

COIC – CET Funding Committee Roster

COIC Board Member Appointees	
Alan Unger, Deschutes County Commissioner 541-388-6569 Alan.Unger@deschutes.org	Richard Ladeby, Madras City Council 503-930-7093 rladeby@ci.madras.or.us
Jason Carr, Prineville City Council 541-233-9692 jason@partnershiptoendpoverty.org	Chris Bellusci, Private Sector 541-550-0745 cbellusci@geoengineers.com
Victor Chudowsky, Bend City Council 541-749-0085 vchudowsky@ci.bend.or.us	Jim Wilson, Private Sector 541-410-7746 brassrng@gmail.com
Regional Appointees	
Scott Cooper, Executive Director NeighborImpact 541-548-2380 ext102 scottc@neighborimpact.org	Matt McCoy, Vice President for Administration Central Oregon Community College 541-383-7704 mccoy@cocc.edu
George Endicott, Redmond Mayor 541-504-2000 George.Endicott@ci.redmond.or.us	Jeff Monson, Executive Director Commute Options 541-330-2647 jeff@commuteoptions.org
Ken Fahlgren, Crook County Commissioner 541-447-6555 ken.fahlgren@co.crook.or.us	Ron Parsons, Program Manager Oregon Department of Human Services 541-504-1320 ext 438 Ron.Parsons@state.or.us
Gary Farnsworth, Area Manager Oregon Dept. of Transportation 541-388-6071 Gary.C.FARNSWORTH@odot.state.or.us	Dave Rathbun, President and General Manager Mt. Bachelor 541-382-4224 drathbun@mtbachelor.com
Wendy Holzman, Sisters City Council 541-549-8558 WHolzman@ci.sisters.or.us	Mike Riley, Executive Director Environmental Center 541-385-6908 x 19 mike@envirocenter.org
Eric King, City Manager City of Bend 541-388-5505 eking@bendoregon.gov	Matt Shinderman, Natural Resources OSU Cascades 541-322-3159 Matt.Shinderman@osucascades.edu
Jim Kirkbride, Director of Support Services St. Charles Healthcare System 541-647-4439 jbkirkbride@stcharleshealthcare.org	
COIC Staff	
Andrew Spreadborough, Interim Exec. Director (541) 504-3306 aspreadborough@coic.org	Karen Friend, Deputy Director/CET Manager (541) 548-9543 kfriend@coic.org
Scott Aycock, Interim Community Development Mgr. (541) 548-9523 scotta@coic.org	Tamara Geiger, Program Assistant (541) 548-9527 tgeiger@coic.org

**COIC Board of Directors
2013**

<u>Board Member</u>	<u>Alternate Member</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Mike McCabe*	Seth Crawford	Crook County
Alan Unger*	Anthony De Bone	Deschutes County
John Hatfield*	Mike Ahern	Jefferson County
Victor Chudowsky	Jim Clinton	City of Bend
Shawna Clanton*	Nancy Diaz	City of Culver
Richard Ladeby	Walt Chamberlain	City of Madras
Bill Reynolds	John Chavez	City of Metolius
Jason Carr*	Jack Seley	City of Prineville
Jay Patrick	Ed Onimus	City of Redmond
Catherine Childress	David Asson	City of Sisters
Ken Mullenex	Kathy Agan	City of La Pine
Lonny Macy	Kahseuss Jackson	Warm Springs
Chris Bellusci		Appointed Representative
John McLeod		Appointed Representative
Jim Wilson		Appointed Representative
Vacant		Appointed Representative
Vacant		Appointed Representative
Vacant		Appointed Representative
Vacant		Appointed Representative

*COIC Executive Committee

CET Funding Committee Process and Timeline

Updated: August 15, 2013

Committee Purpose:

To develop recommendations for the COIC Board on four primary questions:

- Governance: Should transit continue to be operated at the regional scale by COIC, and/or should a transit district or districts be formed?
- Funding Geography: Should there be a single tri-county local funding solution, or a combination of funding solutions tailored to the service needs/priorities and willingness to pay of individual communities?
- Local Funding Tool: Considering the broad array of dedicated funding tools in use in Oregon, what/which are appropriate for CET? If a fee or tax is recommended, what should the rate be?
- Level of Service: Should the funding solution(s) be aimed at maintaining the current level of service, a highly expanded level of service, or somewhere in between?

Meeting Date	Meeting Discussion Topics/Goals
Meeting #1 – August 16 Committee Orientation and CET Overview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss committee goals, process and timeline • Orient participants to CET funding framework; Work to date on system vision, planning, and sustainable system funding concepts • High level review of governance options • High level review of funding mechanism options • Determine CET Committee need for additional information, data, research, etc.
Meeting #2 – September 6 Data and Info on Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed review range of options for transit system governance • Determine CET Committee need for additional information, data, research, etc.
Meeting #3 – September 20 Data and Info on Funding Mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed review range of transit system funding mechanism options • Review preliminary outcomes of regional public phone survey • Determine CET Committee need for additional information, data, research, etc.
Meeting #4 – October 4 Regional Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of geographic options • Review final survey outcomes and findings • Determine CET Committee need for additional information, data, research, etc.
Meeting #5 – October 18 Facilitated Discussion – CET Sustainability Concepts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitated Committee discussion regarding options for a sustainable funding approach. Preliminary identification of recommendations. • Determine CET Committee need for additional information, data, research, etc.
Meeting #6 – November 1 Develop Draft/Preliminary Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop draft recommendations on sustainable funding approach • Achieve concurrence on recommendations to COIC Board
Meeting #7 – November 15 Develop Revised/Final Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on COIC Board questions and feedback, revise/refine recommendations • Achieve concurrence on revised recommendations to COIC Board

CET Governance and Funding Options

Options for governance and funding of CET are interrelated. That is, some funding options necessitate certain governance models and some governance models enable or preclude funding models.

Funding Options

This effort is focused on identifying a sustainable, dedicated local funding source for transit in Central Oregon. It should be noted that there are other options for funding transit above and beyond the tools listed in the table below, including raising fares, public-private partnerships, group pass programs, and other mechanisms. COIC/CET staff are actively pursuing all of these additional tools (particularly in regard to partnerships with tourism, education, and health care partners), however an operating assumption is that none of them will produce the type of enduring “backbone” funding required to maintain and improve transit system services and ensure reliability and sustainability of the system. However, success in regards to public-private partnerships will potentially improve support for other tools.

Figure 1. Transit Local Funding Tools in Oregon

<i>Local Funding Tool</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Impact to Transit</i>	<i>Who pays?</i>	<i>Who decides?</i>	<i>Governance Implications</i>
Maintain Reliance on General Fund (current CET model)	Continue relying on City funding	Likely to result in less funding and impacts to other City/County spending priorities	Taxpayers	Cities, Counties	Status quo – COIC manages/governs
Property Tax Measure (Hood River, Tillamook, Klamath Falls)	Levy new property tax	Grows as community grows	Property owners	Voters within selected geography or geographies	Requires development of transit district, elected Board.
Payroll Tax Measure (Eugene, Salem)	Levy new payroll tax	Grows as employment grows	Employers	Voters within selected geography	Requires enabling legislation or development of mass transit district.
City Transit Utility Fee (Corvallis)	A levy to all utility accounts	Easy to apply, distributes burden widely	All residences, businesses, agencies, etc.	City Council action	Can be utilized by any governance model.
Local Sales Tax (Ashland)		Locals & non-locals share cost	Anyone buying goods/ services	Voters	Administered by the City that passes it.

Fares and Partnerships

Additionally, CET can raise fares (process under way) and enter into public-private partnerships to provide additional service to meet needs – e.g. with tourism, health care, and education partners. However, fares can only be increased so much to continue to meet the needs of transit-dependent and/or to achieve transportation goals, and public-private partnerships are only possible once a baseline level of system reliability and convenience is achieved.

*Governance Options***Figure 2. Governance Options and Implications – Simple Overview of Dynamics**

TOOL	GEOGRAPHY		
	LOCAL	REGIONAL	HYBRID/OTHER
PROPERTY OR PAYROLL TAX	Multiple transit districts or mass transit districts. May or may not contract with regional entity to provide regional service.	Regional transit or mass transit district.	Transit or mass transit district serves some areas, COIC serves others
UTILITY FEE OR SALES TAX	Locally-based services funded by City fees or sales tax	COIC operation, under contract with Cities	Fees in some areas, other tools elsewhere
STATUS QUO	N/A	Operated/governed by COIC, funded by local governments	N/A

Potential Governance Models:

- Council of Governments (Current Model): Transit would remain operated by the regional COG, governed by a Board composed of appointed elected representatives from the eight cities and three counties, with additional private-sector representatives. COIC currently does not have any statutory authority to levy taxes or fees.
- Transit districts and Mass Transit Districts: Transit districts are the primary transit governance/funding tool used in Oregon. They are formed by a popular vote, and are generally formed with a permanent property tax rate. Mass transit districts are also allowed the use of a payroll tax and various other fees. The Governor appoints the governing Board and MTDs are only allowed in MSAs (the Bend MSA is Deschutes County)
- Individual Jurisdictions: Devolve the regional system to a network of systems operated by individual cities and counties. Governance by each City/County, with efforts to develop regional coordination.
- Non-profit: Transit could be operated by a non-profit entity, with governance by the non-profit Board.
- County Service District (?): Transit could be operated by a county service district, although this model has not been fully explored to this point.

Operations

Regardless of the governance model, operations could be coordinated to one or multiple public, private, or non-profit operators.