

## COIC

### Central Oregon Strategic Transportation Options Plan

#### Technical Committee Meeting Notes – (October 7, 2010)

**Attendees:** James Lewis, COIC; Heidi Bauer, Crook County; Lonny Macy, Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs; Jovi Anderson, Bend MPO; Jon Skidmore, Jefferson County; Peter Russell, Deschutes County; Jim Bryant, ODOT.

The primary discussion points at the meeting were: Technical Report 2; and, Scenario Development and Analysis. Drafts of both documents were presented for review and discussion.

#### **Technical Report 2:**

The draft document had been reviewed by those in attendance. There were few comments as all acknowledged that the rationale was a “status quo” scenario, with data coming from existing TSP’s or where best available. There was no disagreement with the data provided. However, it was discussed that this report should include data for the “first intersection” within the City limits to show how the existing development pattern compared to the scenario analysis described below will ultimately affect the local jurisdictions (even though it is beyond the stated scope of the project). Local municipalities and counties typically do not have responsibility for accommodating additional trips (via new infrastructure or otherwise) on state highways. However, local city/county streets that intersect with the highway are the responsibility of these jurisdictions – with fixes to failing systems that typically have high costs. Thus, it was determined that such data will be a key component to giving the Policy Group/local officials the ability to see how VMT reduction on the highway segments (i.e. inter-city trips) affects their respective communities. The “first intersection data” will be added to Technical Report 2, with the overall report updated as necessary throughout this project to reflect the most accurate data available. The intersections identified by the local jurisdictions for which data will be collected and added are:

Prineville – Highway 126/Highway 26 “Y”

Bend – Highway 97/Cooley Road; Highway 97/Robal Road; Highway 20/Robal Road; and, Highway 20/27<sup>th</sup> Street

Sisters – Highway 20/Locust; and, Highway 20/Highway 126

Madras – Highway 97/“D” Street

La Pine – Highway 97/Burgess Road; and, Highway 97/1<sup>st</sup> Street

#### **Scenario Development:**

The draft Scenario Development Document was discussed in detail regarding the ten options listed therein. The TC was asked for input on the viability of each for further analysis – reasons why and why not were sought for each. Ultimately, this document, with all the scenarios listed, will be used for discussion purposes with the Policy Group for final selection of the Scenarios chosen for further analysis within the scope of

the project. The rationale and input of the TC will be used as the basis for the recommendations to the Policy Group. The ten options are listed below, with the comments for each summarized and shown in italics.

1. No Change Alternative (baseline) –Assumes existing land use development and transportation patterns outlined in adopted City/County Comprehensive Plans and TSPs. The No Change Alternative, or baseline condition, is described in Technical Memorandum 2.

*Comment: Essentially this is Technical Report 2. However, it is intrinsically tied to scenario options #3 and #6. See notes under option #3 and #6.*

2. Commuter Rail Analysis - Assumes a establishing a new commuter rail within the Highway 97 corridor (presumably utilizing the existing BNSF rail lines or right of way). Primary components will include: land acquisition, stations and track construction, and other necessary improvements, such as street crossings. This scenario is required by the Scope of Work for the project.

*Comment: This is a requirement of the scope of work for the project.*

3. Compact Land Use/Development Scenario – Assumes strategies at the local (city) level to increase development densities and provide employment and service options within distances that make alternative transportation options attractive and effective. Because existing State and local plans currently limit new development outside of urban growth boundaries, this scenario would likely have a very small effect on meeting either of the project’s two goals.

*Comment: This is the current land use strategy envisioned under the Oregon Land Use Planning System (can be combined with #1 and #6 described herein). According to existing land use planning goals and laws, development will continue to occur within a compact Urban Growth Boundary, with land uses guidelines encouraging more efficient use of land and greater densities. This option was not recommended for further analysis.*

4. Increased Inter-city Transit Services - Assumes expanded expenditure and physical development of transit facilities between cities in the study area, so that alternatives to single occupant vehicles are increased. Assumes that transit runs regularly (no reservation needed) at cities in the study area.

*Comment: This scenario will require a dual analysis that assumes the Intra-city transit service at “adequate” levels (see discussion under #5 for “adequate”) does and does not exist for a true comparison. This scenario was recommended for further analysis.*

5. Adequate Intra-city Transit Services– Assumes that all cities within the study area (except Culver and Metolius) have an adequate local transit system that connects to the regional transit system. “Adequate” is defined as (providing 90% of residents and employees access to transit within ¼ mile walking distance to a transit stop, with transit

running between 6 am and midnight daily). Assumes that this would lead to a XX% increase in intra-city transit use.

*Comment: The definition for “adequate” seemed to be high for most. This assumes Transit Oriented Development (TOD) will occur within the realm of the local land use plan – higher density envisioned within the Oregon land use planning system does not necessarily ensure TOD. The TC was comfortable with this scenario option for further analysis, especially when combined with the Increased Inter-city Transit Service Option. However, the TC thought that the definition of “adequate” needed to be revised with assumptions that did not expect such a high level of availability.*

6. Regional Economic/Housing Lands Planning – Correct the jobs/housing imbalance (in both availability and costs as related to proximity). Assumes ???

*Comment: The TC stated that this issue would presumably be fixed under the Oregon Land Use System that is currently in place. The existing Comprehensive Plans that guide the growth for each community are based on Economic Lands Analysis and Housing Inventories that are aimed at accommodating the projected population growth for the next 20-years – it is assumed that the ratios of need economic and housing lands are balanced for independent and sustainable communities. Also, it was stated that there are many other factors that influence the housing/jobs balance between communities and that the scale of such analysis is beyond the realm of this project. This scenario option was not suggested for further analysis.*

7. Transportation Demand Management Implementation – assumes that all employers with more than 10 employees living in another city have an incentivized vanpool or carpool plan in place, and that XX% of eligible employees use the service.

*Comment: There was not a lot of discussion in this regard. Overall, the TC thought this scenario option needed to be included for further analysis. The group pointed to Commute Options as a local source for specific data in the region. The comments related to the incentives provided for many TDM options were discussed in the realm of the disincentives assumed under option #10 below.*

8. Increased Highway Infrastructure/Capacity Development - ???

*Comment: This was originally provided as an option with the assumption that some transportation improvements could be done ahead of necessity. The TC scaled this back and stated that it is more likely akin to a scenario whereby every improvement listed in the local TSP’s would be fully funded and constructed as anticipated (including and most importantly within anticipated timeframes). Even though this is the basis for the “status quo” scenario that is the basis for Technical Report #2, it was decided that this was not likely to occur and was not a viable option for further analysis).*

9. Pricing/Increased Costs Associated with VMT – Toll roads, parking fees, gas taxes, increased auto prices, etc.. (Most studies show this to be an essential and key component to substantially reducing VMT).

*Comment: This was recognized as being a primary contributor to reduced VMT. However, it was decided that there is very little control over some factors, and that others are not politically likely to occur. However, it was decided that this scenario option had components that might be discussed in the same realm as the incentives provided under the TDM option. More thought about how these can be calculated or anticipated will be necessary to effectively incorporate them into this report.*

10. Allowing Increases in Congestion – Do Not Build Infrastructure. Assumes that no projects listed in existing TSPs or the STIP are constructed.

*Comment: It was decided that allowing conscious increases in congestion (as a general rule for reducing trips) is not likely to occur. This would effectively be a “no-build” option. This would be a complete departure from current policy and would be linked to “no-growth” policies. Not practical for safety and other reasons as well. This scenario option was not recommended for further analysis.*

Overall, options 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and 9 were thought to be appropriate scenarios for analysis and fit within the scope of the project. It was also discussed that as the analysis ensued and a preferred scenario was being selected for further policy development (still months down the road), that it would be most likely that a combination of scenarios (or components thereof) would be the most likely result.

It was acknowledged that other influencing factors, such as social, political, legislative, economic, etc., will all contribute in some manner. However, it was decided that the degree to which was hard to factor. More input on these as influencing factors for scenario analysis will be sought from the TC and the Stakeholders Committee as the project continues.

**Policy Group:**

The COIC Board of Directors, which serves as the Policy Group for this project, will have this information presented to them at their November 4<sup>th</sup> regular meeting. They will be presented with all the options considered, the rationale provided by the TC, and a revised list of scenarios recommended for further analysis.