

**CLIMATE  
SMART  
COMMUNITIES  
SCENARIOS PROJECT**

# Stakeholder Interviews Report

February 2014

*Prepared for Metro by  
JLA Public Involvement, Inc.*

**MAKING A  
GREAT  
PLACE**



## About Metro

Clean air and clean water do not stop at city limits or county lines. Neither does the need for jobs, a thriving economy, and sustainable transportation and living choices for people and businesses in the region. Voters have asked Metro to help with the challenges and opportunities that affect the 25 cities and three counties in the Portland metropolitan area.

A regional approach simply makes sense when it comes to providing services, operating venues and making decisions about how the region grows. Metro works with communities to support a resilient economy, keep nature close by and respond to a changing climate. Together we're making a great place, now and for generations to come.

Stay in touch with news, stories and things to do.

**[www.oregonmetro.gov/connect](http://www.oregonmetro.gov/connect)**

### **Metro Council President**

Tom Hughes

### **Metro Councilors**

Shirley Craddick, District 1

Carlotta Collette, District 2

Craig Dirksen, District 3

Kathryn Harrington, District 4

Sam Chase, District 5

Bob Stacey, District 6

### **Auditor**

Suzanne Flynn

Visit the project website for more information about the climate Smart Communities Scenarios Project at [www.oregonmetro.gov/climatescenarios](http://www.oregonmetro.gov/climatescenarios)

The preparation of this report was partially financed by the Oregon Department of Transportation and U.S. Department of Transportation. The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the State of Oregon or U.S. Department of Transportation.

# Metro Climate Smart Communities Scenarios Project

---

## Stakeholder Interviews Report – February 2014

### INTRODUCTION

#### Project Overview

The Climate Smart Communities (CSC) Scenarios Project was initiated in response to a mandate from the 2009 Oregon Legislature to reduce per capita greenhouse gas emissions by 20 percent from cars and small trucks by 2035. The goal of the Climate Smart Communities Scenarios Project is to engage community, business, public health and elected leaders in a discussion with their communities to shape a preferred approach that meets the state mandate and supports local and regional plans for downtowns, main streets and employment areas.

Metro evaluated many different investments and actions that could reduce greenhouse gas emissions – such as increasing transit service, shifting to low emissions vehicles, improving walking and biking, etc. In 2012-2013, Metro analyzed these investments and actions to determine their climate benefit and how well they support other social, environmental and economic goals. The research resulted in good news – we can reach the state target with existing adopted local and regional plans if we make the investments needed to make those plans a reality. In late 2013, Metro shared the results of the analysis with elected officials and staff at the local and county levels.

#### Stakeholder Interviews Background

In January 2014, Metro launched a public engagement process to get public input on the investments and actions to help begin to shape the preferred approach. As part of this public input process, Metro contracted with JLA Public Involvement to interview 33 key individuals that represent diverse interests including city and county government, environment, public health, environmental justice and equity, business, and transportation. The purpose of the interviews was to further build Metro's understanding of different communities' and organizations' priorities and how they are reflected in their plans and visions. The interviews focused mostly on the 14 investments and actions analyzed by Metro, and covered potential funding mechanisms to pay for investments and incentives to encourage use of transit, and more carpooling, walking and biking. Individuals were also asked about ways to improve Metro's public process and promote collaboration among all jurisdictions and communities in the region.

### KEY THEMES AND TRENDS

#### Prioritization of investments and actions

Improving transit is a priority among stakeholders across all interest groups; people recognized transit investments as a key to improving community health, providing access to jobs, and better connecting communities. Improving the safety and convenience of biking and walking is another main priority—

although several stakeholders stressed that bicycle/pedestrian projects should not receive funding at the expense of road projects. There is general agreement that all of the actions and investments be carried forward into the preferred scenario. Elected officials from suburban jurisdictions said that expanded access to car-sharing and managed or paid parking strategies would not work well in their less-dense communities, though most did not oppose these actions in other communities.

Key priorities of specific interest groups include:

- Elected officials and business leaders support investments to improve local and regional street connectivity in suburban and outer communities and to make commuting by transit faster and more convenient.
- Equity, social justice and public health leaders support more investments in bus lines or Bus Rapid Transit to serve low-income communities living in outer parts of the region.
- Business and suburban community representatives prioritize maintaining streets and making roadways more safe, reliable and connected.

Many stakeholders support the “Where We Live and Work” actions, and stress the need to provide a variety of housing and development options within the Portland metropolitan region. Key input from specific interest groups includes:

- Elected officials stress that local jurisdictions must maintain control over how to implement local plans and how to site new services and businesses within their boundaries.
- Environmental, equity and public health leaders have a preference for maintaining a tight urban growth boundary, while business leaders and some elected officials prioritize the need for adequate industrial and employment land and new residential developments where people want to live.
- Environmental, equity and public health leaders suggest reevaluating local transportation and comprehensive plans to determine their potential negative impacts to vulnerable communities, including economic, health, and housing impacts. Avoiding gentrification and ensuring affordable housing options close to services and jobs are important considerations.

Stakeholders acknowledge that the “Our Health and Environment” actions are important to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but assume that they will happen outside of the CSC Scenarios project, through federal or state legislative action. Therefore, the CSC Scenarios project should focus on actions and investments that create livable and desirable communities.

### **Need for flexibility and local control**

Elected officials, particularly in suburban communities, said it is important that the project provide a “menu of options” so that leaders can select the best options to meet their communities’ unique needs. Without flexibility and local control over which actions to implement, it is unlikely that many communities will support the preferred scenario. They said that the preferred scenario needs to benefit the entire region and respect the needs of all types of communities—urban, rural and suburban; and that projects should not have to fit within a narrow set of criteria to be fundable (i.e., criteria that only a dense urban community could meet).

### Need to advance social equity and reduce disparities in the region

Equity and environmental justice leaders want more information about how the actions will be implemented in specific communities. They suggest that all actions be studied to determine their economic and health impact on low-income communities, and to see how benefits and burdens are distributed to different communities in the region.

### Need to support economic development in the region

Some elected officials and business representatives expressed concern about the CSC Scenario project's economic impact and effect on competitiveness. They want to maintain sufficient industrial and employment land and freight access. They advised that the preferred scenario should not impede economic development priorities, nor should it penalize businesses and industries that by their nature have limitations in what they can do to reduce GHG emissions.

### Need for more information on potential funding sources

Stakeholders rated their level of support for four potential funding sources.

- *Number of miles driven*: Most highly supported funding source because it acts as a user fee.
- *Raising the gas tax*: Stakeholders somewhat support this, recognizing that the gas tax by itself is no longer a sufficient funding source as vehicles become more fuel-efficient.
- *Charging for parking*: Stakeholders somewhat support this in urban centers served by good transit, although there are concerns about the impacts on retail businesses.
- *Carbon tax*: This received the most opposition, mostly because there are many unknowns about its implementation.

Stakeholders want to know how revenues from all four funding sources will be used, and may condition their support depending on the intended use. Equity and environmental leaders warn that any regressive fees or taxes will disproportionately impact low-income individuals, and suggest that fees or taxes be charged in proportion to income.

### Support for Incentive Programs

Stakeholders rated their level of support for several incentive programs to reduce drive alone work trips. They somewhat support the proposed tax incentives, although there was disagreement over the level of incentives needed to get people to change their driving habits. Some stakeholders expressed concern that not all industries or business types are able to make transportation changes, so would not be able to take equal advantage of the incentives.

### Outreach and Engagement

Many elected officials want increased collaboration between Metro and local jurisdictions to create plans and policies that incorporate local needs, not mandates from the regional government. Equity and environmental justice leaders suggest early, meaningful, continued and culturally-specific engagement with low-income communities and communities of color, as well as capacity-building for populations that do not have the expertise to otherwise participate. Stakeholders across different interest groups said that the messaging of the CSC Scenarios project must be relevant to all audiences and clearly

illustrate how the actions and investments will impact people’s daily lives. Many also suggest focusing less on greenhouse gas reduction goals and more on how the project can create livable, attractive communities.

## LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS INTERVIEWED

	Name	Organization or Community Affiliation	Interest Represented
1	Jay Bloom	Elder Representative	Equity/EJ
2	Jody Carson	West Linn City Councilor	Elected official
3	Timothy Clark	City of Wood Village Councilor	Elected official
4	Corky Collier	Columbia Corridor Association	Business
5	Denny Doyle	City of Beaverton Mayor	Elected official
6	Andy Duyck	Washington County Commission Chair	Elected official
7	Ben Duncan	Multnomah County Health Department	Public health
8	Mara Gross	Coalition for a Livable Future	Equity/EJ
9	Chris Hagerbaumer	Oregon Environmental Council	Environment
10	Mike Houck	Urban Greenspaces Institute	Environment
11	Duncan Hwang	Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon	Equity/EJ
12	Donna Jordan	Lake Oswego City Councilor	Elected official
13	Tim Knapp	City of Wilsonville Mayor	Elected official
14	Gerik Kransky	Bicycle Transportation Alliance	Transportation
15	Susie Lahsene	Port of Portland	Business
16	Mary Kyle McCurdy	1000 Friends of Oregon	Environment
17	Sandra McDonough	Portland Business Alliance	Business
18	Neil McFarlane	TriMet	Transportation
19	Diane McKeel	Multnomah County Commissioner	Elected official
20	Julia Meier	Coalition of Communities of Color	Equity/EJ
21	Dave Nielsen	Home Builders Association	Business
22	Steve Novick	City of Portland Commissioner	Elected official
23	Jon Ostar	OPAL Environmental Justice	Equity/EJ
24	Paul Savas	Clackamas County Commissioner	Elected official
25	Travis Stovall	East Metro Economic Alliance	Business
26	Pam Treece	Westside Economic Alliance	Business
27	Peter Watts	Clackamas County Business Alliance	Business
28	Ramsay Weit	Community Housing Fund	Equity/EJ
29	Steve White and Noelle Dobson	Oregon Public Health Institute	Public health
30	Jerry Willey	City of Hillsboro Mayor	Elected official
31	Desiree Williams-Rajee	City of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, Equity Specialist	Equity/EJ
32	Philip Wu	Kaiser Permanente	Public health

## SUMMARY BY QUESTION AND TOPIC

### Investments and Actions

**Question: Which three to five investments and actions are most important to supporting your business or organization, or in realizing your community's vision?**

Overall, making improvements to transit facilities is most important to stakeholders, as is making bicycle and pedestrian movement safer and more efficient. Many also think it is important to implement local zoning, comprehensive and transportation plans. While many support managing the urban growth boundary, there are conflicting ideas for how management should occur. There is support for providing services and shopping close to neighborhoods, but there are concerns about implementation. The chart below shows how many stakeholders rated each action or investment among their top three to five priorities. Some individuals discussed concerns or aspirations for each of the investments and actions rather than listing their priorities.

**Prioritization of investments and actions**

WHERE WE LIVE AND WORK	Top Priority
Implement 2040 Growth Concept	8
Implement local zoning, comprehensive plans and transportation plans	13
Provide new schools, services, and shopping close to neighborhoods	11
Manage the urban growth boundary	9
HOW WE GET AROUND	
Maintain and make transit more convenient, frequent, accessible and affordable	22
Manage parking with a market-responsive approach	5
Use technology and “smarter” roads to manage traffic flow and boost efficiency	7
Provide information to expand use of low carbon travel options and fuel-efficient driving techniques	2
Make walking and biking more safe and convenient with complete streets and trails	18
Maintain and make streets and highways more safe, reliable and connected	10
Expand access to car-sharing	0
OUR HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT	
Transition to low emission vehicles and engines, including electric vehicles	6
Transition to cleaner and low carbon fuels	2
Achieve federal fuel economy standards	2

#### Implement 2040 Growth Concept

Eight stakeholders from across all interest groups rated this as a top priority. Several others are unsure of what exactly the 2040 Growth Concept contains and are concerned that this is too large an undertaking to be counted among the investments and actions. In general, supporters of this action said that land use patterns should support walking, biking, transit and access to services, and integrate a range of affordable housing options. They said the CSC Scenarios project should support development in centers and corridors where transit is good. This will encourage short bike/walk trips and more transit

usage. The region is on the right path here. The challenge is to continue that path. A transportation representative suggested strengthening development in the Gateway District and reinvigorating the Beaverton Regional Center, and an environmental leader suggested that climate adaptation elements of the 2040 Growth Concept should be called out specifically.

### **Implement local zoning, comprehensive plans and transportation plans**

Thirteen people rated this as a top priority. There is support across all interest groups, and particularly by environmental, public health and equity leaders. Some noted that it only makes sense to include local plans that are likely to help meet the GHG reduction goal. It was pointed out that some communities' comprehensive plans are very aspirational and expensive, and may be too unrealistic to fully implement.

Specific concerns about this action include:

- Local plans, and particularly transportation system plans, often do not consider how the specific community vision fits within the regional context. Communities should look at their plans across jurisdictional lines. For example, local TSPs should consider how to efficiently connect with neighboring communities to improve regional transportation. Rules for developing TSPs should require communities to consult with neighboring jurisdictions when creating their TSPs.
- There is too much willingness to grant industrial land conversions to developers.
- There is growing community pushback against increased density. It may not be feasible to implement the density requirements in local plans once neighbors begin fighting against the impacts of density, particularly the impact of new developments that do not provide off-street parking. People desire a variety of housing options, including homes in less dense areas, and local adopted plans may not offer sufficient variety.

Some equity and environmental justice stakeholders stressed that local plans must include meaningful community engagement opportunities, equity considerations, and transit improvements. Many plans are created without looking at health impacts so may need to be reassessed from a public health perspective. In order to avoid the displacement of low-income residents to less-served parts of the region, all local plans should include rental and ownership housing choices for all income levels. It was also suggested that local regulations should make it easier for people to live in home share communities and provide Additional Dwelling Units (ADUs); these kinds of shared living situations are desirable to both the Millennial and Baby Boomer generations.

### **Provide new schools, services, and shopping close to neighborhoods**

Eleven stakeholders rated this as a priority, particularly elected officials and public health representatives. They agree that community design can have a major impact on reducing vehicle emissions. A couple of elected officials from outer communities noted that good community design is needed in new suburban developments to avoid sprawl. Some participants stressed the importance of locating jobs near neighborhoods. One business leader stressed that industrial development must be decentralized to allow more industrial lands near neighborhoods. Industrial lands provide foundation jobs and communities grow around these areas to include other services and retail centers.

A couple of people added that Safe Routes to Schools should be a focus of the CSC Scenarios project. Schools located at the edges of communities create a barrier to biking and walking; a particular problem in suburban areas. It was also noted that walkable communities are particularly attractive and desired by new retirees, who prefer to live in intergenerational areas close to services, culture and shopping.

Some elected officials who do not find this action to be a priority advised that businesses and the market, rather than government, should dictate where services and businesses locate. It was pointed out that that locating jobs near homes may not make sense for the younger generation which tends to change careers and jobs frequently; and most households have two wage earners who may need to travel to opposite ends of the region for their respective jobs.

### **Manage the urban growth boundary**

Nine people rated urban growth boundary (UGB) management as a top priority, although many people have concerns. Most frequently, people said that UGB expansion must be managed *effectively*, which means different things to different people. This action has the most divergent points of view, with a clear split between those that believe the UGB should be kept tight and those that want more lands brought in. A couple of people expressed surprise that managing the UGB does not rate very highly for its climate benefit, and thought it should be rated more highly.

Environmental leaders favored a tighter UGB and stressed the benefits of limiting expansion: it makes it more likely for mixed use development to occur and promotes reinvestment in places where people want to live. It also protects agriculture and local food sources. There was a suggestion to halt expansion of the UGB in the next 5-year cycle and instead focus attention inside the UGB to make the best use of current urban areas, particularly underutilized areas like surface parking lots, strip malls, and brownfields. Another environmental leader stressed the importance of protecting green areas and natural resources within the UGB to deal with future impacts of climate change.

Some business representatives and elected officials support more UGB expansion to provide more land for employment and industrial uses, particularly large lots. A couple of jurisdictional and business representatives are concerned that constraining UGB expansion too much could lead to negative climate change impacts; if people do not have sufficient housing options within the UGB, they will choose to live outside of it and commute even further for work.

A few elected officials said that the current UGB process is flawed and leads to many appeals. One example is that areas like Damascus have been brought in but not resulted in the envisioned community; while areas where people do want to live have not been brought into the UGB, such as parts of the South Cooper Mountain area. The key is to look at how new areas are connected to existing communities. Business and jurisdictional leaders advised that proximity to urban services, including transit, roads, sewer and water, is key to deciding whether an area should be brought into the UGB. They pointed out that construction of new infrastructure creates more emissions. Some officials expressed concern about expansion into the Stafford area. Specifically, they expressed not wanting to see a lot of growth that would require an expansion of an urban services boundary to serve the area.

## **Maintain and make transit more convenient, frequent, accessible and affordable**

Nearly everyone who responded to the prioritization question agreed that improving transit service should be of highest priority for the CSC Scenarios project, and that this action has the greatest potential for reducing GHG emissions. Leaders across all interests said there is a great need throughout the Portland metropolitan region for more reliable and frequent transit service that meets the needs of commuters. Stakeholders noted that improving transit and other active transportation modes has benefits beyond reducing GHG emissions including less pollution, cleaner air, and better health through increased walking and easier access to health resources and hospitals. Active transportation creates greater social cohesion, which itself is a great health benefit, and provides low income communities with a low-cost travel option. Transit can benefit freight and auto travel because more transit usage means less congestion on roads.

Jurisdictional and business representatives said there is a need to make transit more effective for commuters and to expand service to employment areas. The number of people who use transit in the Portland metropolitan region is high for the size of the region, but the number who use transit for commuting is relatively low. They suggested improving the transit commute by creating more rapid bus service options by making efficiency improvements like bus-only lanes, express buses, or Bus Rapid Transit that could compete with driving time. Expanding the amount of service that does *not* connect with the light rail system will serve commuters that don't work downtown or live in areas not served by light rail.

### *Transit in suburban communities*

Many representatives of suburban communities said that they need more transit service, and more frequent and reliable service. Generally, there is sufficient service from most communities to downtown Portland with TriMet's "hub and spoke" model. Lacking, however, are local transit options to help residents reach nearby destinations, as well as regional service connecting suburbs to one another. With the hub and spoke system, residents cannot efficiently take transit to their destination without going out of direction into downtown Portland. While there is a need for more local service in suburbs, there is also acknowledgment that the greatest transit market is in urban Portland.

Leaders in suburban communities would like to see more creative transit options for employees to reach manufacturing areas or employment centers outside of downtown Portland. They stressed that even though there is not enough density in these employment centers to meet TriMet's service criteria, and people would only use the transit service during commute times, this is still a need that must be met, whether by TriMet or a different type of provider altogether.

Several elected officials suggested local shuttle programs to provide short-distance service within suburban communities, such as in Lake Oswego and West Linn. These could be operated by TriMet or by the cities; however, some stakeholders believe that current regulations inhibit cities from providing transit. Small transit systems may be more responsive and efficient in providing creative transit services that fit the needs of non-urban communities. For example, a local shuttle bus system may be more useful for cities with lower density, large populations of older adults or difficult topography.

Suburban community representatives added that providing the “last mile” transit connection is critical for suburban communities. This is lacking on the Westside in areas like Tigard and Tualatin. Many small communities do not have funding to be able to provide this connection themselves.

### *Funding*

There is concern about how to fund transit improvements. Some environmental leaders support greater taxation or other revenue streams paid for by drivers. A couple of business leaders oppose raising taxes to fund transit projects, and said investments should only be made where ridership potential is high.

### *Environmental Justice and Equity Concerns*

Leaders in public health, equity and environmental justice said that the cost of transit must be kept affordable and must serve low-income communities with an equitable fare structure. They suggest that the region invest more in new bus lines that serve low-income populations and in Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), not just in street car and light rail; there is a need for greater focus on operational investments and providing more frequent service as opposed to funding major capital investments. The support for more BRT is shared by leaders across interest areas because it is seen as an option that can provide great service at a fraction of the cost of light rail. Stakeholders advise that Metro challenge the assumption that developers will not build to high densities along BRT lines, and look for models where BRT does spur economic development.

Some equity leaders suggested changes in housing development requirements to help increase transit service. For example, new housing developments might be required to locate near bus service. Employers might also provide subsidies for commuters.

### *Support for specific projects*

Several elected officials expressed support for the Southwest Corridor Plan and/or for the Powell-Division High Capacity Transit project. There are some concerns about gentrification following the Powell-Division project.

### **Manage parking with a market-responsive approach**

Five stakeholders rated managed parking as a top priority, and many more expressed strong concern about this action. No elected officials said this should be a top priority. Environmental, transit, bicycle/pedestrian, and equity representatives mostly support this action; they pointed out that “free parking” is never free – it is just a question of who bears the cost. They said managed parking can make a big impact on one’s choice to use alternative transportation. Equity leaders agreed that paid parking generally impacts the wealthy more than the poor, who are less likely to own a vehicle. On the other hand, they are concerned about any regressive fee that can disproportionately impact low-income individuals that must drive.

A couple of business leaders would support this action if it is managed according to a market response. However, there is already a shortage of parking in downtown Portland. If parking cost increases are planned, impacted businesses must be part of that conversation. Downtown businesses pay for a lot of parking costs by validating parking stubs of retail shoppers.

One perceived barrier to managed and paid parking according to a transit representative is the lack of institutional structure and enforcement of parking regulations. It was pointed out that the City of Portland is the only jurisdiction with an active parking program, and they struggle with managing it.

### **Use technology and “smarter” roads to manage traffic flow and boost efficiency**

Seven stakeholders, mostly elected officials, rated this action as a top priority. Several jurisdictional representatives noted that their agencies already invest in traffic technology and smarter roads. This action appealed to them because it is low cost and has a moderate climate benefit. Some public health representatives wondered if this action might make drive alone travel more attractive, since more efficient roads means less congestion. Business leaders and elected officials support increased Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) and smart facilities; extending technology to freight, commerce and fleet vehicles; and developing GPS technology to aid freight trucks in choosing routes with minimal bicycle traffic. Another suggestion is to create dedicated freight corridors as has been done in Vancouver, WA, to help reduce freight and bicycle/pedestrian conflicts.

### **Provide information to expand use of low carbon travel options and fuel-efficient driving techniques**

Two jurisdictional representatives said this action should be a top priority. Stakeholders support providing information that goes beyond printing pamphlets and running ads. They suggested that the focus should be on door-to-door and personal campaigns that can be more individualized. Studies have shown this type of campaign can truly change behavior. For example, a door-to-door campaign was launched when the MAX yellow line began, and it increased ridership dramatically. One suggestion is to run a “try it once” campaign that shows people how easy it is to walk, bike or take transit. A couple of elected officials in suburban communities said providing information and education probably won’t make much of an impact in how people choose to travel because most people know about their options.

### **Make walking and biking more safe and convenient with complete streets and trails**

Nearly all stakeholders across all interest groups rated this action as a top priority, although it is less supported by business representatives. As with improved transit, stakeholders support this action because it would provide multiple other benefits, such as improved health, better integration with neighbors and services, and is less expensive for both government agencies and users. Some people said that this action should get more than just two stars for its climate benefit. It is a major priority from a public health perspective, particularly with regards to safety.

Several jurisdictional representatives said that their cities already invest substantial funds into bicycle/pedestrian projects, and plan to continue to do so. Several people said that bicycle/pedestrian projects should focus on safety and improving the perception of safety of biking and walking. For example, there should be more dedicated, separate trails for biking and walking because some people will never feel safe biking in vehicle traffic. There should be greater bicycle/pedestrian connectivity from neighborhoods to commercial areas in suburban communities. The focus needs to be on projects that are convenient and provide safe access to places where bikers and walkers actually want to go; not just striping a bike lane on a road.

### *Funding concerns*

One of the most frequent comments by bicycle/pedestrian, transit, and environmental representatives is that there needs to be a dedicated funding source for bicycle/pedestrian projects. A suggestion is to dedicate 100 percent of Regional Flexible Funds to active transportation projects instead of the current 75 percent. A few people, particularly from the business community and some suburban representatives, are concerned about the potential for *overfunding* bicycle/pedestrian projects and taking funding away from needed road projects. They said that, since the majority of people and freight move by vehicles, investments in auto travel must take priority. Some stakeholders are also concerned that taking funding away from road projects could also mean a backlash from drivers.

### *Messaging about bicycle/pedestrian projects*

Several people suggested changing the messaging around bicycle/pedestrian projects to make them more appealing to drivers. For example, messaging should highlight the economic development aspect of increased bicycle/pedestrian travel. Bicyclists and walkers spend less on travel and healthcare costs and can put that saved money back into the local economy. It was also suggested that Metro help promote the message that bicycle/pedestrian projects are needed in order to meet the legislative GHG reduction target. This could help make such projects more acceptable to the freight community or drivers who otherwise see bicycle/pedestrian projects as being in direct competition with vehicular movement or funding for road projects.

### *Climate adaptation strategy*

An environmental advocate stressed that “complete streets” should include bioswales, urban forestry canopy, and planting street trees as part of street design in order to create a better climate adaptation strategy. It is important to have better onsite stormwater management and to implement methods to combat urban heat island impacts.

## **Maintain and make streets and highways more safe, reliable and connected**

Ten people, particularly business leaders and representatives of suburban communities, rated this action as a top priority. They said street and highway improvements are needed to help move freight more efficiently to make the Portland metropolitan region more competitive in terms of business. Some people thought this action should have more than one star of climate benefit since road improvements lead to less congestion and idling, creating cleaner air. They advised that reduced congestion also has positive health and livability benefits. Public health leaders suggested that the CSC Scenarios project study the impacts of highway corridors and freeways to the health of people living nearby. A few people said that the focus needs to be on streets that complement walking and biking. They feel making streets safer would improve health outcomes in the region.

Elected officials in suburban communities said they want a greater focus on regional road connectivity, particularly connectivity between suburbs. They named specific areas needing improvements including infrastructure in East Multnomah County, connectivity between the Clackamas Town Center and I-5, and traffic reduction on I-205 and OR 43 around West Linn. Several people expressed support for the Southwest Corridor Plan and Westside Transportation Study.

### Expand access to car-sharing

No individuals rated expanding car-sharing as a top priority, although there is not much opposition to it moving forward. A few business and jurisdictional representatives said that the private sector should take care of car-sharing.

Some representatives of suburban communities said that car-sharing would not work in their less dense areas, particularly where the “last mile” transit connection is missing. Equity leaders said that car-sharing must be more accessible and affordable to low income communities for their use; for example, there could be car-share parking integrated into affordable housing developments.

### “Our Health and Environment” investments and actions

Six people identified transitioning to low emission vehicles and engines as a priority; and two people identified the other “Our Health and Environment” actions as priorities (transition to cleaner and low carbon fuels and achieve federal fuel economy standards). While people acknowledged that the three “Our Health and Environment” actions are important, some said these strategies should not be a high priority for Metro because they will happen with or without the CSC Scenarios project and do not improve communities or livability. These interviewees stated that the CSC Scenarios project is an opportunity to achieve the types of community visions that cities and the region have said they want. Those who support the actions as a top priority noted that they have a low cost and high climate benefit.

There is concern by some elected officials and business representatives that certain industries will not be able to switch fuels or vehicle type by nature of their business, such as the construction and deliveries industries. Some also wondered how the transition to low emission vehicles would be made. For example, if there is an incentive to purchase low emission vehicles, who pays for that incentive? The project should not penalize those who cannot afford fuel-efficient vehicles or who must use certain vehicle types for business.

### Question: What actions need to be included in a preferred approach to gain your support?

Stakeholders indicated which actions and investments must be included in the CSC Scenarios project’s preferred approach in order to gain their support. Some added different actions or considerations that go beyond the investments and actions suggested by Metro. (Note: Elected officials were not asked this question. Eleven people discussed the question, including business, equity, environmental justice, transportation, public health, and environmental representatives.)

#### Investments that must be included to gain support

WHERE WE LIVE AND WORK	Must Include
Implement 2040 Growth Concept	3
Implement local zoning, comprehensive plans and transportation plans	3
Provide new schools, services, and shopping close to neighborhoods	2
Manage the urban growth boundary	4

HOW WE GET AROUND	
Maintain and make transit more convenient, frequent, accessible and affordable	7
Manage parking with a market-responsive approach	0
Use technology and “smarter” roads to manage traffic flow and boost efficiency	0
Provide information to expand use of low carbon travel options and fuel-efficient driving techniques	0
Make walking and biking more safe and convenient with complete streets and trails	6
Maintain and make streets and highways more safe, reliable and connected	1
Expand access to car-sharing	0
OUR HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT	
Transition to low emission vehicles and engines, including electric vehicles	0
Transition to cleaner and low carbon fuels	0
Achieve federal fuel economy standards	0

Equity and environmental justice leaders said that inclusionary zoning and improved community engagement and collaboration must be included in the preferred approach. This means early, meaningful, continued and culturally-specific engagement with communities, as well as capacity-building for populations that do not have the expertise to otherwise participate. An environmental leader said that climate adaptation or preparation strategies must be specifically called out.

**Question: Which investments and actions may not work for your community but you could support in another part of the region?**

This question was directed to elected officials. Responses included:

- *Locate schools, services and shopping close to neighborhoods* – This would not work in Lake Oswego or West Linn because of the nature of the communities, or because commercial areas are already built out. One representative said that mixed-used development is planned to occur in existing town centers and commercial centers, but the local code will not allow moving this activity into neighborhoods.
- *Manage parking* – Five representatives of suburban and outlying communities said this would not work in their communities. The representatives focused primarily on paid parking, and said that this action is not needed due to plentiful parking in the suburbs. Some are concerned that paid parking would hurt businesses and the economy. There is some support for managed parking like parking structures, which encourage people to park for free in one location downtown and then walk to nearby local destinations, reducing the number of vehicles driving around looking for parking in that district.
- *Expand access to car sharing* – Five representatives of suburban and outlying communities said their communities would not support car-sharing because of a lack of density. Car ownership is high in these areas and many people prefer to drive their own vehicles. Some people said that private industry should manage car sharing programs; they know where the demand is and can do a better job at responding to the market than a government program can.

- “Our Health and Environment” actions – Two people expressed concern that imposing certain vehicle and fuel types on individuals limits personal choice. Federal fuel economy standards could have a negative impact on farmers, who would see increased fuel prices in agriculture.

**Question: Are there any investments and actions that shouldn't be carried forward into a preferred scenario?**

In general, there is agreement that all of the actions and investments should be carried forward. Sixteen people thought that all of the actions should be carried forward and eight thought at least one action should not be carried forward.

One business leader thought that managing UGB expansion should not be included if it means not expanding the UGB at all. Two business and jurisdictional representatives said that managing parking and expanding access to car-sharing are not critical to move forward, as there are likely more effective ways to combat climate change.

Three elected officials took issue with the “Our Health and Environment” actions. They would rather see the federal government and/or private market take care of the transition to cleaner vehicle and fuel types; they also stated alternative fuels may not be the most efficient for all vehicle types, such as for large or freight vehicles. One person thought that the Columbia River Crossing project should not demand the bulk of our transportation dollars without understanding the tradeoffs.

Equity interests expressed a need for more details about implementation before deciding which actions should or should not go forward. They would support managed and paid parking only if there is corresponding strong transit investment to provide a real alternative to driving. Similarly, they would support street and highway improvements only if coupled with greater connectivity to biking and walking and more transit connectivity from outer parts of the city. They advised that attention be paid to the potential disproportionate impact of some actions. For example, creating denser communities may lead to higher housing costs and gentrification, displacing low-income communities.

**Other comments on investments and actions**

*Need for more information*

Some business and equity leaders want more information, particularly cost information, before deciding which investments and actions should be a top priority. More information is specifically needed by equity and environmental justice representatives to understand how the actions would impact vulnerable populations and public health, and by business participants to understand how the actions might impact the economy and market competition.

*Need for flexibility and local control*

A major theme from elected officials, particularly in suburban communities, is that the actions should not be “one size fits all,” and that cities need to have flexibility to choose from a menu of options that fit their unique needs. They said that local jurisdictions know best how they could meet the state mandate

for their constituents; they should be offered suggestions on how to meet the state mandate, but not be told that they must implement one action or another.

#### *Fairness to non-urban communities*

Elected officials from suburban communities want to ensure the actions do not penalize non-urban communities, where driving is often the only transportation option due to distance and poor transit options. Suburbs should not be penalized for not being able to implement impractical actions in their communities. Similarly, funding for projects should not be tied to whether or not a jurisdiction can implement all of the identified actions.

#### *Missing actions and project limitations*

Six people thought that the project is too limited because it looks only at emissions from personal vehicles, while ignoring other major sources of carbon emissions. Ideas for additional actions include:

- Changes to building code or otherwise updating homes to be more energy efficient.
- Higher cost road projects that would reduce congestion.
- Standards for commercial vehicles, including construction vehicles, throughout Oregon. Companies use older equipment that causes a lot of pollution. Oregon could look to California and Washington as a model for construction vehicle emissions standards.
- Funding mechanisms such as the gas tax, carbon fee, and VMT fee that have the potential to change behavior. These should be considered as actions, not just as funding mechanisms.
- Inclusionary zoning.
- Climate adaptation and preparation strategies. A climate adaptation strategy may require revisiting all regulations to see if they are adequate to address climate adaptation.

#### *Economic impact considerations*

Some elected officials and business representatives are concerned about the CSC Scenario project's economic impact and effect on competitiveness. They said that, as the economy is slowly recovering, there is a need for more industrial land in the region, good freight access, as well as broader access to national and international markets and transportation to support it. The CSC Scenario project should not impede economic development priorities, nor should it penalize industries that by their nature have limitations in what they can do to reduce GHG emissions. Stakeholders said that a strong economy is better able to support and encourage risk-taking and innovative solutions to curb the impacts of climate change.

#### *Focus on low-hanging fruit first*

A couple of jurisdictional representatives strongly supported a tiered approach, and said that Metro should focus first on the low-cost, high-climate benefit actions and then assess progress every five or so years. Only if these aren't sufficient, should Metro focus on the more rigorous strategies. This tiered approach might also have more public support. The actions should not be so aggressive as to lose community support.

## Questions for Equity and Public Health Leaders

Leaders in equity, environmental justice, and public health were asked additional questions to address some of the specific considerations of the populations they serve. They discussed potential unintended consequences of the actions for vulnerable communities. They also provided ideas for better ways to engage low-income communities and communities of color in the CSC Scenarios project.

### Question: Of the 14 investments and actions, where is the greatest need for further discussion about implementation and tradeoffs?

This question was asked as a follow up to the Equity and Environmental Justice Scorecards Workshop held in 2012. Stakeholders said there is a need to discuss implementation and tradeoffs for *all* of the investments and actions. In particular, they want to know how the investments and actions will be implemented in East Portland and areas that currently lack sidewalks, good transit, and walkable communities. Most importantly, the project must measure the economic impact that actions would have on low-income residents.

Some of the important considerations for the investments and actions include:

- *Implement 2040 Growth Concept* – The region should providing more affordable housing options and better access to essential resources.
- *Improve transit* – Must be affordable and accessible to low-income communities.
- *Manage parking* – Appears to be applicable only for urban Portland. If paid parking is intended to be implemented elsewhere, then more detail is needed about the cost.
- *Provide new schools, services, and shopping close to neighborhoods* – There is a need to avoid food and health deserts.
- *Transition to cleaner fuels* – Need to know the specific transition steps.
- *Transition to low emissions vehicles* – This will likely require incentives if it costs more. Efficient vehicles are expensive and low-income individuals usually cannot afford them. Putting in place an incentive to help these populations buy an electric vehicle or fuel efficient vehicle would have both a positive climate benefit and help reduce driving costs.
- *Expand access to car-sharing* – Need more models to consider. For example, the Car-To-Go model works in urban Portland but not in other areas.
- *Manage the UGB* – Accessible neighborhood services are very important. UGB expansion may deemphasize development in existing communities where people with less mobility currently live.
- *Maintain and make streets more safe, reliable and connected* – Safer roads are a key equity concern.

There was also a suggestion to add “social cost and benefit” as a third variable in considering tradeoffs. Monetary cost and relative climate benefit should not necessarily be the primary drivers of the project. It makes sense to implement those investments and actions that are low cost and have a high climate benefit; but they also need to be evaluated for their social cost and benefit. Some investments and actions with a low climate benefit may have a high social benefit, and should be implemented to promote community and equity goals.

### Question: Which investments and actions could have unintended outcomes for underrepresented communities?

Environmental justice, equity and public health leaders said that all of the investments and actions could have unintended negative outcomes. The economic impact of all actions should be looked at through a strong equity analysis. In particular, the project should avoid regressive taxes or fees or find ways to mitigate impacts from any the increased economic burden on low-income communities.

Stakeholders said that the CSC Scenarios project should pay particular attention to the following:

- *Implement local plans* – Implementation must avoid displacing vulnerable populations. Allowing for adequate affordable housing in all areas, and creating Community Benefit Agreements or community self-sufficiency strategies could help avoid displacement.
- *Improve transit* – The region must prioritize improved bus service and shift away from the heavy emphasis on light rail that currently exists. Otherwise, transit improvements will disproportionately benefit the wealthier population at the expense of lower income populations that rely on the bus.
- *Transition to low emissions vehicles* – Moving to more fuel-efficient vehicles can have a negative impact on people who can only afford older vehicles. If incentives only help the wealthier population buy more expensive vehicles, this exacerbates inequality.
- *“Where we live and work” actions* – All of these have the potential to negatively impact housing affordability. There are not a lot of good tools to ensure affordable housing in the region, particularly because state law does not allow inclusionary zoning. Urban renewal districts provide the opportunity to increase the amount of affordable housing by requiring a certain percentage set-aside for affordable housing. Other potential tools include tax abatements for developers that build affordable housing units into Transit Oriented Development communities; or, a requirement within the region that each jurisdiction contain a certain percentage of all housing types, including condos, apartments, single family homes, etc.
- *Manage parking* – Paid parking can negatively impact low-income populations because it is a regressive fee.
- *Use technology and “smarter” roads* – This could negatively impact low-income populations if individuals have to pay to access this technology.
- *Implement local plans* – Zoning and comprehensive plans must have tools or incentive to mitigate displacement. Equity must be woven into these plans.
- *Tax incentives* – Tax incentives may reduce funding for direct services that the government would otherwise provide.
- *Provide information to expand use of low carbon travel options* – This information should be presented with sensitivity to different languages and cultures. The right messenger should provide the information. This will require a greater investment in time and resources by government staff than providing information in the usual way.

### Question: Is there a study or lens that should be included in the preferred scenario?

Equity and environmental leaders said that Metro and the various jurisdictions should consider the potential positive and negative economic impacts of the actions on people with limited incomes.

Particularly, they said, there needs to be sensitivity to the effect that certain transportation actions may have on the combined transportation/housing cost burden of low income individuals. It is also important to ensure that low-income communities have good access to jobs.

Additionally, jurisdictions could conduct a Health Impact Assessment of the actions, and put into place Community Benefits Agreements connected with specific projects. Organizations of color have spent time identifying the needs of their communities and strategies that would benefit specific communities. The CSC project should consult those lists.

More generally, local comprehensive plans and transportation projects should have more stakeholders engaged than typical. This will ensure that equity is considered at the project level. For example, advisory committees for transit projects should include more community representation.

Stakeholders cited particular sources for more detail, including:

- Literature on Bus Rapid Transit <http://www.nbrti.org/research.html>
- Research on Bus Signal Prioritization and Bus Jump Lanes
- Elasticity Studies from Victoria Transit Institute for example <http://www.vtpi.org/tranelas.pdf>. Their long term studies on elasticity are important.
- Urban Habitat's study on Ensuring Lifeline Service in all of the Bay Area's Low-Income Communities [http://urbanhabitat.org/files/Urban\\_habitat\\_lifeline\\_2008.pdf](http://urbanhabitat.org/files/Urban_habitat_lifeline_2008.pdf)

## Funding Sources

Currently, sufficient funding does not exist to implement all potential investments and actions of the CSC Scenarios project or to implement local zoning, comprehensive plans and transportation plans. Stakeholders were asked to discuss potential mechanisms that could provide more sustainable funding sources. They rated their level of support for four potential mechanisms. The highest support is for a fee on number of miles driven. People somewhat support raising the gas tax and charging for parking in urban center locations served by good transit. The carbon tax received the most opposition.

### Funding Source #1: Raise the gas tax

Stakeholders across all interests somewhat support raising the gas tax (rating average: 1.9). However, even those that support it generally agree that it is no longer effective as a user fee and is an insufficient funding source as vehicles become more fuel efficient. A couple of people support the gas tax as a short-term measure to be replaced or supplemented by a VMT fee, or used as one part of a hybrid funding scheme.

Many people commented on how revenues would be used. A couple of equity and public health leaders said they support raising the gas tax if revenues are used for transit projects; otherwise, they oppose it. People understand that the use of the gas tax is constitutionally constrained to road projects and projects in the right-of-way. A few elected officials said they only support raising the gas tax if funding is used exclusively for road and highway maintenance. A couple of environmental and bicycle/pedestrian representatives support using a greater percentage of gas tax revenue for building complete streets and

striping more bike lanes on roads, and perhaps raising the state level set-aside from 1 percent to 5-10 percent.

Several people said that drivers may be more willing to support an increase in the gas tax if they understand where the funding is going. One suggestion is to follow the Washington County approach, which lays out the exact projects (and their costs) that gas tax revenues would fund. There is some concern by elected officials about the allocation of gas tax revenue among jurisdictions. How an increase in the gas tax might affect manufacturers and haulers and the competitiveness of the market in Oregon are also concerns.

### **Funding Source #2: Charge for parking in commercial districts, downtowns or locations served by good transit**

Overall, stakeholders somewhat support paid parking (1.9 average rating). Most environmental, equity and public health leaders strongly support this funding mechanism, particularly if revenues are used to fund transit. A few elected officials from suburban areas oppose it in their particular communities because it might negatively impact businesses. Other community representatives strongly support charging for parking, as do some members of the business community. Some business representatives do not support charging for parking because it penalizes businesses that must drive by nature of their industry (for example, delivery businesses and service providers).

Several people stressed that paid parking should be implemented only in areas that are well served by transit, which is not the case in most areas outside of urban Portland. Otherwise, paid parking is a penalty on those who have no choice but to drive. Some suburban jurisdictional representatives are concerned that paid parking may hurt businesses in dense areas that are already struggling to attract customers without parking measures in place.

A few environmental, bicycle/pedestrian, and transit representatives stressed that paid parking should be part of a larger, creative and comprehensive parking management plan. For example, revenues from parking meters could be given to businesses in parking districts to help them provide their employees and customers with alternative transportation options; this could make paid parking more palatable to businesses that would otherwise bear the cost. Different prices for parking at different times of day, and using private lots for public parking at times when the lots are usually vacant or unused are also options. Paid parking revenues could be used to fund Transportation Demand Management strategies, like the Lloyd District Transportation Management Association. Jurisdictions could also implement parking strategies associated with fee areas, like carpool parking spots.

### **Funding Source #3: Moving from a gas tax to a fee on number of miles driven**

A fee on number of miles driven (or VMT fee) is the most highly supported funding mechanism (average rating: 1.6). People support this mechanism because it acts as a true user fee, whereas the gas tax no longer does. Stakeholders are split on whether the VMT fee should replace or be in addition to a gas tax or carbon tax. A couple of business leaders oppose the VMT fee because the population may need a financial incentive to purchase more expensive electric or fuel efficient vehicles, and the VMT fee removes that incentive.

Some thought that the VMT fee will eventually be put in place by the federal government so should not be dealt with by local or regional government now. A few people want more information about the impacts of the VMT fee before offering their support, particularly the economic impact on travel-heavy businesses. The state of Oregon has conducted a pilot study on the VMT fee; the results of this study will be useful to help understand the fee's impacts.

Some elected officials suggest expanding the VMT fee to charge different rates at peak driving times, and to charge more for use of bridges and highways that require vast amounts of funding to build and maintain.

There are concerns about how the VMT fee will be implemented, specifically privacy concerns if a tracking device is installed on vehicles. One suggested solution is to have inspectors check vehicle odometers at annual emissions inspections. Some people conditioned their support of the VMT fee on its ability to be implemented efficiently and cost-effectively, using acceptable technology. There were suggestions to implement the VMT fee in conjunction with a higher weight-mile tax on freight vehicles since heavy vehicles put more strain on roads; and to index the VMT fee with inflation to ensure it continues to be a viable funding source in the long-term

Stakeholders want to know whether the revenue from the fee will be constitutionally constrained, or whether it can be used to fund a broad range of alternative transportation projects. Members of the environmental and equity communities support using VMT fee revenue for transit and bicycle/pedestrian projects. There may be some equity concerns with the VMT fee, since it impacts people who live in outer communities more than it impacts those who can afford to live closer to downtown or to their jobs. A link to an article on the VMT was provided for reference: <http://www.blueoregon.com/2013/09/mileage-tax-good-idea-if-properly-implemented/>

#### **Funding Source #4: Moving from a gas tax to a carbon emissions tax**

The carbon emissions tax has the lowest support of any of the funding mechanisms (average rating: 2.6). Just under half of participants support it, mostly environment, equity and public health leaders. About a third of the participants, mostly elected officials, oppose the carbon emissions tax and several other people feel neutral about it. Several people said they are unsure because there is not enough information about how the tax would be implemented.

Those who oppose the tax believe it will be difficult to implement, and that it may negatively impact several groups of people. If the tax is assessed on the manufacturing industry or source of carbon, this could negatively impact the economy, particularly domestic vehicle manufacturers and the domestic fuel industry. They may have to compete with foreign vehicle manufacturers and fuel importers that do not pay the tax. If the tax is assessed on the car purchaser, it could negatively impact low-income individuals who cannot afford to purchase newer fuel-efficient or electric vehicles. There is concern that climate change skeptics may actively oppose the carbon emissions tax, whereas they might support a gas or VMT tax since these taxes are aimed at more than just dealing with climate change.

Those who support the tax indicate it more accurately reflects the true cost of carbon usage. Just like the tobacco tax, it could be used to both curb people's use of carbon and provide funding for needed projects. Supporters suggested the tax could fund a variety of alternative transportation projects, not just road projects; or it could be used for social benefits, similar to the tax on cigarettes. Alternatively, revenues could fund climate adaptation strategies. The carbon tax revenues could create additional clean sector jobs, helping improve the economy.

People have different ideas on how the tax should be implemented. There is more support for charging the tax upstream in the energy industry; for example, by levying the tax at Oregon's borders with the importers of coal, gas, etc. to account for the overall carbon consumption that occurs in Oregon. A couple of people added that manufacturers who pay the tax will find ways to reduce carbon; if the cost is downstream, then manufacturers have less incentive to be innovative with clean technology. There is less support for a direct fee on consumers. It was suggested that the rate be managed by the Citizens' Utility Board. Someone also suggested extending the carbon fee to cover building structures based on their carbon footprint, as well as levying the tax on both freight and passenger vehicles.

**Question: What would these funding mechanisms look like in your community? How would they impact community members?**

Some public health, environmental justice, and equity leaders were asked about the potential unintended consequences or disparate impacts of the proposed funding mechanisms. In general, they responded that it is difficult to assess potential impacts without more details on implementation and cost impacts per person or driver. They said the most important consideration is that the funding mechanisms not be regressive; a flat tax will always disproportionately impact low-income communities. There needs to be exemptions for low-income families. Some suggested that funding mechanisms be levied on freight trucks in addition to passenger vehicles.

From a public health perspective, there may not be much difference in the way each of the mechanisms impact health, but it depends on the details of how the mechanisms are implemented. In general, economic status and education are the two biggest predictors of health; so any funding mechanism that creates an undue economic burden could have negative health consequences.

Equity and environmental justice leaders said that revenues from new funding mechanisms should be used for more transit, particularly to serve outer, low-income communities. All communities that pay taxes or fees should receive a fair share of the benefits and investments in transit. There is support to lift restrictions in order to expand the use of revenues from existing funding sources for bicycle/pedestrian, transit and transit-oriented development projects.

There is some concern that both an increased gas tax and VMT fee could disproportionately impact low-income residents who cannot afford to live near downtown or their jobs, so are forced to drive longer distances. Leaders said there is a need to increase the variety of housing options throughout the Metro area, and to provide affordable and low-cost housing options in and near urban Portland.

## Other Funding Comments

### *Other sources of funding*

Some stakeholders suggested other funding sources. Several elected officials support a local vehicle registration fee, and some jurisdictions are already considering this. One elected official suggested increasing or altering the structure of the state vehicle registration fee; for example, the fee could be higher for gas guzzling vehicles and RVs which cause more damage to roads.

Other ideas for funding sources include:

- More use-based fees such as tolling, particularly on bridges and highways. This may require some changes to the federal restrictions on tolling.
- Reevaluate use of current resources and see where we can gain operational efficiencies.
- Implement a state sales tax.
- A “vehicle value tax” or “luxury vehicle tax” which assigns a higher value to more expensive vehicles. This would be more equitable to low-income drivers.
- Congestion pricing, with a rate based on income level. Using technology, a system installed on vehicles could tally up the vehicle’s road use at certain times of day, and calculate a fee tied to the driver’s income. However, there may be privacy concerns with this strategy.
- Fee for use of park and rides. The average person who parks and rides makes over \$70,000 a year; right now they are parking for free.
- The streetcar should cost the same as bus and rail fares.
- WES should be a premium cost because it is artificially subsidized.
- Implement cordon pricing.
- Restructure tax breaks given to corporations. If these tax breaks are removed, there may be more funding available for needed projects.
- Increase the payroll tax to fund transit, but only if the general public supports this.
- Look into federal funding sources to subsidize transit, bicycle and pedestrian projects.
- Implement a pilot project for free bus service to see if this would increase transit use.

### *Use of revenues*

A couple of people noted that drivers will be more willing to pay fees and taxes if they know that revenues are going towards projects that benefit their communities; jurisdictions and Metro should focus on marketing to help people understand funding pressures and where revenues are being spent. On the other hand, there is some concern particularly from elected officials about using revenues from the proposed sources for anything besides road maintenance projects.

### *Economic impact concerns*

A business leader cautioned that the new fee amounts should not be so high that they penalize drivers and businesses that rely on driving. Jurisdictions need to implement taxes slowly and incrementally over time, so that businesses can plan their transportation expenses in advance. There is also concern about the economic impact of fees on the freight industry. If fees or taxes are increased on freight vehicles, then revenues need to be used for projects that directly or peripherally improve freight movement.

### *Other comments*

Environmental and bicycle/pedestrian leaders generally said that these funding strategies are the correct ones to pursue, and that the region should aggressively pursue increased revenues from driving in order to fund elements of the CSC project. A couple of people expressed concern that climate change skeptics will oppose any fee marketed as a fee to fund GHG reduction projects.

One elected official questioned the imposition of any funding mechanism at this point because advances in fuel technology and fuel-efficient vehicles can get the region close to the legislative GHG reduction target without any need for increased taxes. It was suggested that Metro focus on those low-cost actions, and then re-measure in 2020. If by then it seems like the region is not making enough progress towards the 20 percent legislative mandate, then at that point the region should have a discussion about implementing a new funding source.

## **Incentive Programs**

The CSC Scenarios project is considering a variety of incentive programs to encourage people to choose to drive less. Stakeholders were asked to discuss these incentives and rate their level of support for each.

### **Incentive #1: Tax incentives to businesses that offer free transit passes, telecommuting, and flexible work hours to their workers**

Overall, stakeholders somewhat support this incentive (average rating: 2.0). Public health, environmental and equity leaders gave it the highest support. Many jurisdictional leaders said that the problem in many communities is a lack of good transit, not a lack of an incentive; so it makes more sense for government to provide better transit options and for employers to decide for themselves how to provide incentives.

Stakeholders are split on whether this incentive is necessary. Some business representatives said that businesses intrinsically benefit from offering free transit passes, etc. and so do not need an additional incentive. Bus passes are fully tax-deductible and this may be incentive enough for many businesses. On the other hand, some business and public health representatives said that people need an incentive to change their behavior, and once they experience the options, they may permanently change behavior. It is important to ensure that incentives phase out over time rather than being permanent. It was also suggested that regional leaders lobby Congress to equalize the federal tax breaks given to businesses that offer free parking and free transit passes to encourage more transit usage.

Some people expressed concern that not everyone will be able to take advantage of this incentive equally, which might feel like a penalty to some businesses. Some companies cannot offer flexible work hours or telecommuting options by nature of the business, or they may depend on deliveries or other travel that make transit usage impracticable.

## **Incentive #2: Tax incentives to businesses that offer programs that encourage their workers to carpool or enroll in car sharing**

Stakeholders are generally neutral to somewhat supportive of this incentive (average rating: 2.4). They said this incentive is less practical and feasible than the incentive for free transit passes and flexible work arrangements; and that commuters who carpool likely already do so because it helps save them money, and don't need an additional incentive or information to carpool more. There is concern about how this will be monitored and implemented; for example, a company should not receive an incentive for simply posting flyers that encourage carpooling.

It was noted that the Portland metro region may not have the right scale or size to make carpooling attractive, since commutes in Portland are relatively short. There is also concern that small businesses and those located outside of the urban core will not be able to take advantage of this incentive, so may feel penalized. A few people suggest creating more TMA style programs, which leverage multiple employees in a district to work together to come up with creative carpooling programs.

## **Incentive #3: Local government using money from taxpayers for marketing and information to help people use public transit, biking, and walking**

Stakeholders are generally neutral to somewhat supportive of this incentive (average rating: 2.6). Some jurisdictional representatives said they already use taxpayer money either formally or informally to promote active transportation. Elected officials stressed that it should be up to local governments to decide whether to use scarce local funds for this purpose, based on local needs and taxpayer sentiment.

Some jurisdictional and business leaders oppose or are neutral towards this incentive because they think marketing won't do much to change behavior, since most people already know about their transportation options. They want to see evidence of the effectiveness of marketing campaigns. Some don't think it is the government's place to try to change people's behavior.

A few environmental, bicycle/pedestrian and jurisdictional representatives said this incentive will provide more results than other proposed incentives, particularly if funding goes towards one-on-one and creative marketing campaigns. For biking, organizing rides and talking about route finding and bicycle equipment has been shown to change behavior. After three years of a focused outreach campaign, Smart Trips of Portland has shown real returns. Several stakeholders said that the best way to change behavior is to focus on changing environments and systems. For example, the Safe Routes to School program is effective because it goes beyond just education—it uses engineering and enforcement to create a holistic system that encourages alternative transportation.

## **Other Comments on Incentives**

### *Funding Concerns*

Many people have questions about which taxes will be implicated by the proposed incentives, and would oppose any incentives that reduce transit funding. Some elected officials said that jurisdictions are already struggling with a shortage of revenues, so impacting tax revenues may be harmful.

### *Other Incentives*

Some people provided other ideas for incentives, including:

- Parking tax, if revenues are used to fund active transportation projects.
- Incentives to employers or groups of employers who help provide the “last mile” of the active transportation commute, such as shuttles from the nearest transit stop or a bike sharing program.
- Metro and local governments can build incentives into their zoning plans and codes to encourage higher density and transit-oriented development. They could also lessen the parking requirements for developers or businesses that provide alternative transportation options and amenities, such as zip car parking, bike share programs, affordable housing, etc.
- Incentives to encourage residential and commercial builders to bring old buildings up to better efficiency standards.
- Incentives for businesses to purchase EV, hybrid, or low-emissions vehicles for their fleet.

## **Regional Partnerships and Strategy**

Elected officials discussed ways that the region could best work together to create a preferred scenario, and suggested elements that should be part of a legislative agenda.

### **Question: How can the region best work together to develop a shared strategy for implementing a preferred approach that may include a transportation legislative package for 2015?**

Many elected officials stressed that the preferred approach must be a “menu of options” that can be adapted to fit the needs of communities with diverse needs; this will be the only way to gain the broad support needed. This means that the selected actions and investments must be implementable by urban, rural and suburban communities, and each of these community types must receive benefits from the CSC Scenarios project. Elected officials warned that projects should not have to fit within a narrow set of criteria to be fundable (i.e., criteria that only a dense urban community could meet).

Several people suggested that the state develop clear climate change goals and then let local jurisdictions determine how to meet them using their own unique approach. This type of local control, they suggested, will make it more likely that all jurisdictions support the project; adding local decision-making can be more effective, adaptable and responsive to local needs than federal decision-making.

Some ideas for the best ways to work together include:

- Local, regional and state government officials should engage in a joint lobbying effort before the state legislature. If their messaging is consistent and shows strong consensus, diverse officials lobbying together would be very powerful.
- Create a true private-public partnership with area businesses and economic drivers. For example, get Nike, Intel and other key employers on board.
- Continue working through and improving the processes of JPACT county-level transportation committees. Make sure that each county’s transportation group is involved.

- Make it clear what the cost of the project will be to different communities within the region, and where the benefits will be felt.
- Plug into existing regional affiliations and get them to work together. The process should unite groups across the region including the Multnomah County 3C/4C alliances, Westside alliances, Clackamas County C4, and Washington County alliances.

### Question: What ideas do you have of the key items a legislative strategy should include?

Elected officials provided the following ideas for items that should be included in the legislative agenda:

- Revisions to UGB laws to allow decision-makers to consider locational factors and to require that new developments locate jobs, housing and recreation near one another.
- Change to enterprise zones, since rural areas no longer need this incentive to compete.
- Funding issues:
  - Include proposals to increase the gas tax.
  - Funding criteria should be streamlined and speak to local values. It would be nice if local jurisdictions could get federal or state funding for projects that meet local or regional standards, as opposed to meeting federal or state standards.
  - Any evaluation criteria for grants and funding should not be urban-centric. All types of geographic areas should be eligible to apply and be able to effectively compete.
- Specific projects to include:
  - Improvements to I-205 and Hwy 34, including bicycle/pedestrian paths on Hwy 34.
  - Bicycle/pedestrian paths along Willamette Falls Drive.
  - Road maintenance and preservation projects that have already been identified as needs.
- Emissions standards for construction vehicles.
- Measures to curb GHG emissions from residential homes and buildings.
- Lift the preemption on inclusionary zoning. This is a particular concern for the Powell-Division High Capacity Transit project, which could lead to gentrification if protections are not put in place.

## Community Outreach

Stakeholders were asked to provide additional comments on ways that Metro can better engage the community in the CSC Scenarios project and to suggest other individuals and organizations that should be involved in the process. They described what they would do to demonstrate local support for the preferred scenario ultimately selected. This information was provided to Metro staff to continue to improve their engagement efforts. Some of the ways stakeholders said they would demonstrate support include: writing a letter, speaking and making presentations in support of the project, adopting local resolutions, lobbying the Oregon legislature, providing written or oral testimony, and engaging their constituents or membership in the process.

### Outreach to Underserved Populations

Leaders of the environmental justice, equity and public health communities were asked more specific questions about upcoming discussion groups that Metro is planning to hold with these interest groups.

They were also asked for input on better engagement strategies that Metro can use with low-income and vulnerable populations. The information collected was also provided to Metro staff to help shape the public engagement process.

Generally, these leaders said there is a need for Metro to engage low-income communities and communities of color in a meaningful and collaborative way, which means engaging them early, helping to build capacity so that they can participate fully, and keeping them engaged throughout the entire process. The project messaging also needs to be written in a way that is relevant to the daily lives of these communities. Leaders pointed to Metro's Equity Baseline Workgroup as a good start to creating the kind of collaboration that is needed.

Clean air and clean water do not stop at city limits or county lines. Neither does the need for jobs, a thriving economy, and sustainable transportation and living choices for people and businesses in the region. Voters have asked Metro to help with the challenges and opportunities that affect the 25 cities and three counties in the Portland metropolitan area.

A regional approach simply makes sense when it comes to providing services, operating venues and making decisions about how the region grows. Metro works with communities to support a resilient economy, keep nature close by and respond to a changing climate. Together, we're making a great place, now and for generations to come.

Stay in touch with news, stories and things to do.

[www.oregonmetro.gov/connect](http://www.oregonmetro.gov/connect)

**Metro Council President**

Tom Hughes

**Metro Council**

- Shirley Craddick, District 1
- Carlotta Collette, District 2
- Craig Dirksen, District 3
- Kathryn Harrington, District 4
- Sam Chase, District 5
- Bob Stacey, District 6

**Auditor**

Suzanne Flynn

# MAKING A GREAT PLACE

