February 25, 2020

To: Metropolitan Policy Committee
From: Paul Thompson
Subject: Item 6.d: LCDC Meeting on Statewide Transportation Strategy (STS)

**Action Recommended:** Information and discussion. Provide consensus direction on speakers and talking points.

**Background**
At the February 6, 2020 MPC meeting staff provided background on the request from the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) and the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) to speak to the Commission during their March 19, 2020 meeting agenda item on “STS Implementation – GHG Scenario Planning.” During the February MPC meeting it was generally agreed that MPC would like to prepare two speakers – one elected and one staff – and that staff would work on a set of draft talking points for the speakers. Mayor Lundberg volunteered to be one of the speakers for the MPO.

**Discussion**
Subsequent to the February MPC meeting regional staff discussed the speaking arrangements and talking points. After checking on availability and other considerations, the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) recommends that Rob Inerfeld be the staff speaker, joining Mayor Lundberg before LCDC on March 19th.

TPC has also approved the following set of draft talking points for consideration by the two speakers, keeping in mind that the speakers will be representing the regional/MPO perspective, and not the perspective of individual jurisdictions. While these draft talking points are not yet broken out by speaker, some general thoughts on that are provided below.
Draft CLMPO Talking Points for March 19th LCDC Meeting

1. General talking points:
   o Funding for implementation needs to be a message throughout. Ensure that both speakers emphasize this – perhaps with Rob Inerfeld starting and ending with it, and Mayor Lundberg emphasize it in the middle of her comments.
     ▪ As far as making points about needed funding - while DLCD won't be a major source of STS implementation funding, they are part of a four state agency/Commission (DOT, DEQ, DOE, DLCD) work group on STS implementation, and anything we can do to get all of those entities thinking more about funding than rules when they are holding their joint meetings and drafting their STS implementation strategy is in our interest.
   o Have Mayor Lundberg emphasize that two or more local agencies can get to same goal very differently, and that any state actions should include flexibility to allow for that.
   o Monitoring enforcement – can't make something mandatory if it’s not funded. Mayor Lundberg can talk about this.
   o Oregon’s MPOs, and others, were involved via a DLCD Advisory Committee in nearly two years of draft rule-making that resulted in recommended updates and would have moved metropolitan area transportation forward. That rule-making was pulled with no explanation at the last minute, resulting in a loss of progress.
   o We need to consider what we want LCDC to do with this information. LCDC does not fund capital projects or even programs. DLCD does fund some transportation planning in conjunction with ODOT through the TGM program. So what’s the specific ask of LCDC in regards to transit and active transportation programs and projects in relation to STS? The point is that we know how to plan for the future and don’t need more requirements for planning – but what lack are the financial resources to fully implement those plans. So how can LCDC help?
     ▪ We should emphasize the "no more planning is needed" message before LCDC as much as possible. This is not the same as "no more rulemaking" - at a minimum, we think this region wants rulemaking around the TPR similar to what was drafted more than a year ago (under the above-mentioned abandoned effort) removing the RTSP requirements and more. And while it seems almost certain that DLCD/LCDC will embark on even more rulemaking, we not want rules that require more planning, we don't want mandates of the MPOs, and we don't want to be in rulemaking limbo for another 2-3 years.
2. Talking points focused on what we learned/observed from Central Lane’s previous Scenario Planning experience:

   o The Central Lane scenario planning process allowed local governments to look beyond existing plans and understand what the implications would be of making changes without requiring implementation. Partners tested new ideas and set aspirations that could inform future decisions.

   o Implementing the Central Lane Scenario Planning preferred scenario would not represent a dramatic shift in the region’s transportation and land use policy. The process highlighted successful polices and reinforced that local and regional plans already support state greenhouse gas reduction goals.

   o Achieving the preferred scenario – and in many cases achieving policies in existing plans – would require substantial additional funding for education and marketing programs, transit and active transportation infrastructure, and operations and maintenance for the entire system.
      - Funding for transit operations and maintenance is particularly important in the region. Current funding mechanisms, which focus on capital development, not operations, have placed Lane Transit District (LTD) in a position where they struggle to expand the existing system. Even if LTD could identify funding for system expansion, the agency would need additional funding to operate and maintain that system.
      - One specific example with regard to funding - while the newly-implemented STIF transit funding has been helpful, to be truly meaningful in the context of implementing the STS and reducing emissions, the STIF funding should be double or triple the current one-tenth of a penny rate, and the "new pilot project" constraint on the use of the funds should be removed. Allow for increased STIF funding to continue, sustain, and expand on the public transportation services implemented through the first round of funding.
      - Further changes to state funding programs to create more opportunities for competitive, multimodal grants would help local governments achieve state goals.

   o Outcomes related to the economy, public health, and equity were more important to some local decision makers than greenhouse gas reduction benefits.

   o The scenario planning process was limited to the MPO boundary. Because transportation issues are not contained by the MPO boundary, this artificial limit made it difficult to fully understand the impacts and
benefits of scenarios to the rural areas that surround the MPO, and to transportation to, from, and through the MPO area.

- Implementation of Central Lane's preferred scenario should remain voluntary to allow each government or agency in the region to use the results of that process to inform future planning processes, and to pursue implementation using the tools and approaches most appropriate for that entity.

- Central Lane's preferred scenario is necessarily flexible. The scenario allows each community to select actions to maximize co-benefits like an improved economy, public health, and equity in addition to greenhouse gas reduction. The process also allowed culturally different communities to find tailored policies that met both local needs and regional goals.

- Because the process was complex and time consuming, it is highly unlikely that the region would undertake a similar effort without state support and funding.

3. Talking Points on how to move forward:

- ODOT and the OTC need to reinstate, originate, and/or expand local grant programs. These programs need to allow for and respect real input and decision making by the local and regional stakeholders. For example, reinstating the STIP Non-Highway Enhance grant program (or something similar) would not just provide more funding for regional goals and objectives (and allow for true local input), but would also support implementation of the Statewide Transportation Strategy (STS) to help meet state goals around the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from transportation.

- Active Transportation needs to be adequately and sustainably funded separate and apart from other funding pots. It needs to be supported as a separate priority. At the current rate of investment, it would take more than 150 years to complete the walking and biking networks solely on ODOT owned facilities, not even accounting for inflation. That also does not account for the substantial need for investment to complete walking and biking networks within the city and county owned portions of the transportation system. Funding pedestrian, bicycle, and other Active Transportation needs is not only a significant "lever" for supporting implementation of the STS, but also contributes to goals related to health & transportation, safety, and more.

- Due to the constitutional limitation on the use of Oregon's gas tax revenue, there needs to be a dedicated sustainable funding source implemented for off-street (out of the right-of-way) multi-modal improvements. Again, these improvements are not only important for
improving non-vehicular mode choices related to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, but also support goals related to health & transportation, safety, and more

- Oregon’s state agencies and Commissions implementing the STS should be more proactive and innovative, leading the way by example, by research, by case studies, and with funding, but not with mandates, to inform and allow local and regional entities to follow their lead.

- Increase Safe Routes to Schools Non-Infrastructure program funding, again, as part of the overall strategy of improving non-vehicular mode choices. An increase in SRTS non-infrastructure funding will result in more kids learning active transportation habits early, which in turn supports both the efforts toward carbon reduction as a lifelong effort, and improvement in long term health outcomes.

- Less "stick" and more "carrot" in any state rules and regulations. Same with respect to monitoring and enforcement.

- The state needs to have more incentives for development that is transit-oriented/close-in/compact, etc. We need more tools to encourage this kind of development because people living in this context are much more likely to drive less. State incentives for development should help support local land use plans and their implementation.

- MPOs should not be regulated or mandated in this area (irrespective of the question of whether the state can even do that). Outside of the Portland MPO, the other Oregon MPOs only have federal authority with respect to transportation. They do not have any land use or other authority under Oregon law. Not only does that limit the ability of the MPOs to take the full range of actions that could be considered during implementation of the STS, but the reality is that the MPOs are structured in a way (Policy Board membership, staffing, etc.) that is not set up to discuss, much less decide, those non-transportation issues.

- To sum up, our area strongly believes that no more planning is needed, that enough planning has been done to demonstrate what projects/programs/policies will be effective in our area in reducing GHG emissions, and what is needed now is simply more money and resources to pursue and implement the effective and meaningful projects, programs, and policies.

To cite the March, 2018 *Reducing greenhouse gas emissions from transportation and land use: Lessons from West Coast states* research article in the Journal of Transport and Land Use, one of the key "lessons learned" is that "States must go further than requiring scenario planning and consider funding and regulations to implement plans."
scenario planning models and resulting plans are improving, plans will not be successful without adequate funding for implementation and a reorientation of status quo transportation funding. In an era when transportation funds are sparse and several funding sources are constitutionally or statutorily constrained, finding adequate funding for plans designed to reduce GHGs is a major obstacle."

Finally, to the extent that DLCD does undertake additional rule-making, we request that the work of the former Rulemaking Advisory Committee on Metropolitan Transportation Planning be honored and built on, not abandoned.

Staff is asking MPC members to engage in discussion, approve two speakers, and provide input on the talking points.

**Action Recommended:** Information and discussion. Provide consensus direction on speakers and talking points.