

**Public Advisory Committee Informational Session #2
3-5 p.m., January 30, 2013**

MEETING SUMMARY

Present: Chips Janger, Ben Horner-Johnson, Rachel Sumner, Laurie Swanson, Elizabeth Glaser-Lindsey, Mike Foley, Glenn Koehrsen, Al Levit, Dick Weber, Tom Cilivetti, Karen Buehrig, Larry Conrad, Sarah Abbott

Meeting purpose: Discuss in greater detail the draft cost estimates, the cost effectiveness factor and the scoring of Goal 6: Fiscal Responsibility.

Karen welcomed the group and reminded everyone that the PAC Informational Sessions are designed to allow the PAC members to delve a little deeper into the various aspects of the project scoring process.

Larry reminded the group about the Funding Forecast memo, which is available here: http://www.clackamascountytsp.com/system/images/523/original/C_Co_TSP_Final_Funding_Memo_10-22-2012.pdf. At this point our best estimate is that the County will have approximately \$444 million available for capital projects over the next 20 years.

COST ESTIMATES

The consultant team delivered the draft cost estimates for the projects that have been identified as needed. The total estimated costs (including right-of-way [ROW]) for all County projects is \$4.7 billion. The total estimated costs for projects on the State system is \$1.65 billion (excluding ROW costs). At this point we estimate that only 10% of the estimated costs will be available for funding of identified projects over the next 20 years.

The following questions were raised and answers given.

Q: How does future spending compare to spending on capital projects in the past?

A: The Funding Forecast memo indicates that since 2001, approximately \$321 million has been spent on capital projects.

Q: Why are the cost estimate assumptions for the roadway classifications used by the State system so much less than the others?

A: Those cost estimates do not include ROW costs.

Q: Why is "Add Travel Lane" (third from the bottom of the cost estimate assumption sheet) so low?

A: [REDACTED] - Staff will talk to the consulting team

Q: Will the benefits of a project be considered in relationship to its costs?

A: The benefits of the project are being scored based on Goals 1 – 5, as well as through the scenario analysis work. The cost effectiveness factor only looks at the vehicle usage of the road in relationship to the cost of the improvement.

COST EFFECTIVENESS FACTOR AND GOAL 6 SCORING

Q: Is there a statistical reasoning behind using auto ADT for scoring of pedestrian and bikeway projects?

A: There is no statistical reason, but the assumption is that higher usage roads would generally attract users of all types. Also, the ped/bike projects are often bringing the road up to standard.

Q: How will you take into account lower volume roads that would be good for bicycle boulevards"?

A: The priority projects in the bicycle plan were integrated in to the *Livable and Local* score.

There was significant discussion about the fact that all road safety audits were rising to the top of the priority list. PAC members don't want all the money to be spent on project identification instead of implementation, and asked for a cost estimate for the projects that come out of the road safety audits. Staff noted that it would be difficult to identify those costs because the purpose of the road safety audit is to identify the specific problems and solutions.

PAC members discussed the benefits of grouping projects, such as the road safety audits, so they could be rated separately. This would help keep all the road safety audits from rising to the top of the priority projects.

Q: How would concurrency fit into the scoring?

A: While concurrency may be discussed in relationship to the DTA scenario results, we do not expect that it will have a role in scoring projects.

Q: The scoring for the *Equity* goal does not account for the inequity in spending in rural areas.

A: That is accurate. The *Equity* score looks specifically at transportation disadvantaged populations.

There was a full discussion on the usage of the current average daily traffic (ADT) vs. the future ADT. While there was an proposal to use the current rather than future ADT, other PAC members were interested in keeping the future ADT as the reference. PAC members asked that the existing ADT be listed for each project and a column for the growth ratio be included.

The next PAC informational session will discuss the DTA modeling and the 70% growth scenario.