

Washington County's Roadway System as of spring 2016

1,294 centerline road miles
 1,076 paved – 218 gravel
 665 urban – 629 rural
3,014 lane miles

184 bridges
3,028 culverts
37 miles of guard rail
3.7 million linear feet of rural road ditches
5.6 million square feet of urban arterial
landscaping

Pavement condition by functional classification:
Urban Arterial 74 Rural Arterial 75
Urban Collector 74 Rural Collector 79
URMD Urban Local 81 Rural Local 68
(Arterial target has been 80)

Deferred maintenance: **\$6.3 million**

Bridge and culvert replacement needs:
\$125 million



Washington County Transportation Funding Strategy "Three Legged Stool"



Existing Safety/ Capacity Deficiencies

Countywide Property Taxes

- Major Streets Transportation Improvement Program (MSTIP)
Roads of countywide significance

System Maintenance

Gas Tax, User Fees, URMD

- Road Fund: State and county fuel taxes, state vehicle registration fees, state weight-mile tax for large trucks
Prioritization policy focuses on major transportation system first
- Urban Road Maintenance District (URMD) (Property tax)
Urban Unincorporated Area Local Streets and Neighborhood Routes

Keeping Up with Growth

System Development Charges (SDCs)

- Countywide Transportation Development Tax (TDT)
- North Bethany Transportation SDC and County Service District

Existing Safety and Capacity Deficiencies:

Major Streets Transportation Improvement Program (MSTIP):

<http://www.co.washington.or.us/mstip>

- Voters approved three MSTIP levies in 1986, 1989, and 1995
- With passage of Ballot Measures 5, 47, and 50 in the late 1990s, the MSTIP rate in effect at the time was reduced and rolled into our base tax rate
- By 2018, MSTIP will have invested more than \$730 million for 130 multi-modal projects
- MSTIP funds have been used to enhance the state highway system in Washington County
- MSTIP funds used to support TriMet's construction of WES
- Over the next five years, we anticipate an average annual MSTIP allocation of \$35 million
- MSTIP allocation tied to changes in assessed valuations
- MSTIP decisions made by the Board of County Commissioners, with input from the Washington County Coordinating Committee (WCCC)
- General MSTIP project criteria:
 - improve safety
 - remove bottlenecks
 - used by residents of more than one city
 - rank as a local government priority
 - address several transportation demands (cars, trucks, bikes, pedestrians, transit)
 - be geographically balanced, providing benefit to residents all around the county
- A future levy or alternate funding source may be needed to increase our project delivery capacity to keep up with increasing needs and with resident expectations for having roads improved throughout the county in a timely manner

MSTIP Bonding Cost-Sharing Program:

<http://www.co.washington.or.us/LUT/TransportationFunding/costsharingtransportationprogram.cfm>

- Partnership with cities of Beaverton, Hillsboro and Tigard
- Finances road improvements in four major residential growth areas:
 - North Bethany/Bonny Slope West (unincorporated Washington County)
 - South Hillsboro (City of Hillsboro)
 - South Cooper Mountain (City of Beaverton)
 - River Terrace (City of Tigard)
- Costs shared: two-thirds County (through bonding MSTIP revenue), one-third cities and development

Keeping Up with Growth:

Traffic Impact Fee (TIF):

- Passed by voters countywide in 1990; has been replaced by the TDT (see below)
- Concept: development pays for a share (target: 30%) of capacity needs from new growth

- Generated an average of \$14 million annually through 2010 (approx. \$268 million overall), including credits to developers
- Collected on all development in cities and unincorporated areas based on impact on the transportation system
- Each city administered TIF in their jurisdiction; County administered in unincorporated area; WCCC advises on funding decisions
- Increases were limited to 6% per year – did not keep up with increased construction costs, diminishing the effective ‘share’ paid by new development (was down to 14% by 2008)
- Funds often combined with MSTIP or other funding sources for major projects that add capacity

Transportation Development Tax (TDT):

<http://www.co.washington.or.us/tdt>

- Approved in November 2008 by 70% of voters
- Concept: replace TIF, phase in higher rates (roughly double the amount under TIF) to restore the ‘fair share’ concept of the original TIF program (TDT target: 28%)
- Upon its full phase-in (originally scheduled for FY 12-13), TDT was anticipated to generate as much as \$30 million in total TDT activity (funds from developers, credits to developers for constructed improvements, and interest earnings) annually
- Given low development activity levels during the recession, TDT activity has been significantly below pre-recession projections. In FY 13-14 (most recent reporting period), countywide TDT activity was \$17.9 million, up significantly from an all-time low of \$4.5 million during the depths of the recession.
- The Board of Commissioners adopted a discounted rate schedule in 2009; and in January 2012 froze the current rate (discounted 20% from full rate). The full TDT rates were implemented in October 2014.
- Going forward, annual TDT rate adjustments will be based on a composite construction cost index but capped at 10% to help avoid issues experienced with TIF rate not keeping up with costs
- The Board adopted permanent TDT rate discounts for certain smaller commercial, industrial or office changes of use to encourage reuse of existing structures
- Administration is very similar to TIF – cities and County administer individually; WCCC advisory role

Countywide transportation SDCs have raised approximately \$320 million since 1990, used to fully or partially fund over 225 projects

Gain Share:

- Gain share decisions made by the Board of County Commissioners
- Eleven bike/ped [improvement projects funded by Gain Share](#) are currently in design
- Future funding uncertain

System Maintenance:

Road Fund:

<http://www.co.washington.or.us/LUT/Divisions/Operations/Programs/annual-maintenance-program.cfm>

- Primary source of road maintenance funding for County roads
- Washington County's distribution from the [State Highway Fund](#) – gas taxes, vehicle registration fees and weight-mile taxes collected by the state (59% to ODOT, 16% to cities based on population, and 25% to counties based on registered vehicles)
- In 2009, HB 2001 increased the state gas tax, vehicle registration fees, and weight-mile taxes, which increased our state Road Fund apportionment. While HB 2001 revenues have not lived up to expectations, it has allowed us to restore program funding that was cut in response to pre-HB 2001 revenue declines. We also used additional funds to increase spending for bridge maintenance and upgrades, minor bike/ped improvements, and minor safety improvements.
- In addition to the state allocation, a local one-cent gas tax brings in about \$2.05 million per year countywide to help the county and cities maintain roads. Of the \$2.05 million, the cities divide about \$1.2 million among themselves and the County receives about \$850,000 per year.
- For FY 2016-17 about \$24.4 million is expected from Road Fund to provide road maintenance.
- Road Fund revenues are not keeping pace with road maintenance costs and needs. Pavement conditions have been declining in recent years, and bridges, culverts and rural local roads suffer from lack of maintenance funding.

Pavement Condition Summary

as of March 2016

Road Functional Classification	Target PCI	2016 Average PCI
Urban Arterial	80	75
Urban Collector	75	74
Urban Local*	75	81
Rural Arterial	80	75
Rural Collector	75	79
Rural Local	65	68

*Maintained by Urban Road Maintenance District

- Deferred road maintenance has grown to **\$6.3 million** and **\$125 million** is needed to replace weight limited, structurally deficient, and obsolete bridges and culverts as of spring 2016.

- The voters rejected a proposed countywide Vehicle Registration Fee in fall 2014, which would have raised additional revenues for County and city road maintenance needs. As our system continues to grow, costs continue to increase and road conditions continue to decline, additional revenue will be needed to sustain our roads. The 2015 state legislature failed to adopt a comprehensive transportation funding package to increase state taxes and fees.
- The Board-adopted Transportation Plan includes a maintenance prioritization policy (see below) which ensures that Road Fund (gas tax) money takes care of roads that see the most use.

Road Maintenance Priority Matrix

Road Classification / Priority*

Activity	Arterial	Collector	Rural Resource Route**	Neighborhood Route	Local Road
Emergencies / Hazards	1	1	1	1	1
Mandated	1	1	1	1	1
General Maintenance	2	3	4	5	8
Minor Improvements	6	7	11	13	14
Reconstruction	9	10	12	15	16

* "1" is the highest priority; "16" is the lowest.

** Resource Routes are an identified network of rural local roads important to the economy and connectivity. Their designation may be adjusted periodically as needed as part of the Board-adopted annual maintenance program.

From Goal 11: Maintenance, adopted by the Board in A-Engrossed Ordinance 768

Urban Road Maintenance District (URMD):

<http://www.co.washington.or.us/urmd>

- The Urban Road Maintenance District (URMD) brings in about \$4.4 million annually from a property tax that residents voted to assess themselves in 1994 (\$0.2456/\$1,000 assessed value).
- This special District's primary purpose is to provide road maintenance on local roads in the urban unincorporated areas of Washington County. URMD has helped bring 95% of our urban unincorporated local roads up to good or better condition.
- Beginning in 2011, URMD can also fund safety improvement projects within the District, including on Arterial and Collector roads. Over the last five years, URMD has allocated \$10.5 million for 32 safety improvement projects.

vs