STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #4
JANUARY 30, 2019
Approval items:

- Initial Funding Assessment
- Citywide Transportation Framework
WORK PLAN PHASES (2018-2020)

PHASES

FEB 2018
PHASE 1
Citywide Transportation Framework

DEC 2018
PHASE 2
Neighborhood Needs and Priorities

JAN - FEB 2019
PHASE 3
Complete Transportation System, Priorities, and Funding Plan

MARCH 2019
PHASE 4
Adoption

JAN 2020
FEB - APRIL 2020

MAJOR OUTCOMES

• Goals
• Citywide Transportation Framework
• Initial funding assessment

• Neighborhood needs and priorities

• Combined Citywide and Neighborhood Transportation Framework – integrates and refines Phase 1-2 work
• Near term investment priorities
• Transportation policies
• Funding plan
• Transportation System Plan and Metropolitan Transportation Plan

• Hearings and adoption

OUTREACH

• Open House 1
• Online open house

• Neighborhood workshops

• Open House 2
• Online open house
CTAC WORK SINCE LAST STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

- September 20: Funding Work Group Meeting
- September 21: Brown Bag on City's Comprehensive Plan
- October 22: CTAC Meeting – Mid-Point Phase 1 Check-in
- October 25: Brown Bag on Low Stress Network
- October 31: Funding Work Group Meeting
- November 7: MPO Technical Advisory Meeting
- November 13: CTAC meeting -- Initial Funding Assessment
- December 4: CTAC Meeting – Citywide Framework Part 1
- December 5: MPO Technical Advisory Meeting
- December 11: CTAC Meeting – Citywide Transportation Framework Part 2
- January 18: Brown Bag on Emerging Technology
- January 23: Brown Bag on Transportation Safety Action Plan
INITIAL FUNDING ASSESSMENT
WHAT DOES “FUNDING” SUPPORT?

Street maintenance
- Operations
- Preservation

Public transit
- Funds allocated to Cascades East Transit

New transportation infrastructure and systems
- Highways
- Local roads and bridges
- Multi-modal (bike/ped, ADA)
- Other programs
FUNDING CHALLENGES

- Limited, variable federal and state funding
- Fuel tax is declining (vehicle efficiency) and not keeping up with inflation
- No dedicated usage fee (e.g., water or wastewater)
- Limitations on property taxes and general fund revenues
- Local funding sources are uncertain. Some sources must be approved by public vote, others fluctuate with the economy and are restricted in usage.

Transportation is very difficult to fund.
Property tax revenues for sample Oregon cities, 2015-2016

Population data are from PSU population estimates from 2015-2016
* Other category includes Developer Contributions, Sale of Assets, Interfund Transfers, Investment Income and other Miscellaneous revenue
** 10-Year SDCs collected was $43.1M, of which $30.6M or 71% could be used on eligible projects
Bend TSDC annual revenue, 2000-2017

Fiscal year

Debt service ———
• **We anticipate that CTAC will develop a long list of needs** due to the many deferred transportation projects/maintenance and extent of new growth to plan for in Bend.

• **Communities everywhere are looking to local sources to address funding gaps** due to limited federal and state revenue sources.

• **We have considered potential local funding tools** applicable to Bend’s transportation needs, regardless of actual projects identified.
FUNDING TASK PROCESS

Informed by system analysis (needs)

Forecast funding from existing sources

Compare funding capacity to preliminary needs. What is the “gap”?°

Identify and evaluate additional funding sources

Develop packages of funding options

Assess funding packages

Output: Initial Funding Assessment, including overall recommendations
WHAT IS THE IFA AND WHY DO WE HAVE IT?

- Defines a **starting place** for funding
- Working ahead to solutions:
  - Generates sideboards for project selection & prioritization
  - Defines the most appropriate funding tools (for later refinement)
  - Facilitates FWG & CTAC discussions & initial decisions
  - Allows later process to be more informed and efficient
IFA REFLECTS TRANSPORTATION GOALS

- Increase system capacity, quality, and connectivity for all users
- Ensure safety for all users
- Facilitate housing supply, job creation, and economic development to meet demand/growth
- Protect livability and ensure equity and access
- Steward the environment
- Have a regional outlook and future focus
- Implement a comprehensive funding and implementation plan
## VERY PRELIMINARY CAPITAL FUNDING NEEDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary estimated funding needs (project costs from today’s needs)*</td>
<td>$400-450 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast of revenue from existing tools</td>
<td>$175-200 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. need for today’s capital needs</td>
<td>$200-250 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes project costs from TSDC project list, MTP financially-constrained project list, Deschutes County ITS plan, capital reconstruction of deferred maintenance that is beyond repair. **Does not include UGB Expansion Areas or new projects.**
PRELIMINARY O&M NEEDS: "KNOWN UNKNOWNS"

COSTS:
- Working estimate of expected costs:
  - $17 – 19 million annually
- More work needed to understand:
  - O&M costs from new projects
  - O&M needs for infill projects
  - Impact of target pavement condition index

REVENUES:
- Assumes sustained general fund
- Costs likely to be higher
### Identifying and Evaluating Potential Funding Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Legality</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Political Acceptability</th>
<th>Magnitude of Additional Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Funding Sources that Could Potentially Be Expanded</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund allocation (city or county)</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>$§§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient Room Tax (TRT)</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>$§§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation System Development Charges (TSDCs)</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>$§§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility franchise fees</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>$§§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business fee</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>$§§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking fee</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>$§§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential New Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Improvement Districts (LIDs)</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>$§§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property tax: general obligation (GO) bonds</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>$§§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property tax: local option levy</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>$§§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property tax: special road districts</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>$§§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban renewal funding</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>$§§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation utility fees</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>$§§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local seasonal fuel tax (city or county)</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>$§§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County vehicle registration fee</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>$§§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll tax</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>$§§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising/naming rights</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>$§§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolls (includes congestion pricing / VMT pricing)</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>$§§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales tax</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>$§§</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IDENTIFYING AND EVALUATING POTENTIAL FUNDING TOOLS (CONTINUED)

Note: The size of the circle indicates the magnitude of potential revenues.
FWG IDENTIFIED THE FOLLOWING TOOLS AS MOST SUITABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding mechanisms tied to the use of transportation systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Fuel tax with seasonal variation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• County vehicle registration fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation utility fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parking fees*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding mechanisms tied to land value capture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Urban renewal funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local improvement districts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other funding mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• General obligation bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation SDC increases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local option levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Targeted sales tax (food and beverage)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Outside of downtown; needs further study
EXAMINING FUNDING TOOLS IN CONTEXT

Funding tools were combined into “packages” according to different themes:

1. Users pay
   - Uses funding tools linked to transportation usage, impacts, or benefits

2. Simplicity
   - Uses as few funding tools as possible; emphasizes a primary funding tool for capital and operations

3. Resilience
   - Emphasizes year-to-year stability. Uses tools that do not require renewal and that are less subject to market cycles

4. Balance
   - Aims for a balance of multiple funding tools, with all components of the community contributing to costs
IFA RECOMMENDATIONS

• Principles
• Core tools
• Supplemental tools
FUNDING PLAN PRINCIPLES

- Intentional diversification
- Fairness and equity
- Full funding for priority projects and O&M
- Community buy-in
- Phased implementation
- Be flexible and adapt to the future
• Provide sufficient funds to act as a financial foundation, flexibly meeting City-wide needs

• Best tools:
  - General obligation (GO) bond
  - Transportation utility fee (TUF)
  - Fuel tax with seasonal variation

• Mixed support or questions about:
  - Transportation system development charges (TSDCs)
  - Food and beverage sales tax
CORE TOOLS: WHAT DOES THIS MEAN?

• GO bond, TSDC increase, and/or TUF
  - Would provide foundational revenue for City-wide capital costs
  - Especially suited to large, highly visible projects that enhance system-wide service

• To provide additional capital revenue and provide operating and maintenance funding, these tools could then be paired with some combination of a:
  - TUF (for O&M)
  - Fuel tax with seasonal variation
  - Prepared food and beverage tax
SUPPLEMENTAL TOOLS

• Play a specific supporting role in a complete funding package

• Supplemental tools include:
  - Urban renewal
  - Local improvement districts
  - County vehicle registration fee
  - Local option levy
  - Parking fees (for managing parking demand)
SUPPLEMENTAL TOOLS: WHAT DOES THIS MEAN?

- For targeted investments (such as UGB expansion areas, opportunity areas, sidewalk investments):
  - Urban renewal
  - LIDs
  - Supplemental TSDCs
- For regional needs:
  - County vehicle registration fee
- For targeted O&M (especially deferred maintenance):
  - Local option levy
• CTAC develops project/program priority list

• Funding Work Group uses IFA principles to compare combinations of core & supplemental tools to fund priority needs

• Leads to funding plan
• Public Comment
• Steering Committee action

Draft Motion:

“I move approval of the Initial Funding Assessment recommended by CTAC, with the refinements identified by the Steering Committee.”

(If any...refinements will be restated as needed.)
CITYWIDE TRANSPORTATION FRAMEWORK
CITYWIDE TRANSPORTATION FRAMEWORK (CTF) DEVELOPMENT STEPS
• **Scenarios** were developed and evaluated to:
  
  - *Learn* how different types of projects and programs perform
  - *Inform* creation of a Citywide Framework (a hybrid scenario)

---

**Baseline**

Implements projects that are planned and have allocated funds for the next five years for all modes.

**Scenario A:** Build New Corridors

Focuses on building new corridors and connections for all modes.

**Scenario B:** Widen and Enhance Existing Corridors

Focuses on expanding and improving existing corridors.

**Scenario C:** Maximize the Existing Transportation System

Focuses on making the existing system work more efficiently.
## SCENARIO EVALUATION PERFORMANCE MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Increase System Capacity, Quality &amp; Connectivity for All Users</td>
<td>• Demand-to-capacity ratio&lt;br&gt;• Sidewalk system completeness&lt;br&gt;• Bicycle system level of traffic stress&lt;br&gt;• Completeness of low-stress network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Ensure Safety for All Users</td>
<td>• Qualitative assessment of predicted crash rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Facilitate Housing Supply, Job Creation, &amp; Economic Development to Meet Demand/Growth</td>
<td>• Vehicle hours of delay&lt;br&gt;• Peak hour VMT on rural facilities (diversion)&lt;br&gt;• Travel time reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Protect Livability &amp; Ensure Equity &amp; Access</td>
<td>• Transportation equity&lt;br&gt;• Employment accessibility&lt;br&gt;• Vulnerable populations within 0.25 mile of sidewalks, low-stress bicycle facilities, and transit&lt;br&gt;• Percentage of collector roads with an ADT above 4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Steward the Environment</td>
<td>• VMT/capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Have a Regional Outlook &amp; Future Focus</td>
<td>• Arterial roadway miles with demand to capacity ratio deficiencies&lt;br&gt;• Potential for alternative funding&lt;br&gt;• Mode split</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Implement a Comprehensive Funding &amp; Implementation Plan</td>
<td>• Capital cost&lt;br&gt;• Roadway lane miles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KEY EVALUATION TOOLS

• **ArcGIS Mapping Software**
  • Spatial analysis tool for mapping and quantifying the transportation system

• **Bend-Redmond Regional Travel Demand Model**
  • Future travel forecast tool to predict how much people will travel, by which mode, and by which route
  • Evaluates the regional transportation system (use and system performance)

• **Conveyal Analysis Tool**
  • Accessibility analysis tool to determine what can be reached for different modes of travel
  • Evaluates the local transportation system (opportunity for use)
KEY EVALUATION FINDINGS – VEHICULAR CAPACITY

• A mix of investments would increase capacity & reduce congestion*:  
  ➢ Building new roads  
  ➢ Widening roads  
  ➢ Fixing intersection bottlenecks

• There are tradeoffs to consider

• In some locations, accepting more peak hour delay in the future may best meet Bend’s goals

* Congestion was forecasted using: demand to capacity ratio, vehicle hours of delay, & travel time reliability
KEY EVALUATION FINDING: CORRIDORS WITH COMPLEX TRADE-OFFS

- East-west capacity in central Bend
  - Deschutes River crossing constraints
  - US 97 interchange capacity constraints
  - Railroad switchyard impacts
  - East-west connectivity gaps surrounding Reed Market Road
- North-south Connectivity in eastern Bend
  - Projected growth on Empire Boulevard and 27th Avenue
KEY EVALUATION FINDING – US 97 CAPACITY AND SAFETY

- Access management & ramp metering appear to have significant benefits
- More detailed evaluation is underway with the US 97 Parkway Study
KEY EVALUATION FINDING – IMPROVING WALKING AND BIKING

• Improving walking and biking requires steps to:
  - Fill key infrastructure gaps
  - Create connectivity with complete corridors throughout the City (including crossings)
KEY EVALUATION FINDING – MOTOR VEHICLE DEMAND MANAGEMENT

- Reducing demand for motor vehicle trips is important to meet VMT/capita:
  - Transit service investment (shorter headways, greater hours of service)
  - Service connections/technology investment
  - Mobility Hubs to connect to first/last mile modes & services
  - Policies & programs to encourage carpooling & other modes
## CTF Outcome: Building a Balanced System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Project Types</th>
<th>Additional CTF Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Majority of Identified Projects:</strong></td>
<td>•  Grade-separated crossings of barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Roadway widening</td>
<td>•  US 97 interchanges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Roadway extensions</td>
<td>➢  Removal of signalized intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intersection capacity and safety improvements</td>
<td>➢  Added capacity with US 97 North Corridor FEIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Upgrades of roads to &quot;urban&quot; standards</td>
<td>•  Citywide low-stress bicycle network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Types of Projects/Programs:</strong></td>
<td>•  Sidewalk &amp; crossings improvement program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bicycle greenways</td>
<td>•  Intersection capacity &amp; safety improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sidewalk infill</td>
<td>•  Transit system investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Citywide safety projects</td>
<td>➢  Enhanced service on key corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•  Travel demand management (TDM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢  TDM programs for larger employers/districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢  Parking pricing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•  Technology investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢  Mobility hubs for first/last mile services connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢  Traffic signal priority for freight and transit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# RECOMMENDED CTF: MEETING BEND’S TRANSPORTATION GOALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Goal</th>
<th>Addressed with CTF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase System Capacity, Quality, &amp; Connectivity for All Users</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure Safety for All Users</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate Housing Supply, Job Creation, &amp; Economic Development to Meet Demand/Growth</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect Livability &amp; Ensure Equity &amp; Access</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steward the Environment</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a Regional Outlook &amp; Future Focus</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement a Comprehensive Funding &amp; Implementation Plan</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDED BASELINE PROJECTS

• Projects already approved in the:
  ➢ City of Bend 5-Year CIP
  ➢ Bend MPO Metropolitan Transportation Plan Financially Constrained Project List
  ➢ Bend Urban Area 2016 TSP Amendments for the UGB Expansion
RECOMMENDED CTF – ADDITIONAL VEHICULAR AND MULTIMODAL PROJECTS

- Grade-separated crossings of barriers
- US 97 interchanges & corridor management
- Intersection capacity & safety improvements
- Corridor improvements on Colorado Avenue
- Corridor improvements on Reed Market Road
- Corridor improvements on Empire & 27th
- Transit system investments
- Travel demand management
- Technology investments
RECOMMENDED CTF – COMPLETE BICYCLE LOW STRESS NETWORK

- Full implementation of a Citywide bicycle low-stress network (LSN):
  - Use existing low-stress streets & paths
  - Retrofit existing key streets
  - Improve crossings
  - Create appropriate policy & standards
RECOMMENDED CTF – CONNECTED PEDESTRIAN SYSTEM

- Implement a complete pedestrian system:
  - Identify projects to close sidewalk & crossing gaps on arterials & collectors
  - Create & fund a local sidewalk infill & crossing improvement program
• There is a long-term need for additional east-west capacity

• CTAC recommends a “study project” (A-4) of options, feasibility, & impacts
Rail crossings & train switching affects Travel Time Reliability

Solutions are costly & challenging

CTAC recommends a “study project” to look at options, feasibility and benefit/cost of:

- Relocating switchyard outside of the City, and/or
- Constructing over-crossings of at-grade crossings (Reed Market to Revere)
For Colorado Avenue (Simpson to Industrial) & Empire-27th (Boyd Acres to Reed Market), implement improvements with a phased approach:

- Identify the corridor as a long-term 5-lane facility in the TSP/MTP
- Preserve/obtain right-of-way for 5 lanes
- Include key intersection capacity/safety projects (e.g., multi-lane roundabouts) to add capacity to the corridor over-time as interim improvements
- Monitor growth, changing trends in how people travel, & revisit long-term needs with each plan update (including assessing alternate solutions)
- Consider widening to 5-lanes when “triggered” as a last step
• Some corridors may need alternate mobility targets that:
  - Increase the threshold for allowable peak hour congestion
  - Consider average weekday instead of seasonal peak traffic demand conditions (for ODOT facilities)
  - Consider the duration of congestion (i.e., how many hours of congested conditions are acceptable)
  - Consider travel time reliability
  - Consider emergency response needs
REMAINING NEED FOR STEERING COMMITTEE DIRECTION: WILSON AVENUE EXTENSION AREA
REMAINING NEED FOR STEERING COMMITTEE DIRECTION: WILSON AVENUE EXTENSION OPTIONS

Potential Options:

a) Approve a project for the Citywide Transportation Framework, including the type of connection (collector or local street connections) & the eastern limit (Pettigrew Road or 27th Street); or

b) Request further evaluation in Phase 2 of the work program to determine the feasibility, impacts, & benefits of a collector corridor vs. local street connections; or

c) Approve a study for the Citywide Transportation Framework to examine this need in more detail, including a targeted public outreach component, at a later time.

Staff recommends advancing Option B.
ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATION FOR STEERING COMMITTEE

Support implementation of other in-process Transportation Plans:

- Deschutes County ITS Plan
- City of Bend and Deschutes County Transportation Safety Action Plans (TSAPs)
- Cascades East Transit (CET) Transit Plan
CTF MOTION

• Public Comment
• Steering Committee action

Draft Motion:

“I move approval of the Citywide Transportation Framework recommended by CTAC, with the refinements identified by the Steering Committee.”

(If any…refinements will be restated as needed.)