policies.

All results represent the estimated reduction in roadway GHG emissions compared to the Reference Case (Level 1). The sensitivity analysis results are grouped into two categories based on the overall effectiveness of the policy areas; the first category includes Community Design, Pricing and Technology and the second category includes Marketing and incentives, Roads and Fleet.

The following points should be noted when reviewing the sensitivity analysis results:

- A small reduction in annual per capita emissions should not be interpreted as ineffective; marginal per capita reductions resulting from the polices discussed below can result in significant absolute GHG reductions. For example, if the region's population is roughly 2 million in 2035, a per capita reduction of .01 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e is the equivalent of an absolute reduction of 100,000 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e.
- The results below are only presented through a climate lens. For example, if two policies result in the same GHG emissions reduction potential, it does not mean they have equivalent effects through other perspectives (e.g. through an equity or fiscal lens). For example, modeled results for Level 3 bike mode share may have the same GHG emissions reduction potential as a no UGB expansion policy, however these policies have significantly different economic, fiscal and equity implications. The following analysis does not address these additional dimensions; however, the economic, fiscal, environmental and equity implications will be evaluated as part of the Phase 3 analysis.

#### **COMMUNITY DESIGN**

Except for "households in mixed-use areas and complete neighborhoods", all of the policy strategies within Community Design were tested.<sup>2</sup> The modeled Base Case (2010) regional estimate for households in mixed use areas and complete communities is roughly 26 percent. The 2035 model estimates for the Reference case is roughly 36 percent. All additional future year scenarios range from roughly 36 – 37 percent.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Because there is not a regionally endorsed approach for estimating the percent of population living in complete communities, the proportion of households living in mixed-use areas was estimated using Metropolitan GreenSTEP's internal land use characteristics model. The internal land use characteristics model uses population density to estimate the probability a household lives in a complete neighborhood or mixed-use area.

**Urban growth boundary:** because there is no change between Levels 1 and 2 only one sensitivity run was needed.

- Isolating Level 3, which represents a no expansion policy, results in a reduction of roughly two percentage points from the reference case.
- Per capita roadway emissions reduced from 1.8MT CO<sub>2</sub>e to 1.77MT CO<sub>2</sub>e.

**Bike mode share:** to isolate the difference between levels 2 and 3, two scenarios were run.

Level 2

- Isolating Level 2, which represents an increase in regional bike mode share from 2 percent to 12.5 percent, results in a reduction of roughly one percentage point from the reference case.
- With a Level 2 bike mode share modeled per capita roadway emissions decrease from 1.8 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e to 1.78 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e.
- Bike mode share at Level 2 results in an almost comparable GHG reduction to a no UGB expansion policy.

## Level 3

- Isolating Level 3, which represents an increase in regional bike mode share from 2 percent to 30 percent, results in a reduction of roughly three percentage points from the reference case.
- With a Level 3 bike mode share, modeled per capita roadway emissions decrease from 1.8 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e to 1.75 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e.
- Bike mode share at Level 3 results in an almost comparable GHG reduction to a no UGB expansion policy.

**Transit:** six model runs were completed to isolate each of the transit model inputs. The inputs include the level of transit service as well as the percent of electricity-powered service.

Changes in transit fleet electrification do not affect light vehicle roadway GHG emissions. While, a change in electrification is assumed to affect transit emissions, this level of analysis was not included in the sensitivity analysis.

The following results reflect the changes in roadway GHG emissions resulting from changes in transit service levels.

Level 2

- Increasing transit service to two and half (2.5) times the 2035 RTP service level results in significant per capita GHG emissions reductions; an estimated 20 percentage point reduction from the reference case.
- With a Level 2 transit service level, modeled per capita roadway emissions decrease from 1.8 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e to 1.49 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e.

 Transit Level 2 reductions are slightly greater than the reductions resulting from the assumed reductions from the State's recommended Technology and Fleet improvements, 1.49 and 1.5 respectively.

## Level 3

- Increasing transit service to four (4) times the 2035 RTP service level results in significant per capita GHG emissions reductions; an estimated 38 percentage point reduction from the reference case.
- With a Level 3 transit service level, modeled per capita roadway emissions decrease from 1.8 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e to 1.21 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e.
- Transit Level 3 reductions yield the greatest reduction of any single strategy tested during Phase 1. Implementing this policy strategy alone would almost meet the region's GHG emissions target.

**Parking:** To isolate the parking pricing factors three additional sensitivity runs were completed. The percent of trips—work and non-work—paying for parking (i.e. coverage) and the average daily parking fee were each isolated.

- Maintaining the 2035 RTP parking coverage assumptions (Level 1), but increasing the daily parking fee to Level 3, results in a roughly two percentage point reduction in roadway GHG emissions. Just increasing the daily parking fee to Level 3 results in a reduction of per capita GHG emissions from 1.8 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e to 1.76 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e; this is roughly equivalent to the reductions seen from a 12 percent regional bike mode share.
- Increasing the parking coverage area (Levels 2 and 3) but maintaining the Level 1 daily parking fee results in a roughly five percentage point reduction from the Reference Case, resulting in a per capita equivalent of 1.71 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e.
- Greater reductions are seen from increasing parking coverage than parking fees.
- Combining an increase in both parking fees and parking management coverage results in greater reductions than from each parking policy individually; testing both policy strategies at Level 3 results in a roughly nine percentage point reduction, resulting in a per capita emissions rate of 1.66 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e.
- Parking pricing level 3 inputs yield a greater reduction than a 30 percent regional bike mode split or the no UGB expansion model runs. However, it is less than half the reduction seen from Transit Level 2.

## PRICING

**Pay-as-you-drive insurance:** Because there was no change from Level 2 to Level 3 only one additional model run was needed for pay-as-you-drive-insurance.

- Levels 2 and 3 reflect a 100 percent transition to pay-as-you-drive insurance, which results in a roughly seven percentage point change from the reference case.
- In per capita terms, this reduction is an estimated 1.68 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e per capita.
- Level 3 pay-as-you-drive insurance has slightly less of a GHG reduction effect than does parking pricing Level 3 (increased coverage and daily fee).

**Fuel costs:** While fuel cost estimates were defined by using the State's assumptions from the first round of STS Scenarios (no regional changes) an additional sensitivity test was run

to isolate the affects of a fuel price increase. Fuel price changes were treated as a background condition that is not controlled by the region or the state.

- Two fuel price alternatives were embedded into the Phase 1 Scenarios. The Level 1 assumptions, which test a lower fuel cost scenario with current gas tax levels, was tested against a scenario that increases the fuel costs but maintains current gas tax levels. This increase in fuel costs results in a roughly six percentage point decrease in roadway GHG emissions.
- Increasing fuel costs to Level 2 is a per capita equivalent of 1.7 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e.
- Increasing 2035 fuel costs to \$6.14 a gallon, up from an estimated \$4.12 (in 2005 dollars) has a greater influence on roadway GHG emissions than Level 3 bike mode split or Level 3 UGB expansion; but less of an influence than the Level 3 parking pricing inputs.

**Road use fees:** Two sensitivity runs were needed to isolate the effects of a road use fee: the road use fee was tested with both the "low" and "high" embedded fuel cost assumptions.

- Applying a road use fee (Level 2) with the low fuel cost assumption results in a roughly six percentage point reduction from the Reference Case.
- Transitioning from a gas tax to a road use fee—with the low fuel cost background condition—has the equivalent effect of reducing per capita roadway GHG emissions to 1.70 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e; just slightly less of a reduction than the Level 2 pay-as-you-drive insurance.
- Applying a road use fee (Level 2) with the high fuel cost assumption results in a roughly nine percentage point reduction from the Reference Case.
- Transitioning from a gas tax to a road use fee—with the high fuel cost background condition—has the equivalent effect of reducing per capita roadway GHG emissions to 1.66 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e; approximately the same affect as Level 3 parking pricing inputs.

**Carbon fee:** Two sensitivity runs were needed to isolate the effects of applying a carbon emissions fee: the carbon fee was tested with both the "low" and "high" embedded fuel cost assumptions.

- Applying a carbon fee (Level 3) with the low fuel cost assumption resulted in a one percentage point reduction from the Reference Case.
- Applying the Level 3 input for a carbon emissions fee—with the low fuel cost background condition—has the equivalent effect of reducing per capita roadway GHG emissions to 1.78 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e.
- Applying a carbon fee (Level 3) with the high fuel cost assumption results in a reduction of just over nine percentage points from the Reference Case.
- Applying a carbon fee—with the high fuel cost background condition—has the equivalent effect of reducing per capita roadway GHG emissions to 1.65 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e; approximately the same affect as Level 3 parking pricing inputs.
#### **Technology**

**Fuel economy:** One sensitivity run was needed to isolate the effects of increased fuel economy for light autos and trucks.

- Increasing the fuel efficiency of both light trucks and autos to Level 2 input values results in a roughly six percentage point reduction in roadway emissions from the Reference Case.
- Level 2 inputs for fuel efficiency yield a per capita roadway emissions equivalent of 1.71 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e; this is approximately the equivalent of the Level 2 road use fee.

**Carbon intensity of fuels:** One sensitivity run was needed to isolate the effects of a lower carbon content in fuel.

- Decreasing the carbon content of fuel to the prescribed Level 2 input value results in a roughly twelve percentage point reduction in roadway emissions from the Reference Case.
- Level 2 inputs for fuel efficiency yield a per capita roadway emissions equivalent of 1.61 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e; this is reduction greater than the road use fee, Level 2 pay-as-you-drive insurance, and the Level 3 parking pricing factors. After the Levels 2 and 3 transit inputs, the modeled reduction in the carbon content of fuels has the third greatest affect on roadway GHG emissions.

**Electric vehicle (EV) and plug-in hybrid electric vehicle (PHEV) market share:** Three sensitivity runs were needed to isolate the effects of the modeled increases in efficiency and market share of EV and PHEV vehicles.

- Increasing the *fuel efficiency* of EV's to Level 2, but maintaining the Level 1 market share of four percent results in a less than 1 percentage point reduction in roadway GHG emissions.
- Per capita roadway emissions reduced from 1.8MT CO<sub>2</sub>e to 1.788 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e; this is roughly half the influence of increasing the regional bike mode share to Level 2 (12.5 percent).
- Increasing the *market share* of EV's to eight percent (Level 2), but maintaining the level 1 fuel efficiency results in a roughly one percentage point reduction in roadway GHG emissions.
- Per capita roadway emissions reduced from 1.8MT CO<sub>2</sub>e to 1.784 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e; this is almost half the influence of increasing the regional bike mode share to Level 2 (12.5 percent).
- Increasing both the efficiency and market share of EVs to the Level 2 assumptions, results in a slightly greater than one percentage point reduction in roadway GHG emissions.
- Per capita roadway emissions reduced from 1.8MT CO<sub>2</sub>e to 1.783 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e; similar to the other EV sensitivity runs, this is almost half the influence of increasing the regional bike mode share to Level 2 (12.5 percent).

Figure 1 provides the relative GHG emissions reduction potential for three policy areas (Community Design, Pricing and Technology). The modeled Reference Case—existing plans and policies—is estimated to reduce annual per capita GHG emissions to 1.8 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e (bolded line). This is a reduction from an estimated 2005 per capita emission rate of 4 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e. However, to meet the region's 20 percent reduction target the annual per capita emissions rate needs to get down to 1.2 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e (dotted line). While no single policy input tested in the Phase 1 Scenarios meets the reduction target on its own, the Level 3 transit input almost provides enough reduction potential to meet the region's target; the Level 2 transit input also provides significant emissions reductions potentials.





#### MARKETING AND INCENTIVES

All of the policy strategies within Marketing and Incentives were tested. These include three categories of policies: (1) eco-driving practices (use of low-rolling resistance tires, eco-driving behavior change, and vehicle use optimization); (2) travel demand management programs (individualized marketing programs and employer-based commute programs); and (3) participation in market-based car-sharing programs (in medium and high-density areas)

**Eco-driving:** to isolate all eco-driving program areas four model runs were completed. Low-rolling resistance tires

- Isolating the use of low-rolling resistance tires at level 2, which reflects a participation rate of 40 percent, results in a reduction in roadway greenhouse gas emissions of roughly one percentage point from the reference case.
- Per capita roadway emissions reduced from 1.8MT CO<sub>2</sub>e to 1.78 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e.

Eco-driving behaviors

- Isolating the effect of an increased participation rate of motorist implementing ecodriving behaviors results in a reduction in emissions of roughly two percentage points from the reference case. Level 2 reflects a 40 percent participation rate for households that reduce fuel consumption by avoiding rapid starts and stops, matching driving speeds to synchronized traffic signals and avoiding idling.
- Per capita roadway emissions reduced from 1.8 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e to 1.77 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e.

Low-rolling resistance tires and eco-driving combined

- An additional sensitivity run was completed to test the effect of both low-rolling resistance tires and eco-driving behaviors combined. Increasing participation in both of these activities to 40 percent (level 2) results in a reduction in emissions by slightly more than two percentage points from the reference case.
- Per capita roadway emissions reduced from 1.8 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e to 1.76 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e.
- Level 2 eco-driving participation rates result in an almost comparable GHG reduction to a no UGB expansion policy.

#### Vehicle optimizations

- Isolating vehicle optimization at level 2 (40 percent participation rate), which represents an increase in the proportion of households that optimize their use of vehicles by putting the most miles of travel on the vehicle that gets the highest fuel economy, results in a roughly three percentage point reduction from the reference case.
- Per capita roadway emissions reduced from 1.8 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e to 1.75 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e.

**Travel demand management:** three scenarios were run to isolate the difference between the individualized marketing (IM) and employer-based commute programs.

Individualized marketing

- Isolating Level 2, which represents an increase in the percent of households participating in an IM program to 65 percent, results in a reduction of roughly three percentage points from the reference case.
- Per capita roadway emissions decrease from 1.8 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e to 1.756 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e.

Employer-based commute programs

- Isolating Level 2, which represents an increase in the percent of employees participating in an Employee Commute Options (ECO) program to 40 percent, results in a reduction of roughly one percentage point from the reference case.
- Per capita roadway emissions reduced from 1.8 MT CO2e to 1.785 MT CO2e.

Individualized marketing and employer-based commute programs combined

- Isolating both IM and ECO programs at Level 2 results in a reduction of roughly three percentage point from the reference case.
- With a Level 2 bike mode share modeled per capita roadway emissions decrease from 1.8 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e to 1.753 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e.
- Combining IM and ECO programs results in a slightly greater reduction than IM programs alone.

**Car-sharing:** to isolate the difference between increased participation in car-sharing in medium and high-density areas, three scenarios were run.

High-density areas

 Isolating Level 2, which represents an increase in participation in car-sharing programs from 1 to 2 people per every one hundred in high-density areas, results in a reduction of slightly less than one percentage point from the reference case.

Per capita roadway emissions decrease from 1.8 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e to 1.78 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e.

Medium-density areas

 Isolating Level 2, which represents an increase in participation in car-sharing programs from 1 to 2 people per every one hundred in medium-density areas, results in a reduction of slightly less than one percentage point from the reference case.

Per capita roadway emissions decrease from 1.8 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e to 1.78 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e. <u>High and medium density areas combined</u>

- Isolating both high and medium-density participation rates, results in a reduction of slightly less than one percentage point from the reference case.
- Per capita roadway emissions decrease from 1.8 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e to 1.78 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e.
- Participation in car-share programs alone does not have a significant emissions reduction effect at a regional scale. However, it should be noted that this market-based

strategy may have more significant affects when combined with the community design policy strategies.

#### ROADS

All of the policy strategies within Roads were tested. These include two categories of policies: (1) freeway and arterial expansion; (2) delay reduction from traffic management strategies

**Roadway expansion:** to isolate all roadway expansion policies, three model runs were completed. Level 2 for both the freeway and arterial expansion tested the effects of a no-expansion policy, in affect this tests the implications of not implementing the regionally adopted 2035 financially constrained system.

Freeway expansion

- Isolating level 2, which reflects a no-expansion policy, results in an *increase* in emissions by roughly one percentage point from the reference case.
- Per capita roadway emissions increased from 1.8MT CO<sub>2</sub>e to 1.802 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e.

#### Arterial expansion

- Isolating level 2, which reflects a no-expansion policy, results in an *increase* in emissions by roughly one percentage point from the reference case.
- Per capita roadway emissions increased from 1.8MT CO<sub>2</sub>e to 1.812 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e.

#### Freeway and arterial expansion

- Isolating both freeway and arterial expansion at level 2, which reflects a no-expansion policy, results in an *increase* in emissions by just over one percentage point from the reference case.
- Per capita roadway emissions increased from 1.8MT CO<sub>2</sub>e to 1.826 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e.
- The increase in emissions seen from Level 2 may be attributable to the increases in congestion associated with a no-expansion policy. However, two considerations should be made; first, Metropolitan GreenSTEP does not model "mode shift" as a result on congestion, therefore it is possible these results do not capture the potential effects of this behavior change. Second, "expansion" not only includes system expansion but also connectivity and network improvement projects. Because these different roadway expansion project types are combined into a single input (roadway lane miles), Metropolitan GreenSTEP is not sensitive to the potential differences between expansion and connectivity projects.

#### **Delay reduction**

- Isolating level 2, which reflects an increase in delay reduction by 35% due to traffic management strategies, results in a decrease in emissions by roughly four percentage points from the reference case.
- Per capita roadway emissions reduced from 1.8MT CO<sub>2</sub>e to 1.74 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e.

#### Fleet

Fleet policy assumptions include fleet mix (proportion of light trucks to light autos) and fleet turnover rate (the rate at which new vehicles replace existing vehicles).

**Fleet mix:** two sensitivity runs were needed to isolate the effects of reducing the proportion of light trucks as a share of the total light duty fleet.

- Decreasing the share of light trucks as a portion of the *commercial service fleet*, from 45 percent to 30 percent, results in a roughly one percentage point reduction in roadway emissions from the Reference Case.<sup>3</sup>
- Per capita roadway emissions reduced from 1.8MT CO<sub>2</sub>e to 1.78 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e.
- Decreasing the share of light trucks as a portion of the *total fleet*, from 43 percent to 29 percent, results in a roughly six percentage point reduction in roadway emissions from the Reference Case.
- Per capita roadway emissions reduced from 1.8 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e to 1.7 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e, a reduction comparable to implementing the level 2 road use fee.

**Fleet turnover rate:** One sensitivity run was needed to isolate the effect of increasing the rate at which new vehicles replace older vehicles.

- Level 2, which increases the average replacement rate for light vehicles from 10 year to 8 years, results in a roughly eight percentage point reduction in roadway emissions from the reference case.
- Per capita roadway emissions reduced from 1.8 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e to 1.67 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e, a reduction comparable to Level 2 pay-as-you-drive insurance.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Commercial Service vehicles are light duty trucks and autos that are owned and operated by businesses within the Metro region. Commercial service vehicles were split out s as a separate market component from household vehicle travel. This enables different vehicle characteristics to be applies to commercial service vehicles. For example, many commercial service vehicles are good candidates for powering by compressed natural gas (CNG) or electricity because they are operated as fleets that can have the support for these power sources and because they have relatively short travel ranges.

Figure 2 provides the relative GHG emissions reduction potential for three policy areas (Marketing and Incentives, Roads and Fleet). The modeled Reference Case—existing plans and policies—is estimated to reduce annual per capita GHG emissions to 1.8 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e (bolded line). This is a reduction from an estimated 2005 per capita emission rate of 4 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e. However, to meet the region's 20 percent reduction target the annual per capita emissions rate needs to get down to 1.2 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e (dotted line). No single policy input tested in the Phase 1 Scenarios meets the reduction target on its own.

Figure 2: Sensitivity analysis results for Marketing and Incentives, Roads and Fleet, annual per capita roadway emissions



Materials following this page were distributed at the meeting.



Date:	June 21, 2012
To:	TPAC, MTAC and interested parties
From:	Robin McArthur, AICP, Planning and Development Director
Subject:	Regional Parking Management Requirements

#### PURPOSE

This memo provides guidance on how Metro will administer new parking management requirements in the Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP).

#### BACKGROUND

Parking plays a large role in achieving region and community goals of vibrant downtowns and mainstreets, clean air and water, access to nature, and transportation choice. Within centers and corridors the amount of parking provided, its design and location have a great impact on both urban form and our ability to meet regional mode share targets. Reducing the amount of land dedicated to parking provides land for development and helps to create vibrant commercial districts with continuous storefronts and engaging ground-floor uses. At the same time, Metro acknowledges the difficulty of managing parking at the local level given apprehension surrounding the issue from businesses and residents.

Metro adopted the RTFP in June, 2010, codifying requirements that will help implement the goals and policies of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan. As part of RTFP adoption, existing regional parking requirements (minimum/maximum ratios) were moved from the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP) to the RTFP. During this process a new requirement to adopt parking policies, management plans and regulations for Centers and Station Communities was added to regional code (3.08.410 (I.)):

"Cities and counties shall adopt parking policies, management plans and regulations for Centers and Station Communities. The policies, plans and regulations shall be consistent with subsection A through H. Plans may be adopted in TSPs or other adopted policy documents and may focus on sub-areas of Centers. Plans shall include an inventory of parking supply and usage, an evaluation of bicycle parking needs with consideration of *TriMet Bicycle Parking Guidelines*. Policies shall be adopted in the TSP. Policies, plans and regulations must consider and may include the following range of strategies:

- 1. By-right exemptions from minimum parking requirements;
- 2. Parking districts;
- 3. Shared parking;
- 4. Structured parking;
- 5. Bicycle parking;
- 6. Timed parking;
- 7. Differentiation between employee parking and parking for customers, visitors and patients;
- 8. Real-time parking information;
- 9. Priced parking;
- 10. Parking enforcement"

Also, as per UGMFP Title 6, jurisdictions need to adopt parking management programs consistent with 3.08.410 in order for Center, Corridors, Station Communities and Main Streets to be eligible

for regional investments (3.07.620.D.4.c), or for taking a 30% reduction in assumed vehicle trip generation rates for purposes of plan amendments subject to section -0060 of the Transportation Planning Rule (3.07.630.B.3.c)

#### **IMPLEMENTATION OF PARKING MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENT (RTFP 3.08.410(I.))**

The regional parking management requirement was developed in part, to address compliance with the non-Single Occupancy Vehicle modal targets which Metro adopted to achieve compliance with section 0035 of the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) and consistency with the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) mobility policy for the Metro region. Since RTFP adoption, the TPR and OHP have both undergone major amendments which reframe both mobility policy within the highway plan and the application of mobility policy to plan amendments, as set forth in the TPR.

In light of these changes, Metro expects to reassess its parking management requirements to ensure consistency with updated state policies, and to take advantage of new provisions that provide for flexibility in meeting mobility goals.

In the meantime, Metro will require local jurisdiction to include parking policies in Transportation System plans (TSP) and to map out how parking management plans will be addressed if not part of the TSP update process. Metro encourages local jurisdictions to innovate, following the example of cities like Beaverton and Hillsboro who have adopted parking management plans for their downtowns.

#### **NEXT STEPS**

Metro recognizes the need to provide more guidance on parking management, building on our Community Investment Toolkit (Volume 2 – Innovative Design and Development Codes). Metro intends to apply for state and federal grants to complete this work, including an update of regional parking policies and requirements.

#### BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

)

)

)

)

)

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE 2012-15 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) TO ADD THE KELLOGG LAKE MULTI-USE BRIDGE PROJECT **RESOLUTION NO. 12-YYYY** 

Introduced by Councilor Collette

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) prioritizes projects from the Regional Transportation Plan to receive transportation related funding; and

WHEREAS, the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) the Metro Council approved the 2012-15 MTIP on March 15, 2012; and

WHEREAS, JPACT and the Metro Council must approve any subsequent amendments to add new projects or substantially modify existing projects in the MTIP; and

WHEREAS, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) administers the Transportation Enhancement funding program of which some funds are recommended for allocation at the discretion of the ODOT Director, subject to approval by the Oregon Transportation Commission; and

WHEREAS, the City of Milwaukie requested discretionary Transportation Enhancement funding for the Kellogg Lake Multi-Use Bridge project and has received a recommendation from the ODOT Director to allocate \$1,000,000 to the project; and

WHEREAS, funding for the project needs to be secured by September 2012 to achieve cost savings provided by incorporating the project into the construction of the Portland to Milwaukie light rail bridge structure; and

WHEREAS, the project will provide a direct bicycle and pedestrian connection between the Milwaukie town center and its neighborhoods to the south; and

WHEREAS, federal rules exempt this type of project from needing to conduct an air quality conformity analysis to comply with the Clean Air Act; and

WHEREAS, funding for the Kellogg Lake Multi-Use Bridge project is available within existing revenues, consistent with the MTIP financial plan; and

WHEREAS, JPACT approved this resolution July 12, 2012; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council hereby adopts the recommendation of JPACT to add the Kellogg Lake Multi-Use Bridge project to the 2012-15 MTIP, consistent with the programming illustrated in Exhibit A.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this \_\_\_\_\_ day of July 2012.

Tom Hughes, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Alison Kean Campbell, Acting Metro Attorney

#### Exhibit A to Resolution No. 12-yyyy

#### 2012-15 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Plan Table 3.1.3 amendment

Action: Amend MTIP to add Kellogg Lake Multi-Use bridge project.

Existing programming:

None

Amended programming:

Project Name	Project Description	ODOT Key #	Lead Agency	Estimated Total Project Cost *	Project Phase	Fund Type	Program Year	Federal Funding	Minimum Local Match	Other Funds	Total Funding
Kellogg Lake Multi-Use Bridge (element of Portland- Milwaukie light rail transit project	Add pedestrian and bicycle path to light rail bridge over Kellogg Lake (Milwaukie).	17519	TriMet	\$1,114,454	Cons	TE	2013	\$1,000,000	\$114,454	\$0	\$1,114,454

\*Total cost of multi-use path element only. Project and project funding will be incorporated into the Portland to Milwaukie light rail project.

#### **STAFF REPORT**

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE 2012-15 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) TO ADD THE KELLOGG LAKE MULTI-USE BRIDGE PROJECT

Date: June 26, 2012

Prepared by: Ted Leybold, 503-797-1759

#### BACKGROUND

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) administers the Transportation Enhancement (TE) program that provides federal funds for projects that strengthen the cultural, aesthetic, or environmental value of our transportation system. TE funds are available for twelve Transportation Enhancement Activities approved by Congress. The Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) approved \$2 million per year for a TE Discretionary Account starting in 2006. This allows ODOT to apply funds to qualified projects as needs become known, separate from the statewide competitive process. Use of the Discretionary Account is guided by a general policy adopted by the OTC in 2003 and implementing procedures adopted by the TE Advisory Committee. Projects are subject to the same eligibility criteria and selection priorities used in the competitive process.

The City of Milwaukie has long sought to re-establish a direct bicycle and pedestrian connection between its downtown and neighborhoods to the south that are separated by Highway 99E, an undeveloped park, and Kellogg Lake. Upcoming construction of the PMLR light-rail bridge over Kellogg Lake presents a short-lived opportunity to cost-effectively restore the bike/ped connection by constructing it on a lower deck of the bridge that has been designed concurrently with the light-rail project. City of Milwaukie and TriMet jointly applied for the TE funds. They need a funding commitment by September 1, 2012 to coordinate fitting the bicycle and pedestrian bridge into the schedule for the light-rail project.

The requested TE funds will cover the added expense of constructing the bike/ped bridge as part of the light-rail bridge, and if funding allows—completing the path connection southward through Kronberg Park to Highway 99E and the Trolley Trail at the existing River Road signal. Without TE funds, the bike/ped bridge deck will not be included in the light-rail bridge contract and will not be built in the foreseeable future.

The TE Advisory Committee determined the project is eligible to be considered for TE Discretionary funds, and that it meets the project selection criteria with a score comparable to those for TE projects awarded in the 2010-2011 selection cycle. FHWA confirmed the requested activity is eligible under TE Activity #1 (facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists). With OTC approval, ODOT staff will work with TriMet and City of Milwaukie to promptly amend the existing agreements and funding documents for the PMLR project, as needed to meet the construction schedule for Kellogg Lake Bridge.

Federal rules exempt this type of project from needing to conduct an air quality conformity analysis to comply with the Clean Air Act. These project elements were included in all National Environmental Protection Act compliance work conducted by TriMet for the overall Portland to Milwaukie light rail project.

The Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation and the Metro Council must approve amendments to the MTIP. This amendment will add TE funding for a bicycle and pedestrian bridge element as a part of the Portland to Milwaukie bridge structure over Kellogg Lake.

#### ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. Known Opposition None known at this time.

- 2. Legal Antecedents Amends the 2012-15 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program adopted by Metro Council Resolution 12-4332 on March 15, 2012 (For the Purpose of Approving the 2012-15 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program for the Portland Metropolitan Area).
- 3. Anticipated Effects Allows project to be eligible for transportation funding.
- 4. Budget Impacts None.

#### **RECOMMENDED ACTION**

Metro staff recommends the approval of Resolution No. 12-yyyy.

#### BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

)

)

)

)

)

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE 2012-15 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) TO ADD THE CONSTRUCTION PHASE OF THE I-84 EASTBOUND TO I-205 NORTHBOUND AUXILARY LANE PROJECT **RESOLUTION NO. 12-XXXX** 

Introduced by Councilor Collette

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) prioritizes projects from the Regional Transportation Plan to receive transportation related funding; and

WHEREAS, the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) the Metro Council approved the 2012-15 MTIP on March 15, 2012; and

WHEREAS, JPACT and the Metro Council must approve any subsequent amendments to add new projects or substantially modify existing projects in the MTIP; and

WHEREAS, the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council has previously approved the development of this project by approving a corridor operations analysis for the Interstate 84 corridor in the 2009-10 Unified Planning Work Program and preliminary engineering for the I-84 Eastbound to I-205 Northbound Auxilary Lane project in the 2010-13 MTIP; and

WHEREAS, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) has conducted the corridor operations analysis for the Interstate 84 corridor and preliminary engineering for the I-84 Eastbound to I-205 Northbound Auxilary Lane project; and

WHEREAS, cost savings from other projects within the state have been identified and must be reprogrammed and obligated to other projects to avoid potential rescission of federal transportation funds; and

WHEREAS, ODOT has proposed a priority improvement that would extend an auxiliary lane between the Halsey Street exit and the I-205 Northbound exit to reduce crash incidents and reduce vehicle delay; and

WHEREAS, as a result of the work completed on this project, it is uniquely ready to obligate the available funds in a timely manner; and

WHEREAS, by proceeding at this time, the project will realize cost savings due to the sharing of construction staging and traffic management work with a pavement preservation project in the same vicinity; and

WHEREAS, the Clean Air Act requires that federally funded transit and highway projects demonstrate conformity with the state's air quality goals; and

WHEREAS, the I-84 Eastbound to I-205 Northbound Auxilary Lane project was included in the Regional Transportation Plan financially constrained system, which plan has demonstrated conformity; and

WHEREAS, funding for the I-84 Eastbound to I-205 Northbound Auxiliary Lane project is available within existing revenues, consistent with the MTIP financial plan; and

WHEREAS, JPACT approved this resolution July 12, 2012; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council hereby adopts the recommendation of JPACT to add the construction phase of the I-84 Eastbound to I-205 Northbound Auxiliary Lane project to the 2012-15 MTIP, consistent with the programming illustrated in Exhibit A.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this \_\_\_\_\_ day of July 2012.

Approved as to Form:

Tom Hughes, Council President

Alison Kean Campbell, Acting Metro Attorney

#### Exhibit A to Resolution No. 12-xxxx

#### 2012-15 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Plan Table 3.1.4 amendment

Action: Amend MTIP to add construction phase to ODOT project.

Existing programming:

Project Name	Project Description	ODOT Key #	Lead Agency	Estimated Total Project Cost	Project Phase	Fund Type	Program Year	Federal Funding	Minimum Local Match	Other Funds	Total Funding
I-84 Eastbound to I-205 Northbound Auxilary Lane	Extend auxilary vehicle travel lane on I-84 EB from Halsey Street exit ramp to I-205 NB exit ramp	70393	ODOT	\$6,000,000	PE	STP	2010	\$897,300	\$102,700	\$0	\$1,000,000

Amended programming:

Project Name	Project Description	ODOT Key #	Lead Agency	Estimated Total Project Cost	Project Phase	Fund Type	Program Year	Federal Funding	Minimum Local Match	Other Funds	Total Funding
I-84 Eastbound to I-205 Northbound	Extend auxilary vehicle travel lane on I-84 EB from Halsev Street exit	70393	ODOT	\$6,000,000	PE	STP	2011	\$897,300	\$102,700	\$0	\$1,000,000
Auxilary Lane	ramp to I-205 NB exit ramp				Cons	STP	2013	\$4,383,800	\$616,200	\$0	\$5,000,000

#### **STAFF REPORT**

## FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE 2012-15 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) TO ADD THE CONSTRUCTION PHASE OF THE I-84 EASTBOUND TO I-205 NORTHBOUND AUXILARY LANE PROJECT

Date: June 26, 2012

Prepared by: Ted Leybold, 503-797-1759

#### BACKGROUND

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) hass performed operations analysis of the Interstate freeway system and has identified potential operational projects to reduce vehicle crashes and increase vehicle flow to reduce congestion. A priority project emerging from this analysis is to extend the auxilary travel lane on eastbound I-84 from the Halsey Street exit to the I-205 northbound exit. The Preliminary Engineering phase of this project was approved as a part of the 2010-13 MTIP and is now nearing completion.

The configuration of existing and proposed lanes is shown in Attachment 1.

By extending an auxilary lane between the Halsey Street and I-205 Northbound exits, vehcicle queing on the left most lane of I-84 from the I-205 on ramps will be reduced. This will reduce crash incidents and delay for eastbound vehicles on I-84.

ODOT has identified financial capacity to fund this project from savings to existing projects from across the state. These funds will be programmed on the project to ensure timely obligation of federal funds and avoid the potential for a rescission of federal funds allocated to the state.

This project was modeled as a part of the air quality conformity of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan. This project was a part of the financially constrained system and modeled with an increase in vehicle capacity for this section of freeway. The forecasted timing of the modeled increase in capacity (by year 2017) is consistent with the proposed programming of funds for construction of this project.

The Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation and the Metro Council must approve amendments to the MTIP. This amendment will add a construction phase the I-84 Eastbound to I-205 Northbound Auxilary Lane project to the 2012-15 MTIP with programming as shown in Exhibit A to Resolution No. 12-xxxx.

#### ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

- 1. Known Opposition None known at this time.
- 2. Legal Antecedents Amends the 2012-15 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program adopted by Metro Council Resolution 12-4332 on March 15, 2012 (For the Purpose of Approving the 2012-15 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program for the Portland Metropolitan Area).
- 3. Anticipated Effects Allows project to be eligible for transportation funding.
- 4. Budget Impacts None.

#### **RECOMMENDED ACTION**

Metro staff recommends the approval of Resolution No. 12-xxxx.

I-84 EB: Extend Halsey St. Lane Drop as Aux Lane to NB I-205



#### I-84 Eastbound - Halsey Street Lane Extension



Source: HCS analysis

Queue: For the I-205 SB OFF ramp the queue builds in the right-most lane with some more aggressive drivers sneaking up to this exit in the middle lane looking for gaps provided by trucks (and others). The middle and left-most lanes serve through traffic and those destined for exits further east, including the I-205 NB OFF Ramp. As the afternoon peak continues the I-205 SB OFF Ramp gaps become fewer (for the sneaking vehicles) resulting in the middle lane experiencing higher densities (slower speeds). Downstream the 1-205 NB OFF Ramp also has a high exiting volume, most of which align in the middle lane (through the I-205 SB and Halsey St. OFF Ramps) to avoid congestion in the right lane. Congestion in the middle lane, from the I-205 SB OFF Ramp "sneakers", pushes some of the vehicles destined for I-205 NB OFF Ramp (that would otherwise use the middle lane) to the left-most lane (and direct competition with through trips) in order to by-pass the I-205 SB OFF Ramp queue. Once past the exit to the I-205 NB OFF Ramp speeds increase (density and v/c ratios decrease).

Duration: The duration of the queue along I-84 between the I-205 SB & NB OFF Ramps is assumed to be equivalent to the congestion duration documented along I-205 (and connecting ramps to I-84), approximately 3.5 hrs (3:00-6:30PM during the workweek).-Source: I-205 Bottleneck graphics, bottlenecks #3 and #8.

Description: Currently the right-most lane of the 3 lane cross-section ends at the Halsey St. OFF Ramp. The proposed improvement would extend this lane east to the I-205 NB OFF Ramp.

Queue-The proposed project will allow better lane alignment for the major eastbound movements (I-205 SB OFF, I-205 NB OFF, and through traffic). The 3-lane section in the vicinity of the I-205 SB OFF Ramp is anticipated to operate similar to the current conditions in the right lane with "sneaker" vehicles using the middle lane. The proposed project would provide the greatest benefit to the one mile segment between the I-205 SB and NB OFF ramps. The additional lane in this section is expected to allow for <u>I-205 NB OFF Ramp</u> traffic to queue in the right-most lane south of the Halsey St. OFF Ramp, with som spillover into the middle lane beginning west of Halsey St. The left-lane queue is anticipated to shrink to around the 82nd Ave OFF Ramp, thus providing a less constricted route for through vehicles east of 82nd Ave compared to current conditions.

Duration-It is anticipated that the queue along I-84 in the right-most lanes will be constant in duration (3.5 hrs) because the source of the queue is not on I-84, rather I-205. The queue/delay for through trips is anticipated to noticeably decrease .

Speed- Speeds in the two right-most lanes are expected to be relatively similar due to spillback from I-205, however, the speed for through trips will increase approximately 5 MPH. <u>Density-</u>HCS traffic modeling supports these benefits showing an

improvement in density (36 pc/h/ln to 22 pc/h/ln) at the Halsey St. OFF ramp over a section of 1500 feet in length. The density leading into the segment between Halsey St. OFF Ramp and the I-205 NB OFF Ramp also shows an improvement in density (22.0 pc/h/ln to 14.6 pc/h/ln). Volume-Traffic volumes are not anticipated to change with the proposed project. Ramp demand volumes are shown on the left side of the queuing figures.

#### Project Impacts Summary:

DAVID EVANS

Queue-The queue is reduced by over a mile in the left lane, up to a half-mile in the center lane, and no change in the right lane. Duration-The duration of queuing for through trips (left and center lanes) is anticipated to noticeably decrease, while the queuing for the right lane remains constant (3.5 hours).

Speed- Speeds in the left lane is expected to increase approximately 5 MPH, while the right and center lanes are relatively similar to existing



FIGURE 2

I-84 Eastbound (Halsey St. OFF Ramp) Extension of 3rd Eastbound lane

#### BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

)

)

)

)

)

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE 2012-15 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) TO ADD THE CRESCENT CONNECTION: CEDAR HILLS BOULEVARD TO DENNEY ROAD BICYCLE, PEDESTRIAN, AND TRANSIT ACCESS PROJECT **RESOLUTION NO. 12-ZZZZ** 

Introduced by Councilor Collette

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) prioritizes projects from the Regional Transportation Plan to receive transportation related funding; and

WHEREAS, the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) the Metro Council approved the 2012-15 MTIP on March 15, 2012; and

WHEREAS, JPACT and the Metro Council must approve any subsequent amendments to add new projects or substantially modify existing projects in the MTIP; and

WHEREAS, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) administers the State Flexiblc Funding program for transit, transportation demand management, bicycle and pedestrian projects; and

WHEREAS, the City of Beaverton was awarded funding for preliminary engineering and rightof-way acquisition for the Crescent Connection project that will provide pedestrian, bicycle, and transit stop improvements between the Cedar Creek Boulevard at the Beaverton Central transit station, the Beaverton Transit Center, and the Fanno Creek trail at Denney Road; and

WHEREAS, federal rules exempt this type of project from needing to conduct an air quality conformity analysis to comply with the Clean Air Act; and

WHEREAS, funding for the Crescent Connection project is available within existing revenues, consistent with the MTIP financial plan; and

WHEREAS, JPACT approved this resolution July 12, 2012; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council hereby adopts the recommendation of JPACT to add the Crescent Connection: Cedar Hills Boulevard to Denney Road project to the 2012-15 MTIP, consistent with the programming illustrated in Exhibit A.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this \_\_\_\_\_ day of July 2012.

Tom Hughes, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Alison Kean Campbell, Acting Metro Attorney

#### 2012-15 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Plan Table 3.1.3 amendment

Action: Amend MTIP to add Crescent Connection: Cedar Hills Blvd to Denney Rd project.

Existing programming:

None

Amended programming:

Project Name	Project Description	ODOT Key #	Lead Agency	Estimated Total Project Cost (all phases, all years)	Project Phase	Fund Type	Program Year	Federal Funding	Minimum Local Match	Other Funds	Total Funding
Crescent Connection: Cedar Hills Blvd to	Multi-use path and on-street pedestian, bicycle and transit access	TBD	City of Beaverton	\$4,231,099	PE	S-STP	2012	\$350,000	\$40,059	\$86,941	\$477,000
Denney Rd	facilities (Beaverton).				ROW	S-STP	2013	\$850,000	\$97,286	\$0	\$947,286
					Con	Other	2014			\$2,806,813	\$2,806,813
					Subtotal			\$1,200,000	\$137,345	\$86,941	\$1,424,286

#### **STAFF REPORT**

## FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE 2012-15 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) TO ADD THE CRESCENT CONNECTION: CEDAR HILLS BOULEVARD TO DENNEY ROAD BICYCLE, PEDESTRIAN, AND TRANSIT ACCESS PROJECT

Date: June 26, 2012

Prepared by: Ted Leybold, 503-797-1759

#### BACKGROUND

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) administers a statewide allocation process known the state Flexible Funds program. The Flexible Funds Program funds Bicycle, Pedestrian, Transit and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) projects, plans, programs and services through a competitive process. The Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) held a public hearing at their February 15, 2012 meeting and on March 21, 2012 approved its list of project allocations, including one to the City of Beaverton for preliminary engineering and right-of-way for bicycle, pedestrian, and transit access improvements between Cedar Hills Boulevard and Denney Road.

The project will complete preliminary engineering and right-of-way phases for a shared use path on the north side of Denney Road from King Boulevard to the Fanno Creek Trail, and for the Beaverton Creek Trail from Cedar Hills Boulevard to the Beaverton Transit Center. It includes safe street crossings and 16 transit stop improvements along the Crescent Connection route, primarily along Lombard Avenue. The project is illustrated in Attachment 1.

Federal rules exempt this project from having to perform air quality conformity analysis. The project is included in the financially constrained 2035 Regional Transportation Plan.

The Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation and the Metro Council must approve amendments to the MTIP. This amendment will add the Crescent Connection: Cedar Hills Boulevard to Denney Road project to the 2012-15 MTIP with programming as shown in Exhibit A to Resolution No. 12-zzzz.

#### ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

- 1. Known Opposition None known at this time.
- 2. Legal Antecedents Amends the 2012-15 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program adopted by Metro Council Resolution 12-4332 on March 15, 2012 (For the Purpose of Approving the 2012-15 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program for the Portland Metropolitan Area).
- 3. Anticipated Effects Allows project to be eligible for transportation funding.
- 4. Budget Impacts None.

#### **RECOMMENDED ACTION**

Metro staff recommends the approval of Resolution No. 12-zzzz.



www.oregonmetro.gov

600 NE Grand Ave. Portland, OR 97232-2736 503-797-1700 503-797-1804 TDD 503-797-1797 fax

# MetroMemoDate:June 26, 2012To:TPAC and interested partiesFrom:Kim Ellis, Principal Transport

From:Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation PlannerRe:Climate Smart Communities – Updated Draft Scenario Options Framework

#### **ACTION REQUESTED**

Metro staff are seeking input on the attached draft scenario options framework. The framework has been refined since the May 25 TPAC meeting to reflect input from the technical work group and the Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC).

As part of TPAC's discussion, staff will be requesting your initial input and recommendations on:

- Will this framework resonate with policymakers? Does it address the concerns and issues that have been raised to date?
- What suggestions do you have for more effectively communicating the framework at upcoming policymaker discussions?
- What policy areas should be emphasized? What suggestions do you have for what should be included as inputs?

Future discussions will focus on the following questions:

- What policies being considered best support your community vision and goals and should be a priority for the process to consider within these different investment scenarios?
- What overall level of investment should the region seek to achieve desired outcomes for each option? What level of transit investment is appropriate?
- What assumptions used in Phase 1 are reasonable? Should certain assumptions be lower or higher that what was assumed in Phase 1?
- What local aspirations need to be considered in analyzing various approaches?
- To what extent should the region rely on the State's projections, which contain aggressive assumptions for fleet and technology? What other STS assumptions should be included in the next round of scenarios?

TPAC's input and recommendations will be provided to the technical work group, TPAC, MTAC and policy advisory committees at upcoming discussions.



The region's six desired outcomes – endorsed by city and county elected officials and approved by the Metro Council in Dec. 2010.

#### **BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE**

The Climate Smart Communities project is a multi-year, collaborative effort to help communities in the Portland metropolitan region achieve the things they want – clean air, safe and healthy communities, jobs and economic vitality – while at the same time attaining state, regional and, in some communities, local greenhouse gas reduction goals.

The Climate Smart Communities program is divided in three phases. Phase 1 focused on understanding available choices by testing a variety of possible actions to reduce emissions from cars and small trucks. In Phase 2 (this year), the project will focus on working with local governments and community stakeholders to shape scenarios options to identify three alternative approaches to evaluate in 2013.

The purpose of the Phase 2 scenarios is to provide distinct options about the region's future to clearly articulate local, regional and state choices and tradeoffs based on more detailed evaluation of those options in 2013.

Phase 2 includes:

- working with local partners to confirm community ambitions and develop case studies, review Phase 1 sensitivity analysis and the draft Statewide Transportation Strategy to identify most effective strategies, and frame a range of scenario options that support community and regional ambitions
- working with local partners and other stakeholders to refine the scenarios evaluation framework and criteria to create a score card
- facilitating a regional discussion with local government, business and community leaders to review the scenario options and assumptions to be tested in 2013.

In December, MPAC, JPACT and Council will be asked to provide direction to staff on the scenario options to be evaluated.

Phase 3 will focus on choosing a final preferred approach that represents a compilation of community plans and visions plus other policies the region's decision-makers agree are needed. The last phase is to be completed by 2014.

#### KEY FINDINGS FROM PHASE 1 AND SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

Staff has reported to you the results of the first phase.<sup>1</sup> After evaluating different levels of ambition for twenty-two strategies in six policy areas, staff found that more than 90 out of 144 scenarios met or exceeded the target reduction objectives for the year 2035.



## Current plans and policies provide a strong foundation but do not meet target

<sup>1</sup> Understanding our Land Use and Transportation Choices: Phase 1 Findings (January 12, 2012) at www.oregonmetro.gov/

In addition, we learned that current adopted plans and policies in combination with state assumptions for changes to fleet and technology get us very close to the state goals for our region. A range of choices exist to meet state goal and most of the strategies under consideration are already being implemented to varying degrees in communities to achieve other important economic, social and environmental goals.



Since the Phase 1 Findings report was accepted in January 2012, staff conducted sensitivity analysis of various strategies to better understand the GHG emissions reduction potential of individual strategies. <sup>2</sup> In addition to significant reductions expected from changes to fleet and technology, some of the most significant strategies that affect GHG reduction are:

- **Transit** Increasing transit service by 2.5 to 4 times over RTP levels has 20 to 38 percent reduction when compared with the reference case.
- **Parking fees (amount) and parking management (extent of paid parking)** Increasing the average daily parking fee from \$5.00 to \$7.25 per day (in 2005 dollars), and expanding the extent of paid parking from downtown Portland and the Oregon Health Sciences University campus in Southwest Portland to include all designated regional centers, town centers and high capacity transit station communities results in a 9 percent reduction when compared with the reference case.
- **Pay-as-you drive insurance** If 100 percent of the region's light vehicle owners paid a .06 per mile insurance premium in lieu of current premium structures, a 7 percent reduction could be achieved when compared to the reference case.
- **Fuel prices** Increasing 2035 fuel costs to \$6.14 a gallon (from estimated \$4.12 per gallon in 2005 dollars) results in about a 6 percent reduction. If combined with a road use fee or carbon fee results in about a 9 percent reduction compared to the reference case.

Except as noted, these reductions are for each strategy individually and do not reflect synergistic benefits from combining various strategies. It is also important to note that while some strategies did not individually achieve significant GHG reductions, such as increasing bicycle mode share or participation in marketing and incentives programs, they remain important elements to complement more effective strategies such as transit service expansion and building walkable downtowns and main streets.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Memo to TPAC and interested parties on Phase 1 Metropolitan GreenSTEP scenarios sensitivity analysis (June 21, 2012)

#### FRAMING SCENARIO OPTIONS – A PROPOSED FRAMEWORK

Building on the lessons learned in Phase 1, the current phase (Phase 2) will define three possible approaches to achieve the emissions reduction goals that will serve as the basis from which to select a preferred approach. The approaches will be evaluated in detail in 2013 for their fiscal, economic, equity and environmental their benefits and impacts (both positive and negative) to communities, businesses and households.

To jumpstart the policy conversation and begin to provide more certainty without driving to pre-determined outcomes, staff drafted a preliminary framework and approach for defining the scenario options.



Policy areas tested in Phase 1

The proposed framework and scenarios are intended to create policy bookends for developing a preferred scenario – and position community plans and ambitions as the foundation.

The purpose of the scenarios is to provide distinct options about the region's future to clearly articulate local, regional and state choices and tradeoffs based on more detailed evaluation of those options in 2013. The framework is intentionally simplistic to be easily communicated and provide flexibility and range of assumptions for defining a preferred scenario in 2013-14. The scenarios will include refined assumptions for each of the policy areas tested in Phase 1.

**Figure 1** illustrates a proposed framework that structures the scenario options so that local community goals and investments are at the forefront and to better communicate that the region's preferred scenario will represent a compilation of local ambitions that have been tailored in each community, and be complemented by state and federal policies being considered in the Oregon Statewide Transportation Strategy.<sup>3</sup>

The proposed framework structures the scenario options to demonstrate what communities and the region can do to build each community's vision with existing plans, investment tools and resources (Low investment scenario) and what could be done with additional investments and tools (Current and High investment scenarios).

This framework is consistent with state direction but allows the project to do so with a focus on building ownership and support for the investment tools and resources needed achieve community visions, while at the same time reducing greenhouse gas emissions. In the end, the preferred scenario will reflect community ambitions and may include parts of each of the four scenarios tested.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/OSTI/STS.shtml



#### Figure 1. Framing the Scenarios – A Starting Point for Discussion

#### **DEFINING SCENARIO INPUTS**

There are two key aspects to defining inputs for the scenario options in Phase 2: adjusting local and regional policies assumptions for the next round of analysis and reaching agreement on what state assumptions should be included in the analysis.

#### Adjusting local and regional policy assumptions

The first involves working with local governments and other partners to adjust the assumptions used to test the Phase 1 scenarios to define alternative approaches that support adopted community plans and visions and achieve GHG reductions. A range of community investmentbased scenarios are proposed to demonstrate what communities and the region can do to build each community's vision within existing resources and investment tools, and what could be accomplished with additional resources and tools.

The compilation of community plans and ambitions will be defined by local government staff and elected officials through the Southwest Corridor work that has already been completed and the local partner

#### New community plans and visions to be reflected in Phase 2 scenarios include:

- Beaverton Civic Plan
- McLoughlin area Plan
- Portland Plan
- Forest Grove comp plan update
- South Hillsboro Plan
- AmberGlen
  Community Plan

work sessions and community case studies described below using Envision Tomorrow.

#### Local partner work sessions to confirm community ambitions and goals

Local partner work sessions are being planned for late-summer/early-fall 2012 to confirm community ambitions that can be translated into assumptions for the scenarios to be evaluated in 2013. Participants are recommended to include: Metro staff, community planning director, community development director, work group member, and senior staff. Participants may engage their respective City Councils, Planning Commissions, County Boards, as desired, for additional input.

These work sessions provide an informal setting for local partners to test different desired land use changes to tailor scenario assumptions for their community. This will ensure the scenarios reflect new ambitions that have been adopted since 2010 or that are being contemplated through periodic review and other local or regional planning efforts. In some communities the "Reference Case" assumed in Phase 1 may adequately reflect those ambitions, and no additional work is needed.

The work sessions will be held with interested local jurisdictions not covered by the Southwest Corridor project outreach. Pending case study locations and interest, this could include Gresham, Hillsboro, Beaverton, Portland, Gladstone, Fairview, Wood Village, Troutdale, Cornelius, Forest Grove, Happy Valley, Damascus, Milwaukie, Oregon City, Maywood Park, Rivergrove, Johnson City, West Linn, Wilsonville and unincorporated areas in Clackamas and Washington counties.

## <u>Community case studies to illustrate community ambitions, goals and the strategies needed to achieve them</u>

Five case study locations are proposed to include an employment area, a regional center, a town center and a corridor. Opportunities to convene two or more jurisdictions together will be sought to discuss connecting focus areas, shared ambitions and investment needs. The Southwest Corridor project will develop an integrated investment strategy for each of the project's focus areas that will inform additional community case studies for this part of the region. More information will be provided as the details are finalized.

#### Reaching agreement on state policy assumptions

The Oregon Statewide Transportation Strategy (STS) is part of a larger effort known as the Oregon Sustainable Transportation Initiative (OSTI), to help the state meet its 2050 goal of reducing transportation-related GHG emissions.

The STS identifies the most effective GHG emissions reduction strategies in transportation systems, vehicle and fuel technologies, and urban land use patterns in three key travel markets: ground passenger and commercial services, freight, and air passenger. The strategies serve as the best tools available to help meet the state's goals while supporting other community and regional goals such as clean air, safe and healthy communities, and economic vitality.

The Statewide Transportation Strategy (STS) forecasts that some of the fleet and technology advancements will need to be more aggressive than assumed when developing the region's GHG reduction target to be on track to meet the state's 2050 goals, as shown in **Table 1**.

## Table 1. Comparison of fleet and technology characteristics assumed in GHG ReductionTarget Rules and the Draft Oregon Statewide Transportation Strategy Vision

Characteristic	Rules Default	STS Vision
Auto fuel economy: ICE & HEV (MPG)	68	68
Light truck fuel economy: ICE & HEV (MPG)	48	49
Auto fuel economy—plug-in hybrids in charge sustaining mode (MPG)	81	71
Light truck fuel economy—plug-in hybrids in charge sustaining mode (MPG)	56	55
Proportion of autos that are plug-in hybrids or electric vehicles	8%	23%
Proportion of light trucks that are plug-in hybrids or electric vehicles	2%	20%
Plug-in hybrids battery range (miles)	35	35
Electric vehicles battery range: auto and light truck (miles)	175	
Electric vehicles battery range: auto (miles)		215
Electric vehicles battery range: light truck (miles)		144
% reduction in fuel carbon intensity from current levels	20%	20%
Electric power sources compared to current Renewable Portfolio Standard	Meet	Exceed
Average vehicle replacement rate (years)	8	9

Source: Oregon Department of Transportation presentation to TPAC and MTAC, June 18, 2012

Upcoming discussions will need to focus on reaching agreement on what state and federal policies and actions should be included in the next round of scenario analysis – including fleet and technology characteristics, pay-as-you drive insurance, and fuel prices, in consultation with state agencies staff from ODOT, ODEQ and DLCD.

## OTHER ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES AND OPPORTUNITIES TO PROVIDE INPUT ON THE SCENARIO OPTIONS

Engagement in 2012 will be focused on local jurisdiction staff and elected officials, targeted community and business leaders (especially from the public health, equity/environmental justice, environmental, and business/economy sectors), and mayors and city councils. The primary goals of engagement are to (1) understand local community aspirations, (2) develop a shared understanding of the local and regional benefits possible through working together, (3) develop clear criteria for measuring the benefits and impacts of policy choices, and (4) build local ownership of and support for the project.

More extensive public engagement will not commence until Phase 3 in 2013-14 when there will be more opportunity for discussions on specific options and tradeoffs; however the public will continue to be informed about the project and issues this year through the project website, a series of newsfeeds and an online opinion tool in the fall.

In addition to the local engagement activities described in the previous section, staff will use the following approach to foster collaboration between local community leaders and elected officials, MPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council, incorporate feedback and new community aspirations, build community ownership and, ultimately, support for the narrowing process this fall:

• **Metro advisory committees** discuss project information and provide direction on assumptions related to the regional transit service; road management and capacity; marketing

and incentives; and draft Oregon Statewide Transportation Strategy recommendations for pricing, fleet and technology policy areas. *(Ongoing)* 

- **Scorecard workshops** (three workshops, focusing on public health, equity/environmental justice, and environment and three focus groups of businesses and developers) to provide input on how the scenarios should be evaluated in Phase 3. (*June-July*)
- **Coordination with the Southwest Corridor Project**, sharing information and building on focus area workshops with stakeholders in project jurisdictions (e.g., Tigard, Tualatin, Portland, Sherwood, Beaverton, Durham, King City and Lake Oswego). *(Ongoing)*
- **Briefings with Local Elected Officials and Planning Directors** to share and discuss project information and facilitate an ongoing dialogue with local and community partners on the scenario options and assumptions to be tested to ensure they reflect community ambition. *(Ongoing)*
- **Seminar series** to highlight successful strategies and build understanding of specific topic areas in coordination with other Metro programs and speakers' series. *(Ongoing)*
- **On-line engagement** to gather input on the range of scenario options and evaluation criteria being considered. *(October)*
- **Summit** in October/November to share and discuss case studies, additional analysis findings, evaluation criteria and scenario options to be tested in Phase 3. (*Proposed summit participants include Metro Council, JPACT, MPAC, scorecard workshop participants, local elected officials and other key business and community leaders*)

#### Technical work group role

A work group of members of the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee and the Metro Technical Advisory Committee was created in 2011 to provide technical support to the Climate Smart Communities Scenarios process. The active participation and input provide by work group members provided a strong foundation for successful completion of Phase 1.

Metro staff will continue to convene the technical work group – made up of staff from local jurisdiction planning departments and community organizations – to conduct the technical work in Phase 2 and review products and materials in advance of Metro technical and policy advisory committee discussions.

Key work group tasks for Phase 2 include:

- Help review Phase 1 sensitivity testing and district results. (April July 2012)
- Help frame scenario options, including regional and state policy options. (April July 2012)
- Help define the Scenarios Score Card and the measures and methods used to evaluate the scenarios. (*June September 2012*)
- Help coordinate development of community case studies and identification of focus areas. (June September 2012)

- Review products and materials in advance of Metro technical and policy advisory committee discussions. *(On-going)*
- Serve as liaison, sharing project information with local government leaders and staff of their respective jurisdiction, Metro technical and policy advisory committees and planning efforts underway in the region (e.g., Southwest Corridor, local comprehensive plan updates, state and regional planning grants, etc.). (*On-going*)

	Name	Affiliation	Membership
1.	Tom Armstrong	City of Portland	MTAC alternate
2.	Andy Back	Washington County	TPAC alternate & MTAC alternate
3.	Chuck Beasley	Multnomah County	MTAC member
4.	Lynda David	<b>Regional Transportation Council</b>	TPAC member
5.	Jennifer Donnelly	DLCD	MTAC member
6.	Denny Egner	City of Lake Oswego	MTAC member
7.	Karen Buehrig	Clackamas County	TPAC member
8.	Carol Gossett	TPAC community member	TPAC member
9.	Jon Holan	City of Forest Grove	MTAC alternate
10.	Katherine Kelly/Jonathan Harker	City of Gresham	TPAC member/MTAC member
11.	Nancy Kraushaar	City of Oregon City	TPAC member
	Kenny Asher	City of Milwaukie	TPAC alternate
12.	Alan Lehto	TriMet	TPAC/MTAC member
	Eric Hesse/Jessica Engelmann		TPAC/MTAC alternates
13.	Mary Kyle McCurdy	MTAC citizen/community group	MTAC member
14.	Ben Bryant	City of Tualatin	Local government staff
15.	Tyler Ryerson	City of Beaverton	MTAC alternate
16.	Margaret Middleton	City of Beaverton	TPAC member
17.	Lainie Smith	ODOT	TPAC alternate and MTAC member
18.	Dan Rutzick/Peter Brandom	City of Hillsboro	Local government staff
19.	Mara Gross	Coalition for a Livable Future	Community member

#### **TPAC/MTAC Climate Smart Communities Scenarios Technical Work Group** (as of June 25, 2012)

For more information or to be added to the Climate Smart Communities scenarios project interested parties list, contact Kim Ellis at kim.ellis@oregonmetro.gov.

#### **NEXT STEPS**

A summary of upcoming discussions is provided for reference:

July 12JPACT discussion on scenario options frameworkJuly 18MTAC and Technical work group meetings to discuss scenario inputsJuly 25MPAC discussion on scenario options frameworkJuly 27TPAC discussion meetings on scenario inputsAugust 15Technical work group discussion meetings on scenario inputs/attachmentImage: Comparison of the stenario option of the stenario option of the stenario option of the stenario option 
### **Climate Smart Communities**

#### Framing the scenarios – a starting point for discussion

The scenarios will test possible futures to understand the impacts of different levels of community investment, and are intended to create policy bookends for developing a preferred scenario.

2012-13



#### **SCENARIOS:**



June 21, 2012

## Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee

Working to Make Bicycling a Part of Daily Life in Portland

1120 SW 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Room 800 Portland OR 97204

12 May 2012

Tom Miller, Director Bureau of Transportation City of Portland 1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Rm 800 Portland, OR 97204



Dear Mr. Miller,

It has come to the attention of the Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) is proposing that the **Guidelines for Implementation of ORS 366.215 (Creation of State Highways; Reduction in Vehicle-Carrying Capacity)** be formally adopted into the Oregon Highway Plan. The BAC has serious concerns with ODOT's implementation of ORS 366.215 as embodied in the Guidelines and recommends that the City of Portland advocate for a policy review. In particular, the BAC urges review of the Guidelines' use of the concept of "hole-in-the-air" as a proxy for vehicle-carrying capacity; the interpretation of the term "highway" to specify which routes are covered by the law; and a close examination of the evaluation process which appears to give disproportionate power to freight stakeholders over all other interests. (Note: Our concerns are apparently shared by Metro's Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC), which has forwarded a list of questions to ODOT and the Oregon Transportation Commission (attached).)

In the guidance document, the term "hole-in-the-air" refers to the height, width, and length of a freight vehicle, and is used as a proxy measurement of "vehicle-carrying capacity" (the terminology used in ORS 366.215 itself). As such, the Guidelines substantially expand the scope of the statute; the term is used to correlate any three-dimensional reduction in the space allotted along an applicable highway directly to a reduction in vehicle capacity (RVC). Based on the guidance, this "reduction" can include restriping a roadway for the provision of bicycle lanes by narrowing auto travel lanes. This methodology is not an accepted traffic engineering standard, and, except for projects on routes used by over-dimensional freight, using the "hole-in-the-air" standard is entirely inappropriate. Nowhere in the Highway Capacity Demand Manual is there any indication that a reduction in lane width reduces the saturation flow rate of vehicles. Further, it is illogical that a narrower lane width affects the ability of a freight vehicle to transport an over-dimensional load. While maintaining a physical "hole-in-the-air" makes sense for over-dimensional routes, it does not seem to relate to any standard definition of vehicle-carrying capacity.

The law states that the "Commission may not permanently reduce vehicle-carrying capacity of an identified freight route." However, the latest Guidelines state that "*all projects* that have the potential to reduce the hole-in-the-air (*regardless of what highway they are on*) must follow the process." This statement dramatically expands the applicability of the statute. As the definition of "highway" found in ORS 801.305 is "every public way," this means that the law would seemingly apply to *any* road project in the state. This guidance terminology gives an overly broad interpretation of ORS 366.215 and can lead to freight stakeholder review on non-freight route projects. It also leads to the question of the
authority under which ODOT staff may expand the application of ORS 366.215 and the process the agency must follow when doing so.

The evaluation process laid out in the Guidelines relies heavily on non-technical members of the public—specifically freight stakeholders—to make decisions about vehicle carrying capacity. This essentially provides them near complete authority over any road project that might narrow travel lanes – including infrastructure directly related to bicycle mobility and safety, such as bike lanes, cycle tracks, and pedestrian/bicycle islands. Portland strives to involve the community in many transportation and planning decisions, but this guidance usurps local authority and, under a potentially more expansive application, could hinder the implementation of the Portland Plan, the Climate Action Plan, and the Portland Bicycle Plan for 2030.

In ODOT's FAQ document explaining the Implementation of ORS 366.215, ODOT states that "the addition of bike lanes to an existing state highway is considered a reduction of the hole-in-the-air and needs to go through this review process if there are proposed changes to the existing number, width and configuration of lanes." As you know, there is a growing interest in bicycling for commuting, recreation, and daily errands in Portland. Where this activity occurs on high-speed roadways, both safety and efficiency can be impaired because of the mixture of motorized and non-motorized modes of travel. Construction of bikeways can promote safety and will assist in retaining the motor vehicle carrying capacity of the highway while enhancing bicycle capacity. Vehicle carrying capacity, therefore, should reflect the capacity of the roadway to maintain a certain level of throughput, not just the level of freight.

We find this guidance document—and indeed the law itself—poorly written due to its lack of clarity; confusing as to its implementation; divorced from accepted traffic engineering measures; and too-heavily reliant on non-technical interest groups for decision-making. Again, we urge the City of Portland to seek an immediate policy review on ORS 366.215.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely

Matthew Arnold Chair, Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee

cc: Pat Egan, Oregon Transportation Commission Rian Windsheimer, Oregon Department of Transportation Tom Kloster, Metro Roger Geller, Portland Bureau of Transportation

## May 15<sup>th</sup>, 2012

Pat Egan, Chair Oregon Transportation Commission Transportation Bldg. Room 135 355 Capitol Street N.E. Salem, OR 97301-3871

RE: ORS 366.215, "Hole in the Air"

Dear Chair Egan and Members of the Commission,

The Bicycle Transportation Alliance (BTA) would like to thank the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) for their leadership in supporting active transportation initiatives. We support the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the OTC in their mission to create a state transportation system that supports a healthier, more prosperous, and sustainable Oregon for everyone.

We are concerned however that the implementation guidelines regarding ORS 366.215, "Hole in the Air" undermine the planning, policies and programs that work toward our collective goals. These guidelines are an example of an over broad interpretation of statute that prioritizes freight mobility potentially at the cost of community objectives, safety, and bicycle and pedestrian access.

While freight mobility is a critical component of our transportation system, we ask the OTC to direct ODOT to:

- Suspend the implementation guidelines for ORS 366.215 pending further review.
- Apply the Oregon Administrative Procedure Act rules (including ORS 183.335) to guide public involvement in this apparent rule change with key stakeholders such as the BTA, active transportation and public health advocates, the freight community, representatives from local jurisdictions, and ODOT staff.
- Analyze the guidelines for their impact on safety and mobility for people who walk and ride bicycles.

We wish to discuss the potential unintended consequences of the legislation and its implementation guidelines. We also request a review of the guidelines in the context of the Governor's directives, delivered to the OTC on August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2011, and referenced within this letter. We look forward to working with you throughout this process.

The current administration of this legislation can disenfranchise communities across Oregon from making infrastructure improvements that support economic vitality and safety for their citizens. We have specific concerns regarding the implementation guidelines for ORS 366.215, including:



618 NORTHWEST GLISAN SUITE 401 PORTLAND OREGON 97209 BTAOREGON.ORG T503 226 0676 F503 226

0498

- Lack of a fair process following the Oregon Administrative Procedure Act rules by engaging a diverse set of stakeholders.
- Over broad interpretation of the statute being used on non-freight routes.
- Over reaching authority of the freight stakeholder review of projects on non-freight routes.
- Difficulty for local agencies to request improvements that promote safety and the local economy.
- Safety for all road users being compromised at the expense of freight movement.

The BTA is involved with a number of policy, funding and safety initiatives that support ODOT in their goals of fostering prosperity, enhancing mobility and preserving livability. We believe the six guiding principals Governor Kitzhaber delivered to the OTC on August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2011 are critical to help direct the agency when creating policy and prioritizing projects and programs. These principals include the following:

- 1. Do we have the right group of individuals at the table at the beginning of the process to define the problem and solution together?
- 2. Should ODOT manage or own the facility or would it be better managed, for a diverse set of outcomes, by another agency or jurisdiction?
- 3. Are we creating programs that don't simply invest in the future of the transportation system but meet a multitude of community objectives.
- 4. Does each decision move us closer to a sustainable, safe, lower carbon, multi-modal system?
- 5. Does the decision maximize benefit for the least-cost under limited resources?
- 6. Does this decision or policy move us closer to finding a more rationale transportation funding mechanism for the future?

With Governor Kitzhaber's principles in mind, the implementation guidelines for ORS 366.215 are clearly out of sync with an inclusive and diverse approach to multi-modal transportation.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. We look forward to working with you on this request and improving the safety and accessibility of the Oregon transportation system for all road users.

Sincerely,

Jerik Kransky

Gerik Kransky Advocacy Director



Subject: Follow-up on ORS 366.215

Date: Monday, June 11, 2012 4:19:20 PM PT

From: GARRETT Matthew L \* ODOT (sent by WILLIAMS BeckySue \* ODOT <BeckySue.WILLIAMS@odot.state.or.us>)

To: 'judtih@tigard-or.gov', 'Heidi@upstreampublichealth.org', Tom Kloster, 'Gerik@btaoregon.org', 'steph@wpcwalks.org', 'Russell@ortrucking.org', 'ajz@zelada.com'

CC: BRADWAY Marjorie C, DALPONTE Gregg L, PETERSON Lynn \* GOV, WINDSHEIMER Rian M, HORMANN Dale K

Category: Hot

Thank you for your time and thoughtful comments regarding ORS 366.215 and ODOT's Guidance for Implementation of ORS 366.215, No Reduction of Vehicle-Carrying Capacity.

In response to your concerns, ODOT will immediately take three steps:

- 1. **Suspend OTC Decision**. Per your request, the OTC's decision to incorporate the current ORS 366.215 guidance by reference into the Oregon Highway Plan is suspended. It has been removed from the OTC's agenda on July 18, 2012.
- 2. **Removal of Non-Freight Routes from Consideration**. All reference to non-freight routes, referred to as "non ORS 366.215 routes" in the existing guidance, will be removed from the guidance document. What is referred to in the current guidance as Step 2a on the flow-chart has been removed. See the draft modified guidance attached.
- 3. **Begin the Rule-Making Process.** ODOT will take steps to begin the rule-making for ORS 366.215. We will be in touch with each of you shortly (within the next month) about the rulemaking and how to work collaboratively during that process.

A draft modified guidance will be in effect (without reference to non-freight routes) until the rulemaking process is complete. Many of you have raised questions about statutory interpretation and implementation of ORS 366.215. We hope that many of these questions will be addressed during the rulemaking process.

Again, thank you for your time.

Matt