

Minutes

CTAC Meeting #6

Bend's Transportation Plan

November 13, 2018

Bend Municipal Court

555 NE 15th Street, Bend, Oregon



CITY OF BEND

CTAC Members

Katy Brooks, *Member*

Louis Capozzi, *Member*

Garrett Chrostek, *Member*

Casey Davis, *Member*

Karna Gustafson, *Co-Chair*

Hardy Hanson, *Member*

Steve Hultberg, *Co-Chair*

Sally Jacobson, *Member*

Suzanne Johannsen, *Member*

Gavin Leslie, *Member*

Nicole Mardell, *Member (absent)*

Katie McClure, *Member*

Ariel Mendez, *Member*

Mike Riley, *Co-Chair*

Richard Ross, *Member*

Mel Siegel, *Member*

Iman Simmons, *Member*

Sid Snyder, *Member (absent)*

Glenn Van Cise, *Member*

Dale Van Valkenburg, *Member*

Peter Werner, *Member (absent)*

Ruth Williamson, *Co-Chair*

Sharlene Wills, *Member (absent)*

Dean Wise, *Member*

Keith Wooden, *Member (absent)*

Travis Davis, *Alternate (absent)*

Ex-Officio Members

Dale Peer

Gregory Bryant

Carolyn Carry-McDonald, *(absent)*

City Staff / Elected Officials

David Abbas, *Transportation Services Director*

Emily Eros, *Transportation Planner*

Russell Grayson, *Community Development Director*

Ben Hemson, *Business Advocate*

Tom Hickmann, *Engineering & Infrastructure Planning Director*

Susanna Julber, *Senior Policy Analyst*

Eric King, *City Manager*

Ian Leitheiser, *Assistant City Attorney*

Robin Lewis, *Transportation Engineer*

Ryan Oster, *City Engineer*

Joshua Romero, *Community Relations Manager*

Sally Russell, *City Councilor*

Consultants

Joe Dills, *Angelo Planning Group*

Lorelei Juntunen, *ECONorthwest*

Kristin Hull, *Jacobs*

Jon Skidmore, *Assistant City Manager*
Camilla Sparks, *Budget & Financial Planning Manager*
Karen Swirsky, *Senior Planner*
Jenny Umbarger, *Office Specialist II*
Mary Winters, *City Attorney*
Sharon Wojda, *Finance Director*

1. Welcome, introductions

Ms. Hull called the meeting to order at 1:05pm.

Member Williamson reviewed intended outcomes of the meeting.

2. Public Comment

James Dorofi with the Old Farm District requested assistance polling high school students regarding their thoughts on transportation.

Jeff Monson with Commute Options urged group to consider TDM and provided update on transportation options program.

Ms. Hull asked the group to declare any conflicts of interest. Member Hultberg, attorney, disclosed his representation of clients within the city of Bend. Member Gustafson disclosed her employment with Central Oregon Builders Association as the Government Affairs Director, representing owners and developers subject to SDCs. Member Van Valkenburg disclosed his employment with Brooks Resources, a real estate development company. Member Simmons disclosed her employment with St. Charles. Member Chrostek, attorney, disclosed his representation of clients within the city of Bend.

Ms. Hull asked for a motion to approve the previous meeting's summary. Member Bryant noted while he attended the previous meeting, his name was omitted from the summary. Motion to approve the August 22, 2018 meeting summary as amended to include Member Bryant's name was approved unanimously.

3. Overview – Initial Funding Assessment

Member Gustafson reviewed work of the Funding Work Group (FWG) since last CTAC meeting.

Ms. Juntunen reviewed what the Initial Funding Assessment (IFA) is and why it is necessary, its goals, principles, context, preliminary needs, potential funding tools, evaluation criteria, maximum revenue capacity and themes.

Members raised the following questions / discussion items:

- How much revenue could be generated if fees were raised?

- What percent of the General Fund is used for transportation?
- Does the \$500M in the GO Bond include debt service?
- How does financing a GO Bond work?
- What is the difference in how property taxes are used to fund a GO Bond vs the General Fund?
- The term 'Equity' used in the Funding Source Ranking Exercise table has changed to 'Fairness' in the meeting packet.
- Revenue numbers are dependent on rates charged.
- Committee is supportive of the 'Multnomah County Model' where fund generated from county vehicle registration fees are dedicated to specific projects.
- Clarification needed on disparity between amount of funds generated from county vehicle registration fees noted in the meeting presentation vs in Figure 1. Funding Sources Matrix.

Ms. Juntunen presented a high-level overview of the FWG's funding tool recommendations. Member Riley noted that transportation SDCs were recently increased, and clarified that a food and beverage sales tax relates only to prepared food and beverage. Member Gustafson clarified the FWG focused on a seasonal gas tax, though a year-round + seasonal variation is still a possibility. Ms. Sparks indicated 14% of the General Fund is going to Streets and Operations Maintenance.

4. Group funding breakout

Members met in assigned groups to develop questions about, and potential revisions to, the FWG's recommendations.

5. Funding recommendation

Ms. Hull asked for a straw poll on the FWG's recommendations. Ms. Eros reminded CTAC the intent of this meeting is to approve the IFA and its recommendations. Mr. Dills reinforced this meeting's work is reviewing the 'initial' part of the process. Ms. Juntunen noted the expectations that federal funds will be part of the plan and will be added to the IFA as information becomes available.

Report outs:

Member Hultberg's group had no strong suggestions of anything missed. They were concerned about feasibility and the political climate / passing funding measures in the future. They suggested a note to look back at the City's past successes and failures regarding funding in order to learn from them.

Member Riley's group expressed general support for the recommendations. They discussed alternative versions of 'users pay' and it being the most important principal, focusing more on 'pay-as-you-go', and considering the GO Bond as a last choice and keeping it small. They discussed the sense that existing residents should not pay for / subsidize new development, that

options were left open to apply several tools that reflect the ‘users pay’ approach and the use / amount / application of SDCs is still to be determined. Though the ‘users pay’ approach is a good one, the group has concerns about political liability, and how it will function with technology.

Member Williamson’s group had consensus the FWG developed a comprehensive list of funding tools and to move forward with tools as-is. They discussed the tools’ resiliency and what the community messaging might be as CTAC moves forward.

Member Gustafson’s group desires that demand-response parking remain on the table for consideration, and potential for federal / grant money should be included as a footnote. They want to ensure the Steering Committee sees the IFA as a package with projects so they understand the return on investment. The group recommended not to lead with funding – perhaps a press-release indicating responsibility to look at funding sources. They also believe transportation SDCs need further discussion.

Item 1 discussion: No changes, but concerns to consider: political climate and sensitivity; what is the economic reality; what can we learn from successes and failures when pursuing funding tools? No vote taken.

Item 2 discussion: CTAC discussion surrounding principles, not necessarily an IFA change: users pay; GO bond as a “last resort”, “pay-as-you-go”. No vote taken.

Item 3 discussion: Consensus that CTAC is generally happy with the IFA. No vote taken.

Item 4 discussion: Demand-responsive parking should be mentioned in the IFA as a potential tool and its revenue potential noted; we are recognizing that implementation will be phased and while it may not be one used immediately, we don’t want to preclude it’s possibility in the future; look at parking pricing through lens of demand management in other / supplemental tools bucket; potentially partnering with other entities within the community in initial stages, while researching and piloting project during first five years.

Question: Do we want to consider including parking pricing in the IFA as a supplemental tool?

Resolution: 11 yes, 9 no, 1 abstain

Item 5 discussion: Clarifying that federal grant funding is included in the IFA.

Question: Should the IFA reference federal grant funding?

Resolution: 21 yes (unanimous)

Item 6 discussion: Consider taking the IFA to the SC as a package including both projects and funding. It is intended to accompany the citywide framework as the TSP process is developing both funding and projects in tandem as a body of work. The discussion does not require a vote and is considered instructions to the co-chairs to develop language for presentation to the SC.

Question: All those in support of the IFA recommendation?

Resolution: 20 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain

Item 7 discussion: TSDCs need further discussion (already documented in IFA, perhaps add emphasis). No vote taken.

Roundtable omitted from agenda by consensus.

6. Bicycle connectivity and Low-Stress Network

Ms. Eros reviewed performance measures for bicycling and project suggestions. Existing roads would be retrofitted with low-stress facilities, dependent on existing environments.

Question: Would CTAC like to include these four projects (in the scenario evaluation report)?

- LSN-1: Olney/Wall traffic signal modification and rail crossing surfacing work
- LSN-2: Butler Market, west of Brinson
- LSN-3: Wilson to railroad, with 3rd St traffic signal
- LSN-4: Brosterhous from Parrell to Brentwood, with canal bridge

Resolution: 21 yes (unanimous)

7. Introduction to scenario evaluation

Ms. Swirsky reviewed what to expect with the scenario evaluation between now and December 11th. Members are encouraged to bring mobile electronic devices (phone, laptop, etc.) to the December 4th meeting to facilitate electronic voting. Extra devices will be available, if need be. Maintenance costs are included in the scenario evaluation, assumed that deferred maintenance becomes capital costs. Subgroups to be established early 2019 to work on policies and performance metrics.

8. Public Comment

No public comment

9. Close and next meeting

Ms. Hull adjourned the meeting at 3:55pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Jenny Umbarger
Growth Management Department

Accessible Meeting/Alternate Format Notification



This meeting/event location is accessible. Sign and other language interpreter service, assistive listening devices, materials in alternate format such as Braille, large print, electronic formats, language translations or any other accommodations are available upon advance request at no cost. Please contact Jenny Umbarger no later than 24 hours in advance of the meeting at jeumbarger@bendoregon.gov, 541-323-8509, or fax 541-385-6676. Providing at least 3 days' notice prior to the event will help ensure availability.

DRAFT