#	Type of Funding	Description	Advantages and Challenges to Implementation	Notes/Supporting Data
1	Local Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF)	VRF can be enacted in 2013 for general transportation purposes up to $43 per vehicle per year. Increases included in revenue sharing agreement with Portland. Revenue sharing (40%) required with cities with the County. County VRF currently $19 per year dedicated to Sellwood Bridge (sunsets in 20 years).	• No vote required. • Revenues from a future VRF must be shared with the cities within the County (40%) as mandated by state law. • The maximum amount that a local VRF can be is the same as the State VRF, meaning that in 2013 the County could increase the local VRF from up to $43 or an additional $24. • Number of registered vehicles has been dropping recently.	In 2005 there were 705,752 registered vehicles. In 2011 there were 518,019 registered vehicles. Are there other factors to consider (i.e. IGA's w/ Portland and Gresham) Can we separate increase from VRF and simply split so it isn't part of revenue sharing?
2	County Gas Fee	County gas fee can be increased in 2014 (HB 2001 limitation).	• Faces reduced receipts as a result of the rising cost of oil and more fuel efficient vehicles lowering consumption coupled with political resistances to gas tax increases. • Some states have looked at increasing their state fuel tax or indexing it to inflation in order to preserve its purchasing power.	
3	Transportation Utility Fee (TUF)	On-going fee collected from users of the transportation system (residences and businesses). Based on average number of trips generated by types of land uses. There have been cities in Oregon collecting a TUF, with revenue per capita ranging from $3-$66, with an average of $28 per capita. Past studies have shown that if the average is applied in Portland this would generate an annual revenue of roughly $15 million.	• Good source of revenues for maintenance and preservation of system. • Limited revenue for the County system due to primarily rural system. • Would not be applicable to Willamette River Bridges. • Technical analysis of road use by parcel level can be a challenge. • The administrative and policy making issues associated with implementing a comprehensive new fee system can be a large effort. • Some implementation issues from TUF experiences of other jurisdictions: resolving basis for cost assumptions, specificity of parcel level trip generation versus available activity data, nexus versus market forces, billing administration and multiple jurisdictions, and public outreach.	
4	Rental Car Tax	Rental tax is currently enacted and contributes to the general fund at the County.	• An increase in this tax could be enacted and dedicated to the Road Fund to be used for roads and bridges. • Subject to revenue sharing agreement with City of Portland and at least City of Gresham IGA.	Current tax is 17%

5	County Bridge Toll	User fee. ORS (Oregon Revised Statutes) amended in 2000 allows County to implement a toll on Willamette River Bridges (WRB)	• Causes redistribution of traffic onto non-tolled facilities (specially other bridges). • High investment need because infrastructure isn't in place. • Electronic Toll Collection (ETC) option would not require toll plazas and would involve tolls being paid using high-speed toll collection lanes.	
6	System Development Charge (SDC)	One time fee imposed on new development, and some types of redevelopment, for the purpose of funding certain types of capital improvements. "Capital improvement(s)" can mean facilities or assets used for any of the following services: 1. Water supply, storage, treatment and distribution; or 2. Sanitary sewers, including collection and transmission, treatment and disposal; or 3. Parks and open spaces land and facilities; or 4. Road and transportation facilities.	• Common tool for jurisdictions for capacity improvements. • Provides revenue for specific projects. • Limited application for County due to primarily rural transportation system. • Not a source for Willamette River Bridges. • Doesn't address maintenance and preservation. • No public vote required to implement.	Troutdale SDCs- based on PM Peak Hour Trip Ends at $723 per Trip End (reference ITE land use titles, codes and units). Info for Wood Village and Fairview?
7	Service Districts	Can assess, levy and collect property taxes pursuant to state statute. County has two service districts currently (sewer system in Dunthorpe/Riverdale, and roadway lighting in Mid County). A road district could be established for maintenance and preservation or for capital improvements. When property owners form a transportation special district or local improvementdistrict (LID), they agree to share inthe cost of public infrastructure improvements that promise to increase the value of their holdings. Rather than paying via future property tax increases, however, the members agree to pay directly for the cost of the improvement. The project scope and assessment methodology can vary.	Requires voter approval.	

8	Vehicle Miles Travelled Tax	Vehicles taxed on the number of miles driven instead of gas tax.	Pilot program conducted in Oregon, but not in widespread use. Conflicting goals of generating revenue and encouraging motorists to drive less. Implementation of a VMT tax also raises some equity issues for urban and rural areas. Concern with invasion of privacy. Easy for consumers to use; no anticipated change of payment behavior required for new mileage fee system as compared with gas tax payments. The use of vehicle mileage fees as a proposed replacement for the existing gas tax and Oregon's testing of this theory through its Road User Fee Pilot Program. Many policy options remain for decision-makers, such as charging a lower rate-per-mile for vehicles that achieve certain fuel efficiency, for motorists that avoid rush hour zones, or for those participating in other environmentally-friendly situations.	Oregon Pilot Program Findings: concept is viable, paying at the pump works, mileage fee can be phased in, Integration with current systems can be achieved, and congestion and other pricing options are viable. Net revenue generation potential criteria found that the Oregon Pilot Program has extensive ability for generation of revenue depending on the rate structure. If the mileage fee was set at a level roughly equivalent to the current gas tax on a fleet average miles-per-gallon basis, the pilot program showed a mileage fee implemented statewide would be roughly revenue neutral. After the initial set-up period, however, the mileage fee implemented statewide would begin to generate more revenues than what the gas tax would be expected to generate since the gas tax erodes because of improvements in vehicle fuel efficiency, while the mileage fee does not. Other ideas: mileage based registration fees, mileage based vehicle purchase taxes, mileage based vehicle lease fees, weight-distance fees, mileage based emission fees
9	Congestion Pricing	Generally used to manage traffic flows by pricing a facility based on time of day and amount of traffic. Can have multiple objectives, one of which is the ability to generate revenues for a facility.	Purpose for pricing can be to reduce traffic, improve livability, or to generate revenues. HB 2001 passed in 2009 required ODOT, working with their regional partners, to implement a pilot program in the metropolitan area. The study is underway and the committee is looking at a number of projects to consider their viability for a demonstration project. The pilot is to be implemented by 2012 and conclude in 2016 so results from this study are still a few years out.	Road pricing impacts and benefits depend on the price structure. A flat fee primarily affects social trips and tends to cause total trips to decline and shifts to non-motorized modes. A peak-period fee primarily affects commute trips, and tends to cause a combination of shifts in time and mode, and working at home. There is agreement that some form of road pricing is economically viable, although what form road pricing should take is still widely debated and discussed. Not viable to enact as County alone.
10	Property Tax Local Option Levy	Could be used to fund bonds for financing costs.	Tax levy for this purpose would need voter approval and would not be subject to the limits of Measure 5 which according to the Oregon Department of Revenue, local option taxes could be used to push property taxes above the permanent rate limitation. Local option taxes are limited to 10 years for capital construction purposes and require what is popularly known as a "double majority" for approval	

			(http://www.oregon.gov/DOR/PTD/property.shtml)	
11	Urban Renewal/Tax Increment Financing (TIF)	TIF utilizes the prospect of increased property taxes to secure bonds issued to fund the transportation improvement. When property values rise because of a new public transportation investment, the resultant tax revenue increase becomes the “tax increment,” all or a portion of which can be dedicated to repay the debt incurred to build the facility. Such TIF districts created to issue bonds are found in cities throughout the United States.	Primary used within urban renewal areas. The area must meet the definition of "blight" as defined in ORS 457. (Blighted areas mean areas that, by reason of deterioration, faulty planning, inadequate or improper facilities, deleterious land use or the existence of unsafe structures, or any combination of these factors, are detrimental to the safety, health or welfare of the community).	
12	Public-Private Partnerships (PPP)	Can provide a means of accessing private capital. These are contractual agreements formed between a public agency and private sector entity that allow for greater private sector participation in the delivery of transportation projects. Oregon Innovative Partnerships Program- allows ODOT to enter into partnerships with private-sector businesses and local governments to study, design, fund, construct, and operate critically needed transportation infrastructure and to bring new funding sources, expertise, technology, and methods to maximize the public's investment in transportation.	Benefits include access to significant private capital, the potential for reduced costs and accelerated project delivery, sharing or shifting project risk, and the opportunity for more efficient management. Challenges include concerns with public acceptance, how to determine appropriate methods	Asset Leases: Type of PPP in which the public sector leases an asset, such as a toll road or bridge to the private sector. The private sector provides an upfront payment or an agreement for revenue sharing (or both) to the public sector in exchange for the lease. During the term of the lease, the private sector manages and operates the facility and in turn receives a return on its investment, typically from user fee revenue such as tolls. Availability Payment: involves finance, operations and maintenance and sometimes design and building as well. Similar to asset lease, except that instead of the private sector operator being compensated by toll revenue, the operator is compensate by the public sector based on performance metrics based on how well the facility is maintained, for example. Private Financing and Management of Facilities: Private sector takes on the responsibility of designing, building, financing, operating, and maintaining a new facility (may also be used without financing). The benefits for a new facility may include accelerated project delivery and therefore less total cost. The potential downside is the possibility of less project oversight.