Climate Smart Communities Scenarios Project

Shaping the draft approach for testing

John Williams, Deputy Planning Director
JPACT and MPAC Joint Meeting

May 30, 2014

SETTING THE STAGE
Where we’ve been & where we are headed

**PHASES 1 & 2**
- Understand Choices 2011-2012
- Shape Choices Jan.-Oct. 2013

**PHASE 3**
- Shape Preferred Nov. 2013-June 2014

WE ARE HERE
What the future might look like in 2035

**RECENT TRENDS**
This scenario shows the results of implementing adopted land use and transportation plans to the extent possible with existing revenue.

**ADOPTED PLANS**
This scenario shows the results of successfully implementing adopted land use and transportation plans and achieving the current RTP, which relies on increased revenue.

**NEW PLANS & POLICIES**
This scenario shows the results of pursuing new policies, more investment and new revenue sources to more fully achieve adopted and emerging plans.

Scenarios approved for testing by Metro advisory committees and the Metro Council in May and June 2013

---

We found good news

- Adopted plans meet the target - *if we can make the investments needed*
- Significant community, economic and environmental benefits can be realized
- We will fall short if we continue investing at current levels

See pages 53-57 of the discussion guide
Benefits grow with more investment

- Investment helps address congestion
- Less air pollution, more physical activity and improved safety save lives
- Reduced emissions benefit the environment
- Businesses and our economy benefit from reduced delay
- Lower vehicle travel costs help household budgets

See pages 53-57 of the discussion guide

What this means for communities

- We can meet the target by building local plans and visions

  Regional agreement to carry forward and implement adopted regional and local plans

- Local control and flexibility will be provided

  Opportunity to advocate for local needs and priorities across the six policy areas

- We’re stronger together

  Local, regional, state and federal partnerships are needed to invest in communities and realize our adopted plans
Implementation framework

Policy tools

Funding tools

Programmatic tools

Engagement & education tools

See page 9 of the memo

REMINDER OF WHAT WE HEARD FROM THE PUBLIC AND COMMUNITY LEADERS
Ensure flexibility and local control

“The investments should not be ‘one size fits all.’ Give cities the flexibility to choose from a menu of options that fit their unique needs.”

Consider community voices

- Co-benefits of investments and actions should be the focus, not just climate benefits or costs
- Economic impact on households and businesses must be better understood and mitigated
- Social cost and benefits of investments should be a factor
- Ensure housing affordability and options remain in areas with good transit
Estimated total cost by policy area (2010 to 2035)

Note: Road-related operations and maintenance costs not available. No parking cost is shown as that policy area is primarily implemented through locally-adopted development codes.

See page 2 and Attachment 2 of the memo
Estimated annual cost per capita by policy area (2014$) to provide sense of scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy area</th>
<th>April 11 Straw Poll</th>
<th>MTAC/TPAC Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit capital</td>
<td>$79</td>
<td>$59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit service</td>
<td>$177</td>
<td>$161-256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel info</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active transportation</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets &amp; highways</td>
<td>$231</td>
<td>$248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$540</td>
<td>$527-622</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions:
- 25 year period (2010-2035)
- 2010 UGB population (1,484,026)

See Attachment 2 of the memo

Effectiveness in reducing greenhouse gas emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIVE CLIMATE BENEFITS</th>
<th>POLICY AREA</th>
<th>RELATIVE COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Up to $$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active transportation</td>
<td>$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information and incentives</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology/TSMO</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Streets and highways</td>
<td>Up to $$$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See page 3 of the memo
APRIL 11 STRAW POLL
PURPOSE AND RESULTS

Weighing in on the policy areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>More than A</th>
<th>Less than B</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>More than B</th>
<th>Less than C</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

APRIL 11 STRAW POLL PURPOSE
1. Gave a sense of where you were April 11 – non-binding, but important
2. Provided something for you share with regional coordinating committees and others
3. TPAC & MTAC used to shape recommendation for your consideration on May 30
April 11 JPACT/MPAC Straw poll results
Preferences for Scenarios A, B, C and in-Between Scenarios (1 – 7)
Averages of all respondents (mean):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Averages</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Less than C</td>
<td>More than B</td>
<td>More than B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Information Programs</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Active Transportation Network</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Street and Highway Network</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Management</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preferences for Scenarios A, B, C
And In-Between Scenarios
Averages for MPAC and JPACT separately:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>MPAC</th>
<th>JPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Information Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Active Transportation Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Street and Highway Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MTAC AND TPAC RECOMMENDATION
SHAPING A DRAFT APPROACH TO TEST

MTAC & TPAC Recommendation #1
Reaffirm your February direction

- LAND USE - Carry forward and implement adopted regional and local plans

Plus new MTAC/TPAC rec:
- 2014 RTP - Ensure 2014 RTP investment priorities are reflected

See page 5 of memo
MTAC & TPAC Recommendation #2
Reaffirm your February direction

- FLEET AND VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY -
  Use state assumptions for transition to cleaner fuels and fuel-efficient vehicles and insurance paid by the miles driven

See page 5 of memo

MTAC & TPAC Recommendations #4-7
Direct staff to work with MTAC & TPAC

- FINALIZE ASSUMPTIONS
- REPORT BACK IN SEPTEMBER
  - Relative climate benefit
  - Other key outcomes reported in Phase 2
  - Estimated cost, any funding gap & potential mechanisms
- IDENTIFY DRAFT ACTIONS TO GUIDE IMPLEMENTATION

See #4 - #7 on pages 8 and 9 of the memo
Outcomes to be reported in the fall

Evaluation criteria approved by Metro advisory committees and the Metro Council in May and June 2013

MTAC & TPAC Recommendation #8
Provision opportunities for further review and refinement in the fall

Sept. 18 Comment periods begins
Oct. – Dec. Consider results and public input to finalize recommendation to Metro Council

See #8 on page 9 of the memo
MTAC & TPAC Recommendation #9

Further discussion on funding in the fall:

- Is there a gap between draft approach, current funding levels and 2014 RTP financial assumptions?
- What funding mechanisms or tools should be considered moving forward?
- Recommendations for continuing finance discussions beyond Climate Smart Communities Scenarios Project?

See #9 on page 9 of the memo

Poll Question #1

Acknowledging that MTAC, TPAC and Metro staff will perform the noted actions in slides 24—27, do you recommend those staff actions and reaffirm the two assumptions below:

- Implementation of adopted regional, and local plans (slide 22)
- State transition to cleaner fuels, more fuel-efficient vehicles and pay-as-you-drive insurance (slide 23)
MTAC & TPAC RECOMMENDATION # 3

CONSIDERING PUBLIC INPUT, COST, CLIMATE BENEFIT AND SIX DESIRED OUTCOMES...

1. HOW MUCH TRANSIT SHOULD WE PROVIDE?
   a) Transit capital
   b) Transit operations

See pages 5-6 of the memo
Make transit more convenient, frequent, accessible and affordable

What you said about transit

Number of participants who voted for each scenario:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>More than A</th>
<th>Less than A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>More than B</th>
<th>Less than B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>More than C</th>
<th>Less than C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Votes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Average mean = More than B

Straw poll results from April 11 joint JPACT/MPAC meeting
MTAC & TPAC recommendation on transit capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>More than A</th>
<th>Less than B</th>
<th>More than B</th>
<th>Less than C</th>
<th>More than B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than B = 2014 RTP Constrained System

- Columbia River Crossing LRT extension
- Fleet replacement/expansion and maintenance & operations facilities expansion
- Transit centers, bus stop and ROW improvements
- Planning and project development for next priority corridors (e.g., Division/Powell and SW Corridor), AmberGlen and Forest Grove

See page 5 of the memo

Do you support MTAC and TPAC’s recommendation for transit capital?

- I’m good to go
- I can support it but have some concerns
- I recommend a different investment level
MTAC & TPAC recommendation on transit operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>More than A</th>
<th>Less than B</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>More than B</th>
<th>Less than C</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. More than B level of transit operations = 2014 RTP Financially Constrained System
   7,200 revenue hours (47% increase in revenue hours from 2010 levels)

2. Less than C level of transit operations to partially implement TriMet Service Enhancement Plans (SEPs) and SMART Transit Master plan
   9,200 revenue hours (64% increase in revenue hours from 2010 levels)

3. C level of transit operations to more fully implement TriMet SEPs and SMART Transit Master plan
   11,200 revenue hours (129% increase in revenue hours from 2010 levels)

See page 6 of the memo and Attachment 2

What is your recommendation for transit operations?

- More than B: $6 B
- Less than C: $8.1 B
- C: $9.5 B
HOW MUCH SHOULD WE USE TECHNOLOGY TO MANAGE THE SYSTEM?

See page 6 of the memo

Use technology to actively manage the transportation system
What you said about technology

Number of participants who voted for each scenario:

MTAC & TPAC recommendation on using technology to manage the system

C = more than 2014 RTP Financially Constrained System

See page 6 of the memo
Do you support MTAC and TPAC’s recommendation on technology?

- I’m good to go
- I can support it but have some concerns
- I recommend a different investment level

HOW MUCH SHOULD WE EXPAND THE REACH OF TRAVEL INFORMATION AND INCENTIVES?

See page 7 of the memo
Provide travel information and incentives to expand use of travel options

What you said about travel information and incentive programs

Number of participants who voted for each scenario:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Vote Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than B</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than B</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average mean = Less than B

Straw poll results from April 11 joint JPACT/MPAC meeting
MTAC & TPAC recommendation on using travel information and incentives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>More than A</th>
<th>Less than B</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>More than B</th>
<th>Less than C</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>$124 M</th>
<th>$161 M</th>
<th>$198 M</th>
<th>$234 M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expanded coordination and public-private partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More resources directed to local governments, employers, transportation associations and transit providers to expand implementation (and participation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverages and enhances transit and active transportation investments and parking management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C = more than 2014 RTP Financially Constrained System

Do you support MTAC and TPAC’s recommendation on travel information?

- I’m good to go
- I can support it but have some concerns
- I recommend a different investment level

See page 7 of the memo
HOW MUCH OF THE PLANNED ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION NETWORK SHOULD WE COMPLETE?

See page 7 of the memo

Make biking and walking more safe and convenient

Photo credit: Urban Advantage and SACOG
What you said about active transportation

Number of participants who voted for each scenario:

Planned Active Transportation Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than B</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than B</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than C</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average mean = More than B

Straw poll results from April 11 joint JPACT/MPAC meeting

MTAC & TPAC recommendation on active transportation

$948 M | $1.75 B | $2.9 B | $3.9 B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Funding Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>More than A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than B</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>More than B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than B</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than C</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than B = 2014 RTP Financially Constrained System

- Completes more of the regional active transportation network, which reflects updated local priorities for sidewalks, bikeways and trails

See page 7 of the memo
Do you support MTAC and TPAC’s recommendation on active transportation?

- I’m good to go
- I can support it but have some concerns
- I recommend a different investment level

HOW MUCH OF PLANNED STREETS AND HIGHWAYS NETWORK SHOULD WE COMPLETE?

See page 7 of the memo
Make streets and highways more safe, reliable and connected

What you said about streets and highways

Number of participants who voted for each scenario:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Street and Highway Network</th>
<th>More than A</th>
<th>Less than B</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>More than B</th>
<th>Less than C</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average mean = Less than B

Straw poll results from April 11 joint JPACT/MPAC meeting
MTAC & TPAC recommendation on streets and highways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>More than A</th>
<th>Less than B</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>More than B</th>
<th>Less than C</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\text{8.8 B}$</td>
<td>$\text{9.2 B}$</td>
<td>$\text{10.8 B}$</td>
<td>$\text{11.8 B}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than B = 2014 RTP Constrained System

- I-5/Columbia River Crossing Bridge Replacement
- Interchange investments and targeted widening of arterials and freeways to support regional travel and goods movement
- New arterial and collector streets improve connectivity and further complete active transportation network

See page 7 of the memo

---

Do you support MTAC and TPAC’s recommendation on streets and highways?

- I’m good to go
- I can support it but have some concerns
- I recommend a different investment level
HOW SHOULD LOCAL COMMUNITIES MANAGE PARKING?

See page 8 of the memo

Manage parking to make efficient use of parking resources
What you said about parking management

Number of participants who voted for each scenario:

MTAC & TPAC recommendation on parking

- B = 2014 RTP Financially Constrained System
- With a sensitivity test as part of the evaluation to help build understanding of effectiveness and more information on the range of approaches in the fall

See page 8 of the memo
Do you support MTAC and TPAC’s recommendation on parking?

- I’m good to go
- I can support it but have some concerns
- I recommend a different level

TIME TO TAKE A POLL
(The results of the poll will be the potential basis for your recommendation to the Metro Council)
May 30 MPAC and JPACT Recommended Draft

Approach for Staff Testing

Averages of all respondents (mean):

DRAFT – subject to final ballot audit
May 30 MPAC and JPACT Recommended Draft Approach for Staff Testing

Averages for MPAC and JPACT separately:

- Transit Capital
- Transit Operations
- Technology
- Travel Info Programs
- Planned Active Transport Network
- Planned Street & Highway Network
- Parking Management

May 30 MPAC and JPACT Recommended Draft Approach for Staff Testing

DRAFT – subject to final ballot audit

JOINT RECOMMENDATION REQUESTED
Proposed action

Is there a motion from MPAC and JPACT to forward today’s poll results to the Metro Council as the recommended draft approach for staff testing this summer?

Approval of this motion is intended to provide staff with sufficient direction to test the draft approach this summer. Approval does not serve as an endorsement of the draft approach.
## Final steps in 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUNE</strong></td>
<td>Council action on draft approach to test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUNE – AUGUST</strong></td>
<td>Staff works with TPAC and MTAC to evaluate draft approach &amp; develop implementation rec’ds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEPTEMBER</strong></td>
<td>Report back results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEPT. – DEC.</strong></td>
<td>Public review of draft preferred approach, identify refinements &amp; final adoption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>