



METRO

MEETING: JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

DATE: April 13, 2006

TIME: 7:30 A.M.

PLACE: Council Chambers, Metro Regional Center

7:30	CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM	Rex Burkholder, Chair
7:35	INTRODUCTIONS	Rex Burkholder, Chair
7:40	CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS	
7:45	COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR	Rex Burkholder, Chair
7:50	CONSENT AGENDA	Rex Burkholder, Chair
	* Consideration of JPACT minutes for March 9, 2006	
	* Resolution No. 06-3667, For the Purpose of Certifying That the Portland Metropolitan Area Is In Compliance With Federal Transportation Planning Requirements – <u>APPROVAL REQUESTED</u>	
	* Resolution No. 06-3685, For the Purpose of Amending the 2006-09 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program to Add a Preservation Project on Highway 213 Between I-205 and Conway Drive - <u>APPROVAL REQUESTED</u>	
	ACTION ITEMS	
7:55	* Resolution No. 06-3668, For the Purpose of Approving the FY 2007 Unified Planning Work Program – <u>APPROVAL REQUESTED</u>	Andy Cotugno
8:00	* STIP Comment Letter - <u>APPROVAL REQUESTED</u>	Ted Leybold
	INFORMATION / DISCUSSION ITEMS	
8:35	# 2035 RTP Update - <u>INFORMATION</u>	Kim Ellis
8:50	* MTIP Allocation Update re: I-205/LRT Commuter Rail/N. Macadam Streetcar - <u>INFORMATION</u>	Andy Cotugno
	OTHER COMMITTEE BUSINESS	Rex Burkholder, Chair
9:00	ADJOURN	Rex Burkholder, Chair

* Material available electronically.

** Material to be emailed at a later date.

Material provided at meeting.

All material will be available at the meeting.



METRO

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

MINUTES

March 9, 2006
7:15 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.
Council Chambers

MEMBERS PRESENT

AFFILIATION

Rex Burkholder, Chair	Metro Council
Brian Newman	Metro Council
Sam Adams	City of Portland
Maria Rojo de Steffey	Multnomah County
Bill Kennemer	Clackamas County
Rob Drake	City of Beaverton, representing Cities of Washington County
Dick Pedersen	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Lynn Peterson	City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas County
Fred Hansen	TriMet
Cathy Nelson	Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT - Region 1)
Royce Pollard	City of Vancouver
Steve Stuart	Clark County
Paul Thalhofer	City of Troutdale, representing Cities of Multnomah County
Bill Wyatt	Port of Portland

MEMBERS ABSENT

AFFILIATION

Rod Park, Vice Chair	Metro Council
Roy Rogers	Washington County
Don Wagner	Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)

ALTERNATES PRESENT

AFFILIATION

James Bernard	Cities of Clackamas County
Doug Ficco	Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)

OTHER COUNCILORS PRESENT

David Bragdon	Metro Council President
Jef Dalin	City of Cornelius
John Hartsock	City of Damascus

GUESTS PRESENT

AFFILIATION

Kenny Asher	City of Milwaukie
Andy Back	Washington County
Lynn Bailey	ODOT
Roland Chlapowski	City of Portland
Olivia Clark	TriMet
Ann Gardner	Schnitzer Steel
Jon Holan	City of Forest Grove
Tom Markgraf	CRC
Terry Moore	ECONorthwest
Sharon Nasset	ETA
Dave Nordberg	DEQ
Ron Papsdorf	City of Gresham
John Rist	Clackamas County
Karen Schilling	Multnomah County
Brian Scott	MIG
Lainie Smith	ODOT
Paul Smith	City of Portland
Becky Steckler	ECONorthwest
Daniel Whelan	Office of Congressman Wu
John Wiebke	City of Hillsboro
Ron Weinman	Clackamas County

STAFF

Andy Cotugno, Kim Ellis, Tom Kloster, Ted Leybold, Jessica Martin, Robin McArthur, John Mermin, Deena Platman, Kathryn Sofich, Mike Wetter, Gina Whitehill-Baziuk, Bridget Wieghart,

I. CALL TO ORDER, INTRODUCTIONS AND WELCOME

Chair Rex Burkholder declared a quorum and called the meeting to order at 7:20 a.m. He welcomed the committee members and guests.

II. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

III. COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR

Chair Burkholder provided a brief *ConnectOregon* update. All of the applications have been screened for completeness and technical feasibility. He directed the committee's attention to a "post-technical review" list of the grant and/or loan applications (included as part of this meeting record). Over the next two months, the applications will be reviewed by four advisory committees (air, rail, freight and public transit), the Area Commissions on Transportation and a specially created Portland metro area committee, since there is no ACT covering the Portland metro area. This will ensure a wide and comprehensive discussion of which projects to recommend to the Oregon Transportation Commission. The OTC is scheduled to make its final project selection this summer.

Chair Burkholder encouraged committee members to attend the Bi-State Forum on Thursday, March 16th.

At the February meeting, Mr. Jason Tell briefed the committee on the STIP process. Mr. Andy Cotugno noted that TPAC would compose a comment letter to be presented at the next meeting. He asked that committee members forward comments they want incorporated into the letter to TPAC.

IV CONSENT AGENDA

Minutes

ACTION: Mr. Rob Drake moved to approve the minutes from the February 9th meeting. The motion passed.

V. ACTION ITEMS

Resolution No. 06-3665, For the Purpose of Adopting the Policy Direction, Program Objectives, Procedures and Criteria For the Transportation Priorities 2008-11 Allocation Process and Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP)

In February, Resolution No. 06-3665 was presented to the committee. The committee requested further analysis and recommendation on two issues prior to adoption of the Policy Report for the 2008-11 MTIP Program.

Issue #1

The committee requested that the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy and the Regional Business Plan be consulted for direction related to economic development objectives and relationship to transportation.

Issue #2

The committee requested that the pipeline of projects that could compete well on a state-wide basis in terms of project readiness should funding become available through state legislative action be analyzed and if inadequate, inform them of the to options for the Transportation Priorities and MTIP program that addresses project readiness.

Mr. Ted Leybold directed the committee's attention to a memo (included as part of this meeting record) and briefly reviewed the recommendations and analysis for each of JPACT's concerns. No changes to current MTIP policies, technical measures or policy changes to address adequate number of projects ready to enter the preliminary engineering/final design were recommended.

ACTION: Mr. Rob Drake moved, seconded by Mr. Doug Ficco, to approve Resolution No. 06-3665. The motion passed.

VI. INFORMATION/ DISCUSSION ITEM

2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update

The Metro Council initiated an update to the regional transportation plan last September. The update is anticipated to be complete by November 2007 to allow adequate time to complete air quality conformity analysis and federal consultation before the current plan expires in March 2008.

The 2035 RTP update represents the first significant update to the plan in six years. The process will build on new information learned from the Cost of Congestion Study and New Look work program and public opinion research. The process will also address new federal, state, and regional planning

requirements, including SAFTEA-LU legislation, recent Transportation Planning Rule amendments and new policy direction from the New Look planning process.

A goal of this effort is a more streamlined plan that better advances regional policies, public priorities and local efforts to implement the 2040 Growth Concept. To this end, the Council has directed the planning process to incorporate a new "outcomes-based" approach that more effectively responds to the issues with which the region is currently faced and prioritizes transportation investments to best deliver desired outcomes.

Chair Burkholder stated that the primary goal of the meeting today would be to discuss:

- Issues the region currently face and the need to approach this update differently than previous updates;
- Principles and parameters for updating the RTP process; and
- Identify who needs to be involved and how to involve them.

Last month, Metro selected a consultant team to assist with this effort. The team is led by Mr. Terry Moore of EcoNorthwest, and includes staff from Moore Iacofano Goltsman (MIG) and Kittleson and Associates. Chair Burkholder introduced Mr. Moore, who briefly provided background information on ECONorthwest. Mr. Moore introduced Mr. Brian Scott with MIG who would help facilitate the discussion. Mr. Scott stated that the goal of the meeting today would not be to list or discuss specific projects, but rather to talk about the successes and challenges of transportation planning so the group can help shape the best RTP.

Mr. Scott asked committee members what they thought the key issues were. The committee suggested the following:

- Moving toward large (rather than spread out) UGB expansions – Infrastructure issue
- Catch-up & redevelopment vs. new
- Importance of thinking beyond Metro's borders
- Don't forget about existing commitments
- Major infrastructure investments – selling to state & Feds funding sources
- Air quality has been a success / will be a challenge
- Conversation about tolling (Multnomah County bridges)
- Environmental impacts of construction
- Corridor planning – how it fits into the big picture
- Land use / transportation connection
- Staff responsiveness to comments is key
- Pedestrian connections
- Need to look toward more efficient use of existing arterials
- Measures in RTP are awkward
- Look at large bridges
- Debrief stakeholders on results of RTP
- Rationalizing how funding happens
- Regional priorities
- Understand public/private price per trip (type of trips)
- Freight & rails – fuel costs changing transportation and location decisions
- Maintenance of current system
- Additional access to outlying areas creates new issues

Mr. Scott asked the committee what they thought were important process principles. The following was suggested:

- Need clear priorities among projects
- Communicating tradeoffs and paybacks to leaders and citizens
- Get JPACT/TPAC out talking to citizens
- Manage expectations – not enough money
- Clear standards and criteria
- Consider impacts of investments on existing areas
- Need more comprehensive understanding of current local and regional situation
- Evaluate success/failures in existing RTP
- Public opinion research about why people make transportation choices
- Communicate choices – consider operation solutions
- Consider management improvements
- Evaluate existing commitments
- Include MPAC and business community

The committee suggested the following entities as those who should be included in the process:

- Truckers
- AAA
- Businesses
- JPACT/TPAC/MPAC
- RTC – Regional vision
- Bi-State Coordinating committee
- County/City Coordinating committees
- Federal Highway Administration
- Federal Reps
- Legislators
- Rural neighbors
- Lower income communities

Suggestions for how to involve the above groups included:

- Polling
- Framing choices
- Speaker opportunities at JPACT
- Tours

VIII. ADJOURN

Chair Burkholder thanked the committee and consultants for a productive discussion and informed committee members that this was just the first part of a much larger discussion. He reminded the committee that there would be a full-day retreat to continue this discussion in the near future.

There being no further business, Chair Rex Burkholder adjourned the meeting at 9:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jessica Martin
Recording Secretary

JOINT RESOLUTION OF THE
METRO COUNCIL
AND
OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

FOR THE PURPOSE OF CERTIFYING THAT)	RESOLUTION NO. 06-3667
THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA IS IN)	
COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL)	Introduced by Councilor
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING)	
REQUIREMENTS)	

WHEREAS, Substantial federal funding from the Federal Transit Administration and Federal Highway Administration is available to the Portland metropolitan area; and

WHEREAS, The Federal Transit Administration and Federal Highway Administration require that the planning process for the use of these funds complies with certain requirements as a prerequisite for receipt of such funds; and

WHEREAS, Satisfaction of the various requirements is documented in Exhibit A; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the transportation planning process for the Portland metropolitan area (Oregon portion) is in compliance with federal requirements as defined in Title 23 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 450, and Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 613.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this _____ day of April 2006.

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

APPROVED by the Oregon Department of Transportation this _____ day of _____
2006.

Craig Greenleaf
Transportation Development Administrator

Metro Self-Certification

1. Metropolitan Planning Organization Designation

Metro is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) designated by the Governor for the urbanized areas of Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties.

Metro is a regional government with six directly elected district councilors and a regionally elected Council President. Local elected officials of general purpose governments are directly involved in the transportation planning/decision process through the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) (see membership roster). JPACT provides the “forum for cooperative decision-making by principal elected officials of general purpose governments” as required by USDOT and takes action on the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) and the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). The Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) deals with non-transportation-related matters and with the adoption and amendment to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Specific roles and responsibilities of the committees are described on page 2.

2. Geographic Scope

Transportation planning in the Metro region includes the entire area within the Federal-Aid Urban Boundary (FAUB). Metro updated the FAUB and federal functional classification in January 2005 as recommended in Metro’s 2004 Federal Review.

3. Agreements

- a. A basic memorandum of agreement between Metro and the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC) delineates areas of responsibility and coordination. Executed in March 2006, to be updated in 2009.
- b. An agreement between TriMet and Metro implementing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), executed August 2004, to be updated in 2007.
- c. An agreement between ODOT and Metro implementing the TEA-21, executed September 2004, to be updated in 2007.
- d. Yearly agreements are executed between Metro and ODOT defining the terms and use of FHWA planning funds.
- e. Bi-State Coordination Committee Charter – Metro and eleven state and local agencies adopted resolutions approving a Bi-State Coordination Committee Charter in 2004. Some were adopted in late 2003 and the balance in 2004, which triggered the transition from the Bi-State Transportation Committee to the Bi-State Coordination Committee.
- f. An agreement between Metro and the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) describing each agency’s responsibilities and roles for air quality planning. Executed August 2004, to be updated in 2007.

- g. Memorandum of Understanding between Metro and Wilsonville outlining roles and responsibilities for implementing TEA-21 was executed June 2005 and will be updated in July 2008.

4. Responsibilities, Cooperation and Coordination

Metro uses a decision-making structure, which provides state, regional and local governments the opportunity to participate in the transportation and land use decisions of the organization. The two key committees are JPACT and MPAC. These committees receive recommendations from the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) and the Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC).

JPACT

This committee is comprised of three Metro Councilors; nine local elected officials including two from Clark County, Washington, and appointed officials from ODOT, TriMet, the Port of Portland and DEQ. All transportation-related actions (including federal MPO actions) are recommended by JPACT to the Metro Council. The Metro Council can approve the recommendations or refer them back to JPACT with a specific concern for reconsideration. Final approval of each item, therefore, requires the concurrence of both bodies. As recommended by Metro's 2004 Federal Review, JPACT has designated a Finance Subcommittee to explore transportation funding and finance issues in detail, and make recommendations to the full committee.

JPACT will be undertaking a bylaw review also recommended in Metro's 2004 Federal Review.

Bi-State Coordination Committee

Based on a recommendation from the I-5 Transportation & Trade Partnership Strategic Plan, the Bi-State Transportation Committee became the Bi-State Coordination Committee in early 2004. The Bi-State Coordination Committee was chartered through resolutions approved by Metro, Multnomah County, the cities of Portland and Gresham, TriMet, ODOT, the Port of Portland, RTC, Clark County, C-Tran, Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and the Port of Vancouver. The Committee is charged with reviewing all issues of bi-state significance for transportation and land use. A 2003 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) states that JPACT and the RTC Board "shall take no action on an issue of bi-state significance without first referring the issue to the Bi-State Coordination Committee for their consideration and recommendation."

MPAC

This committee was established by the Metro Charter to provide a vehicle for local government involvement in Metro's planning activities. It includes eleven local elected officials, three appointed officials representing special districts, TriMet, a representative of school districts, three citizens, two non-voting Metro Councilors, two Clark County, Washington representatives and a non-voting appointed official from the State of Oregon. Under the Metro Charter, this committee has responsibility for recommending to the Metro Council adoption of or amendment to any element of the Charter-required RTP.

The Regional Framework Plan was adopted on December 11, 1997 and addresses the following topics:

- Transportation
- Land use (including the Metro Urban Growth Boundary (UGB))
- Open space and parks
- Water supply and watershed management
- Natural hazards
- Coordination with Clark County, Washington
- Management and implementation

In accordance with this requirement, the transportation component of the Regional Framework Plan developed to meet federal transportation planning regulations, the Oregon Transportation Planning Rule and Metro Charter requirements that require a recommendation from both MPAC and JPACT. This ensures integration of transportation with land use and environmental concerns.

5. Metropolitan Transportation Planning Products

a. Unified Planning Work Program

JPACT, the Metro Council and the Southwest Washington RTC adopt the UPWP annually. It fully describes work projects planned for the Transportation Department during the fiscal year and is the basis for grant and funding applications. The UPWP also includes federally funded major projects being planned by member jurisdictions. These projects will be administered by Metro through intergovernmental agreements with ODOT and the sponsoring jurisdiction. As required by Metro's 2004 Federal Review CMS and RTP update tasks were expanded in the UPWP narratives. Also, Metro identified Environmental Justice tasks in the UPWP in Title VI/Environmental Justice and individual program narratives.

b. Regional Transportation Plan

The 2000 RTP was adopted in August 2000, culminating a two-phase, five-year effort to reorient the plan to Metro's 2040 Growth Concept. The updated plan contains a new emphasis on implementing key aspects of the 2040 land use plan with strategic transportation infrastructure improvements and programs. The plan is fully organized around these land use goals, with modal systems for motor vehicles, transit, freight, bicycles and pedestrians geared to serve the long-term needs called for in the 2040 plan.

The 2000 RTP also includes a new level of detail, prescribing a number of new performance measures and system design standards for the 25 cities and 3 counties in the Metro region to enact. These include: new requirements for local street connectivity; modal orientation in street design; 2040-based level-of-service policy for sizing roads; targets for combined alternative modes of travel; and, parking ratios for new developments. The plan contains nearly 900 individual projects totaling \$7.2 billion in system improvements, and a corresponding series of financing scenarios for funding these projects. It also calls for more than a dozen corridor studies to define specific projects for many of the major corridors where more analysis is needed to determine which improvements best respond to expected demand.

JPACT and the Metro Council approved the RTP 2004 Federal Update on December 11, 2003. The 2004 update was limited in scope, and does not attempt to revisit the requirements of the Oregon Transportation Planning Rule. The update included "housekeeping" amendments to reflect fine-tuning of the various modal system maps, as recommended by local cities and counties through transportation plans adopted since the last RTP update in August 2000. The 2004 RTP includes new policy text that establishes two tiers of industrial areas ("regionally significant" and "local") for the purpose of transportation planning and project funding.

The 2004 update also provided an updated set of financially constrained projects. The total revenue base assumed in the 2004 RTP for the road system is approximately \$4.3 billion, with \$2.16 billion for freeways, highways and roads, \$1.67 billion for transit and the balance for planning, bike, pedestrian, transportation demand management, system management and other similar programs. In addition to the financially constrained system, the 2004 Federal Update identifies a larger set of projects and programs for the "Illustrative System," which is nearly double the scale and cost of the financially constrained system. The illustrative system represents the region's objective for implementing the Region 2040 Plan.

Finally, a new map has been added to Chapter 1 of the RTP that identifies the MPO Planning Boundary. This boundary defines the area that the RTP applies to for federal planning purposes. The boundary includes the area inside Metro's jurisdictional boundary, the 2003 UGB and the 2000 census defined urbanized area boundary for the Portland metropolitan region. FHWA and FTA approved the 2004 RTP and the associated air quality conformity determination on March 5, 2004.

Resolution Number 03-3380A adopted the RTP to meet federal requirements for long-range planning. FHWA approved Air Quality conformity determination on March 3, 2004. Metro adopted Resolution 04-1045A to meet state planning goals on July 8, 2004. The document was published with both the July 8 2004 adoption date and the March 5, 2004 federal approval date as required by Metro's 2004 Federal Review.

Work has begun on the 2008 RTP update. Tasks related to the update are outlined in the 2006-07 UPWP. As required by Metro's 2004 Federal Review the RTP update will address operating and maintenance costs paid by member jurisdictions.

c. Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program

The MTIP was updated in Summer 2005 and incorporated into the 2004-07 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The 2005 update includes projects or project phases with prior funding commitments and allocated \$50 million of Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality Program (CMAQ). The adopted MTIP features a program approved for three-years of projects and a fourth "out-year." The first year of projects are considered the priority year projects. Should any of these be delayed, projects of equivalent dollar value may be advanced from the second and third years of the program without processing formal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) amendments. This flexibility was adopted in response to ISTEA (now TEA-21) planning requirements. The flexibility reduces the need for multiple amendments throughout the year. As recommended in Metro's 2004 Federal Review, the MTIP webpage was linked to ODOT's STIP page.

6. Planning Factors

Currently, Metro's planning process addresses the seven TEA-21 planning factors in all projects and policies. Table 1 below describes this relationship. The TEA-21 planning factors are:

1. Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity and efficiency;
2. Increase the safety and security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users;
3. Increase the accessibility and mobility options available to people and for freight;
4. Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation and improve quality of life;
5. Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight;
6. Promote efficient management and operations; and
7. Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.

In 2005, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act (SAFETEA-LU) added transportation security as a separate factor. Metro will address this factor in the current update to the Regional Transportation Plan, scheduled for completion in early 2008. Table 2 outlines Metro's response to the new SAFETEA-LU planning provisions.

Table 1: TEA-21 Planning Factors

Factor	System Planning (RTP)	Funding Strategy (MTIP)	High Capacity Transit (HCT)
1. Support Economic Vitality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTP policies linked to land use strategies that promote economic development. • Industrial areas and intermodal facilities identified in policies as “primary” areas of focus for planned improvements. • Comprehensive, multimodal freight improvements that link intermodal facilities to industry are detailed for 20-year plan period. • Highway LOS policy tailored to protect key freight corridors. • RTP recognizes need for freight linkages to destinations beyond the region by all modes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All projects subject to consistency with RTP policies on economic development and promotion of “primary” land use element of 2040 development such as centers, industrial areas and intermodal facilities. • Special category for freight improvements calls out the unique importance for these projects. • All freight projects subject to funding criteria that promote industrial jobs and businesses in the “traded sector.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCT plans designed to support continued development of regional centers and central city by increasing transit accessibility to these locations. • HCT improvements in major commute corridors lessen need for major capacity improvements in these locations, allowing for freight improvements in other corridors.
2. Increase Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RTP policies call out safety as a primary focus for improvements to the system. • Safety is identified as one of three implementation priorities for all modal systems (along with preservation of the system and implementation of the region’s 2040-growth management strategy). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All projects ranked according to specific safety criteria. • Road modernization and reconstruction projects are scored according to relative accident incidence. • All projects must be consistent with regional street design guidelines that provide safe designs for all modes of travel. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Station area planning for proposed HCT improvements is primarily driven by pedestrian access and safety considerations.

Table 1: TEA-21 Planning Factors

Factor	System Planning (RTP)	Funding Strategy (MTIP)	High Capacity Transit (HCT)
3. Increase Accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RTP policies are organized on the principle of providing accessibility to centers and employment areas with a balanced, multi-modal transportation system. • The policies also identify the need for freight mobility in key freight corridors and to provide freight access to industrial areas and intermodal facilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measurable increases in accessibility to priority land use elements of the 2040-growth concept is a criterion for all projects. • The MTIP program places a heavy emphasis on non-auto modes in an effort to improve multi-modal accessibility in the region. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The planned HCT improvements in the region will provide increased accessibility to the most congested corridors and centers. • Planned HCT improvements provide mobility options to persons traditionally underserved by the transportation system.
4. Protect Environment and Quality of Life	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RTP is constructed as a transportation strategy for implementing the region's 2040-growth concept. The growth concept is a long-term vision for retaining the region's livability through managed growth. • The RTP system has been "sized" to minimize the impact on the built and natural environment. • The region has developed an environmental street design guidebook to facilitate environmentally sound transportation improvements in sensitive areas, and to coordinate transportation project development with regional strategies to protect endangered species. • The RTP conforms to the Clean Air Act. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MTIP conforms to the Clean Air Act. • The MTIP focuses on allocating funds for clean air (CMAQ), livability (Transportation Enhancement) and multi- and alternative modes (STIP). • Bridge projects in lieu of culverts have been funded through the MTIP to enhance endangered salmon and steelhead passage. • "Green Street" demonstration projects funded to employ new practices for mitigating the effects of storm water runoff. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Light rail improvements provide emission-free transportation alternatives to the automobile in some of the region's most congested corridors and centers. • HCT transportation alternatives enhance quality of life for residents by providing an alternative to auto travel in congested corridors and centers.

Table 1: TEA-21 Planning Factors

Factor	System Planning (RTP)	Funding Strategy (MTIP)	High Capacity Transit (HCT)
<p>4. Protect Environment and Quality of Life (cont)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many new transit, bicycle, pedestrian and TDM projects have been added to the plan in recent updates to provide a more balanced multi-modal system that maintains livability. • RTP transit, bicycle, pedestrian and TDM projects planned for the next 20 years will complement the compact urban form envisioned in the 2040 growth concept by promoting an energy-efficient transportation system. • Metro coordinates its system level planning with resource agencies to identify and resolve key issues. 		
<p>5. System Integration/ Connectivity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RTP includes a functional classification system for all modes that establishes an integrated modal hierarchy. • The RTP policies and Functional Plan* include a street design element that integrates transportation modes in relation to land use for regional facilities. • The RTP policies and Functional Plan include connectivity provisions that will increase local and major street connectivity. • The RTP freight policies and projects address the intermodal connectivity needs at major freight terminals in the region. • The intermodal management system identifies key intermodal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects funded through the MTIP must be consistent with regional street design guidelines. • Freight improvements are evaluated according to potential conflicts with other modes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planned HCT improvements are closely integrated with other modes, including pedestrian and bicycle access plans for station areas and park-and-ride and passenger drop-off facilities at major stations.

Table 1: TEA-21 Planning Factors

Factor	System Planning (RTP)	Funding Strategy (MTIP)	High Capacity Transit (HCT)
	links in the region.		
6. Efficient Management & Operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RTP policy chapter includes specific system management policies aimed at promoting efficient system management and operation. • Proposed RTP projects include many system management improvements along regional corridors. • The RTP financial analysis includes a comprehensive summary of current and anticipated operations and maintenance costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects are scored according to relative cost effectiveness (measured as a factor of total project cost compared to measurable project benefits). • TDM projects are solicited in a special category to promote improvements or programs that reduce SOV pressure on congested corridors. • TSM/ITS projects are funded through the MTIP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed HCT improvements include redesigned feeder bus systems that take advantage of new HCT capacity and reduce the number of redundant transit lines.
7. System Preservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed RTP projects include major roadway preservation projects. • The RTP financial analysis includes a comprehensive summary of current and anticipated operations and maintenance costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconstruction projects that provide long-term maintenance are identified as a funding priority. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RTP financial plan includes the 20-year costs of HCT maintenance and operation for planned HCT systems.
8. Increase Security of Transportation System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will address in 2008 RTP update 		

* *Functional Plan = Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, an adopted regulation that requires local governments in Metro's jurisdiction to complete certain planning tasks.*

7. Public Involvement

Metro maintains a proactive public involvement process that provides complete information, timely public notice, and full public access to key decisions. Metro supports early and continuing involvement of the public in developing its policies, plans and programs. Public Involvement Plans are designed to both support the technical scope and objectives of Metro studies and programs while simultaneously providing for innovative, effective and inclusive opportunities for engagement. Every effort is made to employ broad and diverse methods, tools and activities to reach potentially impacted communities and other neighborhoods and to encourage the participation of low-income and minority citizens and organizations.

All Metro UPWP studies and projects that have a public involvement component require a Public Involvement Plan (PIP) that meets or exceeds adopted public involvement procedures. Included in individualized PIPs are strategies and methods to best involve a diverse citizenry. Some of these may include special public opinion survey mechanisms, translation of materials for non-English speaking members of the community, citizen working committees or advisory committee structures, special task forces, web instruments and a broad array of public information materials. Hearings, workshops, open houses, charrettes and other activities are also held as needed.

The MTIP relies on early program kick-off notification, inviting input on the development of criteria, project solicitation, project ranking and the recommended program. Workshops, informal and formal opportunities for input as well as a 45-day+ comment period are repetitive aspects of the MTIP process. By assessing census information, block analysis is conducted on areas surrounding each project being considered for funding to ensure that environmental justice principles are met and to identify where additional outreach might be beneficial.

TPAC includes six citizen positions that are geographically and interest area diverse and filled through an open, advertised application and interview process. TPAC makes recommendations to JPACT and the Metro Council. Metro Council adopted Metro's Transportation Public Involvement Policy on June 10, 2004 by Resolution Number 04-3450.

Title VI – In June 2005, Metro completed and submitted its Title VI Plan to the FTA and FHWA. This plan is now being implemented through updates to Metro's RTP and MTIP, and through corridor planning activities in the region.

Environmental Justice – The intent of environmental justice (EJ) practices is to ensure that the needs of minority and disadvantaged populations are considered and that the relative benefits/impacts of individual projects on local communities are thoroughly assessed and vetted. Metro continues to expand and explore environmental justice efforts that provide early access to and consideration of planning and project development activities. Metro's EJ program is organized to communicate and seek input on project proposals and to carry those efforts into the analysis, community review and decision-making processes. In addition, Metro recently established an agency diversity action team. The team is responsible for identifying opportunities to collaboratively develop and implement sustainable diversity initiatives across and throughout the agency. Metro's diversity efforts are most evident in three areas: Contracts and Purchasing, Community Outreach, and Recruitment and Retention.

8. Disadvantaged Business Enterprise

A revised Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) program was adopted by the Metro Council in June 1997 (Ordinance No. 97-692A); 49CFR 26 allows recipients to use the DBE goal of another recipient in the same market. Metro's Executive Officer approved an overall DBE annual goal in accordance with ODOT. This goal was established utilizing ODOT's methodology to determine DBE availability of "ready, willing and able" firms for federally funded professional and construction projects. The current goal is 13.36 percent.

Metro's DBE program was reviewed and submitted to FTA in August 1999 and is awaiting formal approval. Metro currently piggybacks on ODOT's DBE program.

9. Americans with Disabilities Act

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Joint Complementary Paratransit Plan was adopted by the TriMet Board in December 1991 and was certified as compatible with the RTP by Metro Council in January 1992. The plan was phased in over five years and TriMet has been in compliance since January 1997. Metro approved the 1997 plan as in conformance with the RTP. FTA audited and approved the plan in summer 1999.

10. Lobbying

Annually Metro certifies compliance with 49 CFR 20 through the FTA TEAM system.

Table 2: Metro's Response to New SAFTEEA-LU Provisions

SAFTETEA-LU Provision for all MPO's	Metro Response
<i>Consult/Coordinate with planning officials responsible for planned growth, economic development, environmental protection, airport operations, and freight movement</i>	<p>Metro's transportation planning and land-use planning functions are within the same department and coordinate internally.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metro consults MPAC on land-use activities. • Metro is a member of Regional Partners for Economic Development and endorsed the Consolidated Economic Development Strategy (CEDS). • Metro has implemented a fish and wildlife habit protection program through regulations, property acquisition, education and incentives. • Metro has a standing committee to coordinate with public agencies with environmental protection responsibility. • The Port of Portland manages the airport and is represented on both TPAC and JPACT. • Metro is developing a freight master plan and is forming a freight advisory committee
<i>Promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development</i>	<p>Metro transportation and land-use planning is subject to approval by the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development.</p>
<i>Give safety and security due emphasis as separate planning factors</i>	<p>Metro will address security and safety as individual factors in the current update to the RTP schedule for completion in 2008. Additionally, Metro staffs the Regional Emergency Management Group (REMG). The group brings together local emergency managers to plan responses to security concerns and natural hazards.</p>
<i>Discuss in the transportation plan potential environmental mitigation activities to be developed in consultation with Federal, State, and tribal wildlife, land management, and regulatory agencies</i>	<p>Will be incorporated into the 2008 update to RTP.</p>
<i>Consult with State and local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation in development of the transportation plan</i>	<p>Will be incorporated into the 2008 update to RTP.</p>

Table 2: Metro's Response to New SAFETEA-LU Provisions

SAFETEA-LU Provision for all MPO's	Metro Response
<i>Include operation and management strategies to address congestion, safety, and mobility in the transportation plan</i>	Metro has established a Regional Transportation Options Committee as a subcommittee of TPAC to address demand management. The TransPort Committee is a subcommittee of TPAC to address ITS and operations.
<i>Develop a participation plan in consultation with interested parties that provides reasonable opportunities for all parties to comment on transportation plan</i>	Metro has public involvement policy for regional transportation planning and funding activities to support and encourage board-based public participation in development and review of Metro's transportation plans. The Transportation Planning Public Involvement Policy was last updated in June 2004.
<i>Employ visualization techniques to describe plan and make information available (including transportation plans) to the public in electronically accessible format such as on the Web.</i>	On a regular basis, Metro employs visualization techniques. Examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTP document is available on Metro's website • RTP flyers • MTIP document is available on Metro's website • GIS maps to illustrate planning activities • Video simulation of light rail on the Portland Mall and 1-205 Corridor
<i>Update the plan at least every 4 years in non-attainment and maintenance areas, 5 years in attainment areas</i>	Initial RTP update completed by will be completed by March 2008.
<i>Update the TIP at least every 4 years, include 4 years of projects and strategies in the TIP</i>	Initiated MTIP and STIP update for August 2007
<i>SAFETEA-LU includes a new requirement for a "locally developed, coordinated public transit/human services transportation plan" to be eligible for formula funding under three FTA grant programs (5310,5316,5317) It is not clear yet who will be responsible for these plans.</i>	Metro participates on the Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee and Regional Transportation Coordinating Council of the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Plan. A coordinated human services and public transportation plan is under development by those committees and will be integrated into the 2008 RTP update.

STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 06-3667 FOR THE PURPOSE OF CERTIFYING THAT THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING REQUIREMENTS

Date: March 23, 2006

Presented by: Andrew C. Cotugno

BACKGROUND

Federal transportation agencies (Federal Transit Administration [FTA] and Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]) require a self-certification that our planning process is in compliance with certain federal requirements as a prerequisite to receiving federal funds. The self-certification documents that we have met those requirements and is considered yearly at the time of Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) approval. Required self-certification areas include:

- Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) designation
- Geographic scope
- Agreements
- Responsibilities, cooperation and coordination
- Metropolitan Transportation Planning products
- Planning factors
- Public Involvement
- Title VI
- Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE)
- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)

Each of these areas is discussed in Exhibit A to Resolution No. 06-3667.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. **Know Opposition-** No known opposition
2. **Legal Antecedents-**This resolution certifies that the Portland metropolitan area is in compliance with federal transportation planning requirements as defined in Title 23 of Code of Federal Regulations, Part 450 and Title 49, of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 613.
3. **Anticipated Effects-**Approval will mean that grants can be submitted and contracts executed so work can commence on July 1, 2006, in accordance established Metro priorities.
4. **Budget Impacts-**Approval of this resolution is a companion to the UPWP. It is a prerequisite to receipt of federal planning funds and is, therefore, critical to the Metro budget. The UPWP matches projects and studies reflected in the proposed Metro budget submitted by the Metro Chief Operating Officer to the Metro Council. The UPWP is subject to revision in the final adopted Metro budget.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Approve Resolution No. 06-3667; certifying that the Portland metropolitan area is in compliance with federal transportation planning requirements.

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE 2006-) RESOLUTION NO. 06-3685
09 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION)
IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO ADD A) Introduced by Councilor Rex Burkholder
PRESERVATION PROJECT ON HIGHWAY 213)
BETWEEN I-205 AND CONWAY DRIVE)

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) prioritizes projects from the Regional Transportation Plan to receive transportation related funding; and

WHEREAS, the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council must approve the MTIP and any subsequent amendments to add new projects to the MTIP; and

WHEREAS, the JPACT and the Metro Council approved the 2006-09 MTIP on August 18, 2005; and

WHEREAS, Region 1 of the Oregon Department of Transportation was able to secure additional Preservation funds from cost savings from other Preservation projects across the State of Oregon; and

WHEREAS, the Highway 213: I-205 to Conway Drive preservation project was best able to meet the criteria set by ODOT and the Oregon Transportation Commission for securing these additional funds; and

WHEREAS, the Highway 213: I-205 to Conway Drive preservation project is consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan; and

WHEREAS, this is a new transportation project requiring amendment into the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program prior to these funds being made available to the project; and

WHEREAS, new preservation projects on the highway system costing more than \$2 million require approval by JPACT and the Metro Council; and

WHEREAS, the Highway 213: I-205 to Conway Drive preservation project is estimated to cost \$4.3 million; and

WHEREAS, the Highway 213: I-205 to Conway Drive preservation project is exempt from air quality conformity determination per federal regulations; and

WHEREAS, the Oregon Department of Transportation seeks to amend the 2006-09 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program to make engineering funds available in 2006 and construction funds available in 2009; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council hereby amends the 2006-09 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program to include \$224,325 federal funds (\$250,000 total) for Preliminary Engineering in 2006 and \$3,634,065 federal funds (\$4,050,000 total) for construction of the Highway 213: I-205 to Conway Drive preservation project.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this _____ day of April 2006.

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 06-3685, FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE 2006-09 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO ADD A PRESERVATION PROJECT ON HIGHWAY 213 BETWEEN I-205 AND CONWAY DRIVE

Date: April 27, 2006

Prepared by: Ted Leybold

BACKGROUND

Region 1 of the Oregon Department of Transportation was able to acquire additional funding for a preservation project in addition to their original allocation of preservation funding from the Oregon Transportation Commission that was made available from cost savings from other preservation projects state wide. The project they were able to obtain funds for is on Highway 213 between I-205 and Conway Drive. The project will restore pavement, and include signing, signal loops and illumination.

New transportation project of regional significance must be amended into the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) prior to those funds being made available to the project. Preservation projects on the state highway system whose costs are greater than \$2 million need approval by JPACT and the Metro Council to be amended into the MTIP.

Funding proposed for programming in the MTIP includes \$250,000 for design and engineering in 2006 and \$4,050,000 for construction in 2009.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. **Known Opposition** None known at this time.
2. **Legal Antecedents** Amends the 2006-09 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program as adopted by Metro Resolution No. 05-3606 on August 18, 2005 (FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING THE 2006-09 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA).
3. **Anticipated Effects** Adoption of this resolution allows the Oregon Department of Transportation to proceed with design and construction of the preservation project on Highway 213 between I-205 and Conway Drive.
4. **Budget Impacts** None.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Adopt the resolution as recommended.

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE FY)
2007 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK)
PROGRAM)

RESOLUTION NO. 06-3668

Introduced by Councilor

WHEREAS, The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) as shown in Exhibit A, describes all federally-funded transportation planning activities for the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan area to be conducted in FY 2007; and

WHEREAS, The FY 2007 UPWP indicates federal funding sources for transportation planning activities carried out by Metro, Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council, Oregon Department of Transportation, TriMet, City of Wilsonville SMART, the Port of Portland and the local jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS, Approval of the FY 2007 UPWP is required to receive federal transportation planning funds; and

WHEREAS, The FY 2007 UPWP is consistent with the proposed Metro budget submitted to the Metro Council; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Metro Council hereby declares:

1. That the FY 2007 UPWP is adopted.
2. That the FY 2007 UPWP is consistent with the continuing, cooperative and comprehensive planning process and is given positive Intergovernmental Project Review action.
3. That Metro's Chief Operating Officer is authorized to apply for, accept and execute grants and agreements specified in the UPWP.
4. That staff shall update the UPWP budget figures, as necessary, to reflect the final Metro budget.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this _____ day of April 2006.

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

FY 2006-07

Unified Planning Work Program

Transportation Planning in the Portland/Vancouver Metropolitan Area

Metro

City of Portland

City of West Linn

City of Wilsonville (SMART)

Clackamas County

Multnomah County

Washington County

Port of Portland

TriMet

Oregon Department of Transportation

Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council

Draft

March 23, 2006

STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 06-3668 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE FY 2007 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM

Date: March 23, 2006

Presented by: Andrew C. Cotugno

BACKGROUND

The FY 2007 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) describes transportation planning activities to be carried out in the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan region during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2006. Included in the document are federally funded studies to be conducted by Metro, Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC), the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), TriMet, City of Wilsonville SMART, the Port of Portland, and local jurisdictions.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. **Know Opposition-** No known opposition
2. **Legal Antecedents-** Federal transportation agencies (Federal Transit Administration [FTA] and Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]) require an adopted UPWP as a prerequisite for receiving federal funds according to Title 23 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 450 subpart c.
3. **Anticipated Effects -**Approval will mean that grants can be submitted and contracts executed so work can commence on July 1, 2006, in accordance established Metro priorities.
4. **Budget Impacts-** The UPWP matches the projects and studies reflected in the proposed Metro budget submitted by the Metro Chief Operating Officer to the Metro Council. The UPWP is subject to revision in the final Metro budget. This resolution also directs staff to update the UPWP budget figures, as necessary, to reflect the final Metro budget.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Approve Resolution No. 06-3668 which adopts the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) continuing the transportation planning work program for FY 2007; and authorize submittal of grant applications to the appropriate funding agencies.

M E M O R A N D U M

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736
TEL 503 797 1700 | FAX 503 797 1794



METRO

DATE: April 5, 2006
TO: JPACT and Interested Parties
FROM: Ted Leybold: MTIP Manager
SUBJECT: TPAC Recommended comments on Region 1 STIP proposal

* * * * *

ODOT Region 1 has a draft proposal for the major portions of the 2008-11 State Transportation Implementation Program (STIP). The proposal was created to respond to screening and prioritization criteria of the Oregon Transportation Commission. The Preservation and Bridge portions of the program were generated by their respective management systems and then reviewed by local staff.

The proposed program needs to be narrowed further to available funding. Region 1 is requesting comments on the proposal and direction on how to narrow the program to available funding by April 14th. The proposed projects, organized by the Modernization, Preservation, Safety and Bridge categories are attached.

A draft list of projects balanced to forecast revenues will be submitted by Region 1 to ODOT headquarters for inclusion in the draft STIP. The draft STIP will be then be made available for public review and comment this fall.

A TPAC workshop was held March 20th to consider draft comments on the STIP proposal. Metro staff introduced a set of potential comments for consideration by workshop participants. TPAC then considered and recommended a revised letter for JPACT consideration at its March 31st meeting.

The basis for these comments were formed from the 2006-09 STIP comment letter adopted by JPACT and the Metro Council in 2004. That letter is available on request and will be provided in hard copy at the JPACT meeting.

April 13, 2006

Mr. Jason Tell
Director: ODOT Region 1
123 NW Flanders
Portland, OR 97202

Dear Mr. Tell:

Thank you for conducting an early coordination STIP process to solicit input on a draft list of eligible projects. This effort responds to the priority recommendation made by my Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council during the 2006-09 STIP process for implementation during this STIP cycle. It begins a healthy debate of project priorities and allows the opportunity for early coordination of state and local projects.

Following the close of the public comment period April 14th, JPACT and the Metro Council look forward to reviewing the comments received on your draft proposal, the technical evaluation of the candidate modernization projects, and how the comments and technical evaluation were used to develop a final recommendation. We will make available our technical staff to support your efforts on evaluation and narrowing of the candidate modernization list. With this information, we look forward to developing a recommendation to the Oregon Transportation Commission for a narrowed list of candidate projects prior to the August deadline for submission of the draft program to ODOT headquarters.

Additionally, JPACT and the Metro Council appreciate ODOT recognizing the importance of public comment and local coordination in finalizing the project list and timing for projects prioritized through the Preservation, Safety and Bridge management systems. While these management systems provide important data regarding system conditions, their outputs of suggested project priorities need to be supplemented with additional technical and policy data that may not be quantifiable or tracked in the management system. Suggested projects should also be coordinated with other state and local projects to achieve cost-efficiencies and minimize construction impacts. Coordination suggestions are listed in **Attachment 1**.

Specific requests are organized below by funding program category.

Modernization

The Metro region has more than \$2 billion dollars of highway project needs identified in the Regional Transportation Plan and recognizes the importance of working with ODOT, the State Legislature, FHWA and Congress to identify additional resources for programming to priority projects in the STIP. With existing modernization revenues as identified by the OTC, JPACT and the Metro Council would appreciate consideration of the following project and program comments for the 2008-11 STIP.

1. Propose projects in the existing RTP financially constrained system

Two projects on the draft Modernization list are not in the existing 2004 RTP financially constrained project list: the I-5 Southbound/I-205 Merge Lane (\$3 million) and the Troutdale Marine Drive backage road (\$7.9 million). Projects included in the TIP should have already been vetted through the regional planning process. While these may be good projects, they have not received an evaluation of priority relative to the other highway projects in the financially constrained system and it is not clear at this time that they warrant prioritization for funding relative to those other projects. JPACT and the Metro Council recommend ODOT not propose projects that are not in the RTP financially constrained system. These projects may be evaluated for inclusion in the 2007 RTP update for inclusion in the 20-year financially constrained project list prior to inclusion in the TIP.

Should such a project be prioritized for funding, it would need to be amended into the RTP financially constrained system and complete an air quality analysis and consultation process for conformity with the State Implementation Plan for air quality. Amendments to the RTP at this time would require updating the plan to comply with a requirement for a current twenty-year planning horizon. This would mean updating the financial forecast, project list and air quality conformity for the entire plan. With the current 2007 RTP update process underway, the region strongly encourages ODOT not request a separate update process that would be required to amend these projects into to the plan. To maintain fiscal constraint of the Regional Transportation Plan, projects of equal funding would also need to be removed from the financially constrained system.

This recommendation is consistent with the process defined for the prioritization of projects for regional flexible funds through the Transportation Priorities allocation process.

2. Continue funding of the Preservation Project Pedestrian/Bike supplement

ODOT responded to regional concerns about early coordination with preservation projects and the ability to fund supplemental pedestrian, bicycle and other work as part of preservation projects with a supplemental funding program of \$1 million for the 2008-09 biennium. ODOT should continue funding of the Preservation Pedestrian/Bike supplemental work with another \$1 million for the 2010-11 biennium. The early coordination this process allows is critical to achieve economies of scale and to minimize disruption that would result from separate preservation and capital improvement project timing. Continued funding of a supplemental program is crucial to carrying out improvements identified in the coordination process.

3. Coordinate proposal with Planning and Project Development activities

Further information regarding the Planning activities outlined in the 2006-07 Unified Planning and Work Program, emerging planning activities and project development work and whether there is adequate budget to perform this work would be helpful to understand in the context of the modernization proposal. Budget shortfalls to address these activities could then be evaluated for priority relative to capital needs identified in the modernization project list. Specifically, the information regarding how ODOT intends to address the following potential activities is requested.

A. Recent Corridor Plan priorities

In order to address urgent transportation priorities identified in collaboration with the community during recent corridor planning work, it is important to address the highest priority actions adopted in those plans. JPACT and the Metro Council request that ODOT evaluate whether the following activities can be adequately provided for within the current Region 1 planning budget as described in the UPWP. If not, we request that these projects be evaluated for potential funding from modernization or other funding within the draft 2008-11 STIP proposal.

A1. Highway 217 EIS (RTP Project # 3004)

The Highway 217 Corridor Transportation Plan identified the importance of completing an EIS for the corridor so that ramp and interchange improvements can be implemented as funding becomes available. Specifically, the plan, adopted by the Plan's Policy Advisory Committee, JPACT and the Metro Council, identified as a next step that "Metro, ODOT, and the local jurisdictions should seek to include in the draft 2008-11 STIP funding for the Highway 217 EIS."

A2.I-205/Powell Boulevard Interchange (RTP Project #1163)

The Powell/Foster Corridor Transportation Phase I Plan identifies as a next step within the Roadway section the implementation of RTP Project No. 1164 to plan and design the interchange improvements at I-205/Powell Boulevard. The recommendation identifies ODOT as the lead agency for the study to evaluate modifications to the existing overpass with full access ramps to I-205.

B. I-5/I-405 Loop

The I-5/I-405 Loop is a project of statewide significance and is currently finishing a planning process to identify future alignment and design alternatives. This facility is the only corridor of statewide significance not to receive some form of modernization funding. JPACT understands that the city of Portland will lead efforts to obtain further project development funds for this project and that ODOT intends to work with regional partners to continue efforts at resolving priority improvements in this corridor. The corridor contains several possible project development opportunities, including the I-5: I-84 to Greely segment. Should funding be identified through this effort, a future STIP amendment would be needed.

C. North Milwaukie Industrial Area

McLoughlin Boulevard between Highway 224 and Johnson Creek Boulevard has experienced safety and access related issues since implementation of the new Highway 224 ramp connection improvement was constructed in the early 1990's. The surrounding north Milwaukie industrial area continues to seek improved access to McLoughlin Boulevard and Highway 224. These access issues will be exacerbated with land use intensification and access issues associated with the future Milwaukie light rail project. The City of Milwaukie is interested in studying circulation and access issues in the north Milwaukie industrial area and would benefit from a coordinated effort with ODOT, TriMet and Metro. JPACT understands that ODOT intends to work with affected agencies on the South Corridor phase II planning activities which may lead to proposals for future Development STIP activities.

4. Fund STA Implementation Program

Per previous requests, ODOT should begin implementation of a Special Transportation Area project (or program) to ensure that the transportation system is supporting our state and local planning goals. ODOT has recently adopted Special Transportation Area guidelines in the Oregon Highway Plan to

support mixed-use development in designated community centers along state highways.

Completing transportation systems in urban areas to support development patterns and peak-hour mode shifts from single occupant vehicles should be a priority investment of ODOT as it reduces the need for providing more expensive capacity projects in urbanizing rural areas. Our mutual effort to attempt to define and identify funding for transportation services to the Damascus area illustrates this point. Success of our strategy of accommodating the majority of expected growth within existing urban areas depends on the provision of whole transportation systems that support economic development of mixed-use areas.

There are eight STA designated areas within the Metro area the ODOT could address with a funding program. Metro staff and TPAC are willing to work with ODOT staff in the development of a specific project proposal for inclusion in the 2008-11 or the 2010-13 STIP. Alternatively, a planning process to identify a strategy for how ODOT could participate in the development of an STA implementation program is requested.

5. Regional balance

As ODOT works to propose a final modernization list, JPACT and the Metro Council request that ODOT consider regional balance when considering proposals to narrow to a regionally balanced program and a balanced urban/rural program. This request is made understanding that within a small modernization program with expensive projects may need to consider balance over a long-term perspective. As JPACT and the Metro Council develops a recommendation to the Oregon Transportation Commission on the modernization program, regional balance will be considered.

Preservation

The early identification of potential preservation projects provides the opportunity to coordinate with local project and funding opportunities as well as other state program efforts. The region looks forward to identifying how to prioritize and program a state preservation program that maximizes funding efficiencies and minimizes construction disruption.

Specific coordination opportunities are listed in an Attachment 1.

Safety

Further explanation of the Safety Priority Index System and Safety Management System data and the projects identified to address this data would be helpful in providing recommendations on project priority and local coordination opportunities. JPACT and the Metro Council are interested in safety projects addressing the priorities identified in the comprehensive Oregon Traffic Safety Performance and Safety Action Plans.

Secondly, JPACT and the Metro Council are interested in local transportation staff working further with ODOT to identify and evaluate transportation safety issues that are unique to the urban setting. We will make local transportation planning staff available to be involved in the next update of the Oregon Transportation Safety Action Plan. We also request local transportation staff participate with ODOT in the development of the Oregon Traffic Safety Performance Plan and the development of safety projects to address identified safety issues within the Metro area.

Bridge

The region is interested in the progress in developing a proposed local bridge list and whether local bridge programming is intended to be consistent with understandings regarding target splits between large and small bridges.

The region is also interested in knowing how the SAFETEA-LU earmarks of \$160 million for 1-5 bridges and \$40 million for statewide bridges will be allocated to specific projects when that information is available.

Specific coordination issues are identified in Attachment 1.

Other State and SAFETEA-LU Implementation Programs

The region is interested in information regarding how ODOT intends to implement the Safe Routes to Schools program and any other new SAFETEA-LU authorized programs.

The region would like to support funding of travel options marketing program within the Public Transit Division budget in the 2010-11 biennium.

The region would also request information about whether the funding proposal activities associated with the Oregon Innovative Partnership Program need to be identified in the STIP to ensure eligibility of project funding.

Attachment 1

The following comments are to provide ODOT staff with information about local activities that may influence consideration of project ripeness, project timing or project scope.

Preservation Program Coordination

- US 26: North Plains to Cornell (2009). A modernization project has been identified on US 26: 185th to Cornell: how would these projects be coordinated?
- OR43: McVey to I-205. Two street design studies will be underway within the year on West Linn portions of this segment. Should coordinate design and opportunities for supplemental work to implement new street design recs.
- OR 8: Mintner Bridge to Forest Grove. Need to confirm the location of Mintner Bridge. The Hillsboro 10th Avenue turn lane project and Cornelius Boulevard and 10th Avenue projects could be affected.
- OR 213 (82nd): Killingsworth to Hwy 224. City of Portland has an ITS project on 82nd Avenue scheduled for 2006. Opportunities for Safety project coordination
- Regional flexible funds have been allocated to the St. Johns freight and pedestrian project, currently programmed for construction in 2009. Planning activities to develop a final design option will begin this year and ODOT staff should participate in this City led effort to prepare for the eventual preservation project. Also, US 30B (Lombard). Portland has a main street design per St. Johns/Lombard Plan. The main street elements could be implemented through supplemental funding from SWIP, Preservation Supplemental modernization funds, STA Implementation funding (if created), regional flexible funding or local funding options.
- US 99E: Naef to MP 13.04. The City of Oregon City has a boulevard project programmed for 2008. These projects need to coordinate schedules if the preservation project is prioritized for funding.

Bridge Program Coordination

- The historic Oregon City to West Linn Bridge is proposed for preservation work by ODOT in 2008. Metro will work with ODOT Region One staff and the City of Oregon City on coordination of this work and the McLoughlin Boulevard (OR 99E) boulevard work in the vicinity of this bridge, currently scheduled for 2008, to minimize disruption to the surrounding community with the construction of improved pedestrian treatment on McLoughlin Boulevard. It will

be important to upgrade bike/pedestrian facilities on this narrow bridge to the extent feasible.

- OR99E: Viaduct repair – potential to coordinate with Oregon City boulevard retrofit of McLoughlin Boulevard adjacent to bridge project. The viaduct repair project should also consider inclusion of cleaning and painting.

Safety Program Coordination

- US 26 (Powell Boulevard) 122nd to 136th add center turn lane, bike lanes and sidewalks. This project should be evaluated for consistency with the design recommended in the Powell – Foster Corridor Plan.
- OR 213 (82nd Avenue): Foster Road WB and EB right turn lanes. This project should be coordinated with design work on this intersection already completed by TriMet and the City of Portland to improve pedestrian safety and transit stop improvements and the 82nd Avenue ATMS project led by the City of Portland.

ODOT Region 1 Draft Bridge Project List for 2008-2011 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

Key Number	Project Name	Bridge ID	Pre-Estimate*	Project Description	County	Freight
2008						
			x 1,000			
14014	OR43: Willamette River Bridge (Oregon City)	02552	\$ 3,514	Repair and Rehabilitation	Clackamas	Yes
TBD	US26: West Fork Dairy Creek, MP 46.30	02673	\$ 2,024	Replace bridge with new Prestressed Beam bridge (1 mile east of US26/OR47)	Washington	Yes
TBD	Nehalem River, OR47 (Banzer)	03140A	\$ 1,346	Place deck overlay; Retrofit rails, Repair cracked girders with post-tensioning; Repair cracked stringers with post-tensioning; Repair cracked cols with ext stirrups, post-tensioning; Repair cracked caps with post-tensioning	Columbia	No
TBD	OR 213 Milk Creek	02120	\$ 3,000	Replace bridge which lies between a preservation and safety project.	Multnomah	No
TBD	I-205: Columbia River N Channel, (Glenn Jackson)	09555	\$ 2,565	Repair bad deck joints.	Multnomah	Yes
	<i>Subtotal</i>		\$ 12,449			
2009						
14180	Lewis and Clark (Longview) Bridge Painting Project	02046	\$ 10,834	Repaint Bridge, Partnership with State of Washington	Columbia	Yes
TBD	OR99E: Parrot Creek	00580	\$ 1,525	Remove wearing surface & place deck overlay	Clackamas	No
TBD	Mt Scott Creek & Union Pacific RR (82nd Ave)@MP9.67	02135A	\$ 378	Retrofit old picket fence railing each side. Bridge is north of Milwaukie Expressway.	Clackamas	No
TBD	OR47: Nehalem River (Miles Bridge - Vernonia)	02323	\$ 3,300	Replace bridge. #2 Priority Recommendation from NW Area Commission on Transportation.	Columbia	No
TBD	OR99W over Portland/Western RR (Tigard)	02532	\$ 7,615	Replace bridge with new Prestressed Beam Bridge.	Washington	Yes
	<i>Subtotal</i>		\$ 23,652			
2010						
TBD	OR99E: SE Water Street Viaduct, (McLoughlin Blvd) @ MP12.29	02374	\$ 389	Retrofit rails to type F at curb; Repair deck joints; Repair cracks in superstructure; Repair cracks in substructure; Repair & clean rocker bearings; Rail transitions.	Multnomah	No
TBD	OR99E: Partial Viaduct, SB @ MP13.86	07164	\$ 693	Replace with Soldier pile retaining wall	Clackamas	No
TBD	I-205: Willamette R & OR99E & OR43,(George Abernethy)	09403	\$ 12,823	Place deck overlay; Repair strip seal expansion joints; Repair open expansion joints; Repair other deck joints.	Clackamas	Yes
TBD	I-5 SB Over the Union Pacific RR	S8588E	\$ 8,152	Overlay; Retrofit rails; Joint repair.	Multnomah	Yes
	<i>Subtotal</i>		\$ 22,057			
2011						
TBD	OR8: Dairy Creek on TV Highway	00744B	\$ 1,508	Retrofit rails with new historic type rails; Joint repair; Corbel catcher blocks; Cable restraints; Other Phase 1 seismic retrofit work; Rail transitions; New RC end panels	Washington	No
TBD	OR99W over SW Multnomah Blvd	02010	\$ 4,498	Replace bridge with new Prestressed Slabs Br with 7' sidewalks, historic rails.	Multnomah	No
	<i>Subtotal</i>		\$ 6,006			
Total for 2008-2011 STIP			\$ 64,164			
Bold = Projects funded in the 2006-2009 STIP						
Freight = Bridge in on State Highway Freight System						
Federal Earmark						
TBD	I-5: SW Iowa Street Viaduct (MP298.2)	08197	\$ 20,000	Replace Structure	Multnomah	Yes

* Project cost based on planning level estimates and are subject to revision after project scoping.

**ODOT Region 1 Candidate Preservation
Project List for 2008-2011 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)**

Key Number	Project Name	In current STIP*	Project Description	County	
2008	Region 1 Actual Allocation = \$10.729M	x 1,000			
13715	US 26: E. Mountain Air Dr. - E. Lolo Pass Rd.	\$ 2,411		Clackamas	
13716	US 26: MP 44.03 - MP49.2	\$ 2,135		Clackamas	
13708	US 30: Yeon Steet Preservation	\$ 2,605		Multnomah	
13712	US 26: SE 51st - I-205 (East Portland Freeway)	\$ 2,000		Multnomah	
13713	US 26: MP37.26 - MP39	\$ 1,353		Multnomah	
13972	Reserve PE & RW Preservation 2008	\$ 726		Various	
13970	Reserve Utilities Preservation 2008	\$ 292		Various	
2009	Region 1 Actual Allocation = \$13.098M + 4.3M				
13706	OR224: Jct Hwy 172 - Jct Hwy 161	\$ 3,146		Clackamas	
13709	OR213: MP7.7 - MP 10.75	\$ 1,275		Clackamas	
13710	OR213: S. Henrici Road - S Monte Carlo Wy	\$ 813		Clackamas	
13971	Reserve Utilities Preservation 2009	\$ 304		Various	
13973	Reserve PE & RW Preservation 2009	\$ 754		Various	
13707	US26: North Plains - Cornell Rd	\$ 9,536		Washington	
TBD	OR213: Oregon City bypass I-205-Conway	\$ 4,300	Pavements Committee selected this project for funding in 2009, project will be added to the 2006-2009 STIP via OTC amendment	Clackamas	
* Amounts programmed may include funds from other programs (ie. Operations and Safety)					
2010	Region 1 Allocation = \$19.4M	Pre- Estimate**			
2011	Region 1 Allocation = \$20.3M	Begin MP	End MP	x1,000	
TBD	OR43: I-5 - Terwilliger (Macadam)	0	2.79	\$ 5,900 Urban	Multnomah
TBD	OR8: Sunset Hwy - Hwy 217 (Canyon Road)	0.05	3.18	\$ 3,150 Urban	Washington
TBD	OR43: McVey - I-205	6.7	11.66	\$ 3,750 Urban	Clackamas
TBD	OR8: Minter Br. Rd. - Forest Grove	11.28	17.46	\$ 8,810 Urban - Project runs through City of Hillsboro - Will need to be supplemented with other funds	Washington
TBD	OR141 and OR210: Hall, Boones Ferry, Scholls Ferry	2.57	various	\$ 6,770 Urban - Beaverton / Tigard - Will need to be supplemented with other funds	Washington
TBD	OR10: Farmington Rd (SW 198th - SW173rd)	5.88	7.53	\$ 1,160 Urban - Will need to be supplemented with other funds	Washington
TBD	OR219: OR8 - Farmington Rd.	0	5.43	\$ 2,960 Urban / Rural	Washington
TBD	US26: Military Cr. Rd. - Wolf Cr.	26	37.4	\$ 4,620 Rural	Washington
TBD	US26: Wolf Cr. - West Fork Dairy Cr.	37.4	45	\$ 4,500 Rural	Washington
TBD	OR47: US26 - Banks	80.8	82.85	\$ 1,170 Rural	Washington
TBD	OR99E: MLK Viaduct - Kellog Cr.	1.31	5.97	\$ 6,440 Urban	Multnomah
TBD	US30B: NE 60th - Sandy Blvd	9.2	11.25	\$ 2,050 Urban	Multnomah
TBD	OR99E: I-5 - Columbia Blvd	-6.09	-4.01	\$ 3,410 Urban	Multnomah
TBD	OR99E: Naef - MP 13.04	9.19	13.04	\$ 5,450 Urban	Clackamas
TBD	US26: I-205 - Gresham (SE 182nd Ave)	5.75	9.96	\$ 2,960 Urban - Will need to be supplemented with other funds	Clackamas
TBD	OR213: 82nd (NE. Killingsworth - Hwy. 224)	0	10.18	\$ 15,790 Urban - Will need to be supplemented with other funds	Multnomah / Clackamas
TBD	OR213: I-205 - Conway	0	4	\$ 5,740 Urban	Clackamas
TBD	OR99E: City of Canby	20.46	22.11	\$ 3,300 Urban	Clackamas
TBD	US30B: Lombard Street	1.31	6.25	\$ 21,930 Urban - Will need to be supplemented with other funds	Multnomah
TBD	OR211: OR213 - Mathias Rd (Molalla)	11	13	\$ 1,480 Urban - Will need to be supplemented with other funds	Clackamas
TBD	US30: City of Cascade Locks	29.7	30.33	\$ 930 Project runs through City of Cascade Locks	Hood River
TBD	US26: Sandy - MP 30 (add 33.2-34.1 if needed)	22.49	34.1	\$ 8,250 Urban / Rural - Project runs through City of Sandy	Multnomah
TBD	OR281/282: Hood River - OR35	0	5.09	\$ 3,620 Urban / Rural	Hood River
TBD	OR211: Meadowbrook - Hult Rd.	16.39	20.89	\$ 1,580 Rural	Clackamas
TBD	OR224: Rock Cr. - Eagle Cr.	8.15	17.92	\$ 3,440 Rural	Clackamas
TBD	OR224: Estacada - Forest Bdry.	23.84	31.56	\$ 3,180 Rural	Clackamas
TBD	OR211: Sandy - Eagle Cr.	-0.23	5.94	\$ 2,160 Rural	Clackamas
TBD	US26: MP49.2 - 62.15	49.2	62.15	\$ 11,420 Rural	Clackamas
TBD	OR35: Jct. US26 - Polallie Cr	57.2	73.18	\$ 11,740 Rural	Hood River
<i>Total</i>				\$ 157,660	**Pre-estimate figures are for paving work only and does not include other features (drainage, curbs, sidewalk)
Region 1 Preservation Target for 2010 and 2011		\$39.7M	Region 1 Target (Urban) = \$17.7M, Target Lane Miles = 53.6 Region 1 Target (Rural) = \$22.0M, Target Lane Miles = 88.1		
Total Preservation Target for 2008-2011		\$67.827M			
Bold = Projects funded in the 2006-2009 STIP			08/09 already programmed = \$28.127		

* Project cost based on planning level estimates and are subject to revision after project scoping.

ODOT Region 1 Candidate Safety Project List for 2008-2011 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

Key Number	Project Name		Project Name		
2008 Region 1 Allocation = \$15.160M			2009 Region 1 Actual = \$12.610M		
12840	US26: Wildwood - Wemme	Clackamas	13721	OR 219 @ East Laurel Rd.	Washington
13764	2008 Safety Project	Various	13765	2009 Safety Project	Various
13723	OR213: Cascade Hwy S. @ S Mulino Rd [Left turn]	Clackamas	13728	OR 99E: MP 14.0 - MP 14.9 (Oregon City)	Clackamas
13729	Light Emitting Diode (LED) Signal Upgrade	Various	13722	US 26: Salmonberry Road - Viewpoint Sec (HEP) (Tillamook State Forest)	Washington
13724	OR213: Cascade Hwy S @ S Barnards Rd	Clackamas	13730	Reserve PE & RW Safety 2009	Various
13732	2008 Button Replacement Program	Various	13731	2009 Button Replacement Program	Various
13744	Reserve PE & RW Safety 2008	Various	13975	Reserve Utilities Safety 2009	Various
13725	OR 219: Midway - McFee Creek	Washington	13733	2009 Safety Reserve	Various
13974	Reserve Utilities Safety 2008	Various			

2010	Region 1 Allocation = \$13.832M
2011	Region 1 Allocation = \$14.456M

	Project Name	Begin MP	End MP	Pre-Estimate*	Project Description	Safety Issue	County
TBD	I -5: N Vancouver Av - Burnside Bridge	301.70	302.60	Med	SB Exit Only Lane to Morrison Bridge (add to Paving Project)	Rear End & Side Swipe	Multnomah
TBD	I-5: Interstate Bridge - Jantzen Beach	307.77	307.98	Low	ITS signing (Operations)	SB Rear End	Multnomah
TBD	OR 99E@Columbia Blvd.	-4.01		Med	WB Right Turn Lane on Columbia Blvd	Rear End & Turning	Multnomah
TBD	OR 99W: Capitol Hwy.-SW Huber	6.21	6.30	Med	SB Left turn lane to Capitol Hwy, Two way SW Huber	Turning	Multnomah
TBD	I-84: I-205 to 122nd	9.70	10.00	Med	EB Exit Only Lane, add to I-84 Paving Project	Rear End & Side Swipe	Multnomah
TBD	US 30: Ramp to Lewis & Clark Bridge	48.71	48.74	Low	Acceleration Lane	Rear End	Columbia
TBD	US 26: 122nd to 136th	7.21	7.90	High	Construct center turn lane, bike lanes sidewalks	Rear End & Turning	Multnomah
TBD	US 26: Zig Zag River - Bruin Run Rd	46.02	47.39	High	EB & WB passing lanes, 16'median, realign curve; Add to 2008 Paving Project	Lane Departure	Clackamas
TBD	US 26: Bruin Run Rd - Ski Bowl	47.39	52.50	High	Extend WB passing lane, 16' median (add to 2009 Rock fall Project)	Lane Departure	Clackamas
TBD	US 26: Vista Ridge Tunnel to I-405 South	73.70	2C74.05	Med	Two lane ramp to I-405, Close Montgomery On Ramp	Rear End	Multnomah
TBD	OR 213: Foster Road WB Right Turn Lane	5.76		High	WB Right Turn Lane	Rear End	Multnomah
TBD	OR 213: Foster Road EB Right Turn Lane	5.76		High	EB Right Turn Lane	Rear End	Multnomah
TBD	OR 47: South Fork Dairy Cr - Kemper Rd	86.20	86.80	High	Realign curves and widen shoulders	Lane Departure	Columbia
TBD	US 30 Bypass: NE122nd to NE141st	12.40	13.49	Med	Channelization	Turning & Rear End	Multnomah
TBD	OR 219 @ Midway	8.00	8.50	Med	Realign curve and widen shoulders	Lane Departure	Washington
TBD	OR 219 @ Wolsborn	9.60	9.90	High	Realign curve and widen shoulders; requires bridge	Lane Departure	Washington
TBD	OR 217: Allen Blvd. - Denny Rd	2.48	3.02	Low	Congested Weave Corrections	Rear End	Washington
TBD	OR 213: Mulino-Blackman's Corner	11.30	16.10	Med	Widen Segments with narrow shoulders (add to STIP Paving Project)	Off Road	Clackamas
TBD	OR 224 @ Johnson Rd	3.60	3.80	Low	Add third lane eastbound through signal	Rear End	Clackamas
TBD	OR 224: Carver - Barton	9.21	15.00	High	Realign curves and widen shoulders (add to STIP Paving Project)	Lane Departure	Clackamas
TBD	OR 224 @ Tong Rd	10.00	10.60	High	Channelization (add to STIP Paving Project)	Lane Departure	Clackamas
TBD	OR 224 @ SE 197th Ave	11.30	11.70	High	Realign curves widen shoulders (add to STIP Paving Project)	Lane Departure	Clackamas
TBD	OR 224: MP 12.2 - 232nd Ave	12.20	13.50	High	Realign curves and widen shoulders (add to STIP Paving Project)	Lane Departure	Clackamas
TBD	OR 224 @ SE 232nd Ave	13.50	13.90	High	Channelization requiring a bridge (add to STIP Paving Project)	Lane Departure	Clackamas
TBD	OR 212 Sunnyside Road-Royer Road	2.50	2.85	Med	2nd eastbound lane	Rear end & turning	Clackamas
TBD	Region 1 Reflective Pavement Markers			Low	Bi-yearly projects to replace pavement markers (Operations)		Region-wide
TBD	Funding for Durable Striping in Preservation Projects			High	Operations		Region-wide

Total for 2008-2011 STIP

\$56.058M

Cost Low <\$1,000,000; Medium \$1,000,000 to \$3,000,000; High > \$3,000,000

Bold = Projects funded in the 2006-2009 STIP

*Cost estimates and years to be determined during project scoping.

*** Project cost based on planning level estimates and are subject to revision after project scoping.**

February 6, 2006

ODOT Region 1 150% Candidate Modernization Project List for 2008-2011 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

Key Number	Project Name	150%*	Pre-Estimate*	Project Description	County	RTP #	Freight
2008	Region 1 Allocation = \$19.362M + (DSTIP = \$1.5M)	x 1,000	x 1,000				
13720	I-205/Mall Light Rail Unit 3	\$ 5,000		Capital funding for light rail project.	Clack/Mult.		
13957	US26: Staley's Junction Improvement	\$ 500		Interchange Improvements at US26 and OR47.	Washington		State Rt, OFAC
13762	Sellwood Bridge EIS (D-STIP)	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	Funding for EIS work.	Multnomah	1012	
13955	2008 PE, R/W and Utilities for I-5 Delta Park Phase 1	\$ 2,104		Funding for project development, right of way acquisition and utility relocations.	Multnomah		
12076	I-5: Delta Park Phase 1 (Victory Blvd. - Lombard St.)	\$ 16,000	\$ 67,000	Constructs third lane SB. Fully funds project programmed in the 2006-2009 STIP.	Multnomah		State Rt, OFAC
13957	US26: Staley's Junction Improvement	\$ 5,000	\$ 12,000	Fully funds project programmed in 2006-2009 STIP.	Washington		State Rt, OFAC
14030	I-84: Replace/Lengthen Bridge Structure MP64.44 (Hood River exit 64)	\$ 1,539	\$ 1,539	Fully funds an OTIA 3 Bridge replacement project on I-84 in Hood River at OR35.	Hood River	N/A	State Rt, OFAC
TBD	I-5: Delta Park Phase 2 (Access Improvements at Columbia Blvd)	\$ 9,000	\$ 60,000	Access improvements at I-5/Columbia Blvd. This phase funds protective right of way acquisition and begins preliminary engineering.	Multnomah	4006	State Rt, OFAC
	<i>Subtotal</i>	\$ 40,643	\$ 142,039				
2009	Region 1 Allocation = \$17.199M + (DSTIP = \$0)						
13759	Pedestrian & Bicycle Elements for Pres projects	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	Funds bicycle and pedestrian facilities for 2008-2011 STIP Preservation Projects.	Various		
13953	US26: Langensand Rd - Brightwood Loop Rd	\$ 1,400	\$ 1,400	Constructs safety improvements between mp27 and mp41.	Clackamas		State Rt
13964	2009 PE, R/W and Utilities for US26 Glencoe Road	\$ 3,117		Funding for project development, right of way acquisition and utility relocations.	Various		
12885	US26: Sunset Hwy @ Glencoe Road	\$ 6,000	\$ 26,000	Constructs new interchange at US26 and Glencoe Road. This phase funds preliminary engineering and protective right of way acquisition. Also funds PE and construction for Glencoe Rd (US26 - West Union).	Washington		State Rt, OFAC
TBD	US30: Widening at Van Street	\$ 1,700	\$ 1,700	Widens US30 and constructs a left turn lane to Van St.(Clatskanie).	Columbia	N/A	State Rt
TBD	US30: Widening at Tide Creek	\$ 1,100	\$ 1,100	Widens US30 and constructs a turn lane to Tide Creek. (Columbia City).	Columbia	N/A	State Rt
	<i>Subtotal</i>	\$ 14,317	\$ 31,200				
2010	Region 1 Allocation = \$17.508M + (DSTIP = \$451k)						
TBD	I-5 SB / I-205 Merge: Acceleration Lane	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	Constructs acceleration lane at merge of I-205/I-5 SB for improved operations and safety.	Washington		State Rt
TBD	US26: 185th Ave - Cornell Road Widening	\$ 19,500	\$ 19,500	Continues widening from Cornell Road to SW 185th.	Washington	3011	State Rt
TBD	Troutdale Marine Dr/Backage Road	\$ 7,900	\$ 7,900	Completes Interchange Area Management Plan and constructs a new 2-lane road from I-84 EB off ramp (Marine Dr.) to 257th. Project in local Transportation System Plan.	Multnomah	Amend	
	<i>Subtotal</i>	\$ 30,400	\$ 30,400				
2011	Region 1 Allocation = \$17.508M + (DSTIP = \$451k)						
TBD	US26: Springwater Interchange Phase 1	\$ 5,800	\$ 5,800	Constructs at-grade intersection to serve Springwater industrial area.	Multnomah	phase of 2051	State Rt
TBD	I-5: Wilsonville Interchange	\$ 10,500	\$ 25,000	Funds interchange improvements at I-5 and Wilsonville. Project to be phased.	Clackamas	6138	State Rt, OFAC
TBD	OR212/OR224 Sunrise Corridor	\$ 7,000	\$ 60,000	Funds preliminary engineering and protective right of way acquisition.			OFAC
	<i>Subtotal</i>	\$ 23,300	\$ 90,800				
	Candidate List of 150%	\$ 108,660	\$ 290,039				
	Region 1 Modernization Target w/ DSTIP	\$ 73,979		Region 1 Target = \$73.979M available for 08-11 STIP includes \$2.402M for DSTIP			
	Bold = Projects funded in the 2006-2009 STIP			08/09 already programmed = \$14.621M			

OFAC = Project identified on Oregon Freight Advisory Committee Recommendations for High Priority Freight Mobility Projects

State Rt = Project on Oregon State Highway Freight System

*** Project cost based on planning level estimates and are subject to revision after project scoping.**

January 24, 2006

Memorandum

Date: March 20, 2006
To: Andy Cotugno, Metro
From: Steven M. Siegel, Siegel Consulting
Subject: Use of the MTIP Funds for Commuter Rail, Portland Streetcar, and I-205/Mall LRT Projects

1. Summary Conclusions

The following changes have been made to the Portland Streetcar and I-205/Mall LRT Project finance plans compared to that shown in the resolution establishing the multi-year commitment of MTIP funds to the regional rail projects:

- Shifted \$10 million of TriMet general fund bond proceeds from I-205/Mall LRT Project to Portland Streetcar project to retain Streetcar Project as a non-federally funded project.
- Shifted \$10 million of MTIP funds from Portland Streetcar to I-205/Mall LRT Project to keep I-205/Mall LRT Project whole.
- Increased use of MTIP funds to pay for pre-Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) costs from \$35 million to \$58.5 million, and expanded pre-FFGA costs to include right-of-way acquisition, vehicle and early material procurement, and early construction activities, in addition to Final Design costs.

The impacts of these changes are as follows:

- The shifting of general fund and MTIP funds between the Portland Streetcar Project and the I-205/Mall LRT Project results in both projects receiving the exact same amount of funds as initially proposed; only the source of funds have changed. This helps Streetcar and has no negative impact on I-205/Mall LRT.
- The increase in the use of MTIP funds to pay pre-FFGA costs for I-205/Mall LRT Project is proposed to keep project on schedule, minimize inflationary increases, and to comply with construction scheduling requirements along the Mall. Funds used to pay pre-FFGA costs would not be repaid should the project not receive a FFGA. However, this risk is considered minimal due to inclusion of proposed FFGA in President's Budget.

The JPACT/Metro MTIP resolution expressly provides TriMet the flexibility to use the funds in ways that differ from that anticipated at the time the resolution was enacted. Thus, while the current use of MTIP funds differs somewhat from initially anticipated, it appears to fully comply with both the JACT/Metro resolution and IGA. However, to avoid any misunderstandings regarding the use of these MTIP funds, we request JPACT's concurrence with the currently proposed use of MTIP funds. The following paragraphs provide additional detail.

2. Background Documents

2.1 JPACT/Metro Resolutions

In January 1997, the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 96-2442 that first established a multi-year commitment of Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) funds totaling \$55 million over the period of FY 1999-2009 for the South/North LRT Project. Over the next seven years the multi-year commitment was extended and increased, culminating in July 2004 with Resolution 04-3468.

In total, these resolutions made \$117.5 million available over 17 years for the Interstate MAX, Washington County Commuter Rail, I-205/Mall LRT, and Portland Streetcar projects. Of that total, \$41.5 million was allocated to the Interstate MAX Project. The remaining funds were allocated to three other projects. Since most of these remaining MTIP funds were not available until after the construction period of the three projects, TriMet anticipated issuing grant anticipation bonds, primarily secured by the future MTIP grants, to meet project development and construction requirements.

Key elements of the July 2004 resolution include the following (paraphrased):

- TriMet was required to prepare and implement a financing program to provide the following amounts, net of borrowing costs, to the following projects:

Project	Millions
I-205/Mall LRT Project	\$48.5
Commuter Rail Project	\$10.0
North Macadam Project	\$10.0

- TriMet was entitled to employ the multi-year commitment of MTIP funds to provide the amounts shown above to the respective projects in any manner that facilitates its funding and borrowing program.
- TriMet was permitted to use any portion of the multi-year commitment of MTIP funds to pay its general fund costs if needed to make TriMet general funds available to provide the amounts shown above to the respective projects.
- TriMet anticipated entering binding agreements with FTA and local governments committing TriMet to provide the amounts shown above and loan agreements that rely on receipt of the MTIP funds for repayment. Accordingly, the annual amounts were fully committed to TriMet; subject only to authorization and appropriation of MTIP funds.
- TriMet was expressly permitted to expend MTIP funds prior to receiving a Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) for the Commuter Rail and I-205/Mall LRT Projects; and the resolution acknowledged that MTIP will not be repaid or reimbursed should the projects not proceed to construction. At the time of the

resolution, it was anticipated that \$10 million of MTIP funds would be spent prior to the FFGA for Commuter Rail and \$35 million prior to the FFGA for Final Design costs for I-205/Mall LRT.

2.2 Metro-TriMet Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA)

Because TriMet intended to borrow directly against the MTIP allocation, to the extent possible, it was necessary for TriMet to enter into an IGA with Metro that implemented the JPACT/Metro resolution allocating the funds. For the most part the IGA simply established contractual terms that paralleled the provisions of the resolution, but it elaborated on how the bondholders would be kept whole in the event that authorization, appropriation or obligational ceiling levels were lower than expected. It also elaborated on how funds would be reallocated to other projects in the event that one or more of three projects receiving MTIP funds failed to progress to construction.

3. Status of MTIP Program

3.1 TriMet GARVEE Bonds

In June 2005 TriMet issued about \$85.5 million in grant anticipation revenue bonds (“GARVEE bonds” or “GARVEEs”) of which about \$71.5 million were backed by the MTIP allocation for the projects described above, and about \$14.0 million were backed by TriMet’s formula transit grants for general transit capital projects (i.e. buses, or other transit facilities) at TriMet’s discretion. Of the \$71.5 million in MTIP-backed proceeds, about \$3.0 million was for capitalized interest and issuance costs, and \$68.5 million for projects, as required by the Metro/JPACT resolution.

3.2 Portland Streetcar (North Macadam)

As anticipated by the JPACT/Metro resolution, TriMet and the City of Portland entered an IGA wherein TriMet pledged \$10 million toward the construction of the North Macadam Streetcar (“Streetcar”). The Streetcar proceeded to construction as a local project, and therefore did not comply with the environmental study requirements of NEPA. Since the MTIP-backed portion of the GARVEE bonds are federal funds, NEPA approval is required for their use on a project. As a result, at Portland’s request, TriMet committed \$10 million of TriMet general fund revenue bond proceeds to the Streetcar, and reprogrammed the \$10 million in GARVEE bond proceeds initially allocated to the Streetcar to the I-205/Mall LRT Project. Thus, TriMet fulfilled its requirements under the Metro/JPACT resolution and IGA by providing \$10 million to the Streetcar; and did so in a way that differed from how it was initially envisioned, but permitted by the resolution and IGA.

3.3 I-205/Mall LRT Project

As required by the JPACT/Metro resolution, TriMet entered into IGAs with Portland, PDC, and Clackamas County wherein each of the parties committed their share of

funding for the I-205/Mall LRT Project. In these IGAs, TriMet was to provide \$26.33 million in general fund revenue bond proceeds and \$48.5 million in GARVEE bond proceeds toward the construction of the project. Because TriMet had to provide \$10 million in general fund revenue bond proceeds to the Streetcar in lieu of \$10 million in GARVEEs, TriMet's funding plan for the I-205/Mall LRT was changed to provide \$16.33 million in general fund revenue bond proceeds and \$58.5 million in GARVEE bond proceeds. Thus while different than initially anticipated, the overall local funding for the I-205/Mall LRT is kept whole; consistent with the JPACT/Metro resolution and IGA.

When the JPACT/Metro Resolution was enacted, it was anticipated that \$35 million of the MTIP funds would be spent prior to receiving a FFGA. Section 2.3 of the resolution states:

FTA procedures require that Final Design be between 60 and 100 percent complete prior to commencing Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) negotiations. The finance plan anticipates that about \$35 million of Final Design and related engineering and administration costs will be incurred prior to executing a FFGA, and that such cost will be paid with proceeds from MTIP-backed bonds and/or MTIP grant funds. MTIP will not be repaid or reimbursed for such expenditures, should the project not proceed to construction.

Currently the finance plan calls for all \$58.5 million in GARVEE bond proceeds to be spent prior to the FFGA for Final Design, advance purchase of key materials, acquisition of light rail vehicles, and early construction activities. These pre-FFGA expenditures are required to keep the I205/Mall LRT project on schedule for a September 2009 opening. Keeping the project on schedule also keeps the overall project cost down because delays will result in inflated project costs. It is my opinion that the JPACT/Metro resolution did not intend to limit pre-FFGA expenditures to only final design costs or cap spending at \$35 million; this was merely the estimate at the time of the resolution. In support of this opinion note that the resolution uses the term “*anticipates about*” when referring to the \$35 million rather than language expressly limiting pre-FFGA expenditures; and the resolution acknowledges that estimates would change through the project development process.¹ Further, the IGA acknowledges that expenditures will be made pre-FFGA without addressing any limitations or estimates of how much would be spent pre-FFGA or what it would be spent on.² Thus, the expenditure of \$58.5 million of MTIP funds prior to the FFGA does not appear to be inconsistent with the resolution or IGA.

¹ Section 2.1 of the resolution states, with regard to the I-205/Mall LRT project finance plan that “*This finance plan is preliminary, and subject to change due to Preliminary Engineering, Final Design, Full Funding Grant Agreement negotiations with FTA, and other future adjustments.*”

² Section 3.2(d) of the IGA states: “*In the event that one or more of the projects described in the Regional Funding Plan do not proceed to construction, the difference between the actual expenses incurred on those projects and the amounts shown ... herein shall be made available by TriMet for reallocation to other regional projects through a regional process ...*”

3.4 Commuter Rail Project

The JPACT/Metro resolution and IGA anticipate that \$10 million in MTIP funds will be provided to the Commuter Rail Project; the current finance plan complies with this expectation. While the finance plan shows \$11.25 million in GARVEE bond proceeds, \$1.25 million of that total is from the non-MTIP component of the GARVEEs, which are essentially TriMet general funds.

4. Conclusion

The MTIP resolution is being fully implemented; two of the projects (Interstate MAX and Streetcar) to be funded by the overall MTIP allocation have been completed and the other two (Commuter Rail and I-205/Mall LRT) will be under contract this year. While the current use of MTIP funds differs somewhat from initially anticipated, it appears to fully comply with both the JACT/Metro resolution and IGA. However, we cannot afford to have any misunderstandings on this issue. Thus, TriMet requests:

- (a) A determination by Metro that the current use of MTIP funds as outlined above is consistent with the resolution and IGA, and
- (b) This issue to be presented to JPACT to ensure full understanding and consensus on the use of the funds.
- (c) Should there be a determination that the current plan does not fully comply with the resolution and IGA, the resolution and/or IGA be amended to make them consistent with the current finance plans. If we need to proceed in this manner, I could provide you with an initial draft of the amending language.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me. Thanks for your assistance.

Materials following this page were distributed at the meeting.

M E M O R A N D U M

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736
TEL 503 797 1700 | FAX 503 797 1794



METRO

DATE: April 5, 2006
TO: JPACT and Interested Parties
FROM: Ted Leybold: MTIP Manager
SUBJECT: TPAC Recommended comments on Region 1 STIP proposal

* * * * *

ODOT Region 1 has a draft proposal for the major portions of the 2008-11 State Transportation Implementation Program (STIP). The proposal was created to respond to screening and prioritization criteria of the Oregon Transportation Commission. The Preservation and Bridge portions of the program were generated by their respective management systems and then reviewed by local staff.

The proposed program needs to be narrowed further to available funding. Region 1 is requesting comments on the proposal and direction on how to narrow the program to available funding by April 14th. The proposed projects, organized by the Modernization, Preservation, Safety and Bridge categories are attached.

A draft list of projects balanced to forecast revenues will be submitted by Region 1 to ODOT headquarters for inclusion in the draft STIP. The draft STIP will be then be made available for public review and comment this fall.

A TPAC workshop was held March 20th to consider draft comments on the STIP proposal. Metro staff introduced a set of potential comments for consideration by workshop participants. TPAC then considered and recommended a revised letter for JPACT consideration at its March 31st meeting.

The basis for these comments were formed from the 2006-09 STIP comment letter adopted by JPACT and the Metro Council in 2004. That letter is available on request and will be provided in hard copy at the JPACT meeting.

April 13, 2006

Mr. Jason Tell
Director: ODOT Region 1
123 NW Flanders
Portland, OR 97202

Dear Mr. Tell:

Thank you for conducting an early coordination STIP process to solicit input on a draft list of eligible projects. This effort responds to the priority recommendation made by Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council during the 2006-09 STIP process for implementation during this STIP cycle. It begins a healthy debate of project priorities and allows the opportunity for early coordination of state and local projects.

Following the close of the public comment period April 14th, JPACT and the Metro Council look forward to reviewing the comments received on your draft proposal, the technical evaluation of the candidate modernization projects, and how the comments and technical evaluation were used to develop a final recommendation. We will make available our technical staff to support your efforts on evaluation and narrowing of the candidate modernization list. With this information, we look forward to developing a recommendation to the Oregon Transportation Commission for a narrowed list of candidate projects prior to the August deadline for submission of the draft program to ODOT headquarters.

Additionally, JPACT and the Metro Council appreciate ODOT recognizing the importance of public comment and local coordination in finalizing the project list and timing for projects prioritized through the Preservation, Safety and Bridge management systems. While these management systems provide important data regarding system conditions, their outputs of suggested project priorities need to be supplemented with additional technical and policy data that may not be quantifiable or tracked in the management system. Suggested projects should also be coordinated with other state and local projects to achieve cost-efficiencies and minimize construction impacts. Coordination suggestions are listed in **Attachment 1**.

Specific requests are organized below by funding program category.

Modernization

The Metro region has more than \$2 billion dollars of highway project needs identified in the Regional Transportation Plan and recognizes the importance of working with ODOT, the State Legislature, FHWA and Congress to identify additional resources for programming to priority projects in the STIP. With existing modernization revenues as identified by the OTC, JPACT and the Metro Council would appreciate consideration of the following project and program comments for the 2008-11 STIP.

1. Propose projects in the existing RTP financially constrained system

Two projects on the draft Modernization list are not in the existing 2004 RTP financially constrained project list: the I-5 Southbound/I-205 Merge Lane (\$3 million) and the Troutdale Marine Drive backage road (\$7.9 million). Projects included in the TIP should have already been vetted through the regional planning process. While these may be good projects, they have not received an evaluation of priority relative to the other highway projects in the financially constrained system and it is not clear at this time that they warrant prioritization for funding relative to those other projects. JPACT and the Metro Council recommend ODOT not propose projects that are not in the RTP financially constrained system. These projects ~~may~~ should be evaluated for inclusion in the 2007 RTP update for inclusion in the 20-year financially constrained project list prior to consideration for inclusion in the TIP.

Should such a project be prioritized for funding prior to the scheduled RTP update, it would need to be amended into the RTP financially constrained system and complete an air quality analysis and consultation process for conformity with the State Implementation Plan for air quality. This would be a costly and out-of-sequence process. Amendments to the RTP at this time would require updating the plan to comply with a requirement for a current twenty-year planning horizon. This would mean updating the financial forecast, project list and air quality conformity for the entire plan. To maintain fiscal constraint of the Regional Transportation Plan, projects of equal funding would also need to be removed from the financially constrained system. With the current 2007 RTP update process underway, the region strongly encourages ODOT not request a separate update process that would be required to amend these projects into to the plan.

This recommendation is consistent with the process defined for the prioritization of projects for regional flexible funds through the Transportation Priorities allocation process.

2. Continue funding of the Preservation Project Pedestrian/Bike supplement

ODOT responded to regional concerns about early coordination with preservation projects and the ability to fund supplemental pedestrian, bicycle and other work as part of preservation projects with a supplemental funding

program of \$1 million for the 2008-09 biennium. ODOT should continue funding of the Preservation Pedestrian/Bike supplemental work with another \$1 million for the 2010-11 biennium. The early coordination this process allows is critical to achieve economies of scale and to minimize disruption that would result from separate preservation and capital improvement project timing. Continued funding of a supplemental program is crucial to carrying out improvements identified in the coordination process.

3. Coordinate proposal with Planning and Project Development activities

Further information regarding the Planning activities outlined in the 2006-07 Unified Planning and Work Program, emerging planning activities and project development work and whether there is adequate budget to perform this work would be helpful to understand in the context of the modernization proposal. Budget shortfalls to address these activities could then be evaluated for priority relative to capital needs identified in the modernization project list. Specifically, the information regarding how ODOT intends to address the following potential activities is requested.

A. Recent Corridor Plan priorities

In order to address urgent transportation priorities identified in collaboration with the community during recent corridor planning work, it is important to address the highest priority actions adopted in those plans. JPACT and the Metro Council request that ODOT evaluate whether the following activities can be adequately provided for within the current Region 1 planning budget as described in the UPWP. If not, we request that these projects be evaluated for potential funding from modernization or other funding within the draft 2008-11 STIP proposal.

A1. Highway 217 EIS (RTP Project # 3004)

The Highway 217 Corridor Transportation Plan identified the importance of completing an EIS for the corridor so that ramp and interchange improvements can be implemented as funding becomes available. Specifically, the plan, adopted by the Plan's Policy Advisory Committee, JPACT and the Metro Council, identified as a next step that "Metro, ODOT, and the local jurisdictions should seek to include in the draft 2008-11 STIP funding for the Highway 217 EIS."

A2.I-205/Powell Boulevard Interchange (RTP Project #1163)

The Powell/Foster Corridor Transportation Phase I Plan identifies as a next step within the Roadway section the implementation of RTP Project No. 1164 to plan and design the interchange improvements at I-205/Powell Boulevard. The recommendation identifies ODOT as the lead agency for the study to evaluate modifications to the existing overpass with full access ramps to I-205.

B. I-5/I-405 Loop

The I-5/I-405 Loop is a project of statewide significance and is currently finishing a planning process to identify future alignment and design alternatives. This facility is the only corridor of statewide significance not to receive some form of modernization funding. JPACT understands that the city of Portland will lead efforts to obtain further project development funds for this project and that ODOT intends to work with regional partners to continue efforts at resolving priority improvements in this corridor. The corridor contains several possible project development opportunities, including the I-5: I-84 to Greeley segment. Should funding be identified through this effort, a future STIP amendment would be needed.

C. North Milwaukie Industrial Area

McLoughlin Boulevard between Highway 224 and Johnson Creek Boulevard has experienced safety and access related issues since implementation of the new Highway 224 ramp connection improvement was constructed in the early 1990's. The surrounding north Milwaukie industrial area continues to seek improved access to McLoughlin Boulevard and Highway 224. These access issues will be exacerbated with land use intensification and access issues associated with the future Milwaukie light rail project. The City of Milwaukie is interested in studying circulation and access issues in the north Milwaukie industrial area and would benefit from a coordinated effort with ODOT, TriMet and Metro. JPACT understands that ODOT intends to work with affected agencies on the South Corridor phase II planning activities which may lead to proposals for future Development STIP activities.

D. Coordination with Oregon Innovative Partnership Program

The region would also request information about whether the funding proposal activities associated with the Oregon Innovative Partnership Program need to be identified in the STIP to ensure eligibility of project funding. Future funding for the Sunrise and I-205 corridors will rely on this effort and are critical to addressing these projects of statewide significance.

4. Fund STA Implementation Program

Per previous requests, ODOT should begin implementation of a Special Transportation Area project (or program) to ensure that the transportation system is supporting our state and local planning goals. ODOT has recently adopted Special Transportation Area guidelines in the Oregon Highway Plan to support mixed-use development in designated community centers along state highways.

Completing transportation systems in urban areas to support development patterns and peak-hour mode shifts from single occupant vehicles should be a

priority investment of ODOT as it reduces the need for providing more expensive capacity projects in urbanizing rural areas. Our mutual effort to attempt to define and identify funding for transportation services to the Damascus area illustrates this point. Success of our strategy of accommodating the majority of expected growth within existing urban areas depends on the provision of whole transportation systems that support economic development of mixed-use areas.

There are eight STA designated areas within the Metro area the ODOT could address with a funding program. Metro staff and TPAC are willing to work with ODOT staff in the development of a specific project proposal for inclusion in the 2008-11 or the 2010-13 STIP. Alternatively, a planning process to identify a strategy for how ODOT could participate in the development of an STA implementation program is requested.

5. Regional balance

As ODOT works to propose a final modernization list, JPACT and the Metro Council request that ODOT consider regional balance when considering proposals to narrow to a regionally balanced program and a balanced urban/rural program. This request is made understanding that within a small modernization program with expensive projects may need to consider balance over a long-term perspective. As JPACT and the Metro Council develops a recommendation to the Oregon Transportation Commission on the modernization program, regional balance will be considered.

Preservation

The early identification of potential preservation projects provides the opportunity to coordinate with local project and funding opportunities as well as other state program efforts. The region looks forward to identifying how to prioritize and program a state preservation program that maximizes funding efficiencies and minimizes construction disruption.

Specific coordination opportunities are listed in an Attachment 1.

Safety

Further explanation of the Safety Priority Index System and Safety Management System data and the projects identified to address this data would be helpful in providing recommendations on project priority and local coordination opportunities. JPACT and the Metro Council are interested in safety projects addressing the priorities identified in the comprehensive Oregon Traffic Safety Performance and Safety Action Plans.

Secondly, JPACT and the Metro Council are interested in local transportation staff working further with ODOT to identify and evaluate transportation safety issues that are unique to the urban setting. We will make local transportation planning staff available to be involved in the next update of the Oregon

Transportation Safety Action Plan. We also request local transportation staff participate with ODOT in the development of the Oregon Traffic Safety Performance Plan and the development of safety projects to address identified safety issues within the Metro area.

Bridge

The region is interested in the progress in developing a proposed local bridge list and whether local bridge programming is intended to be consistent with understandings regarding target splits between large and small bridges.

The region is also interested in knowing how the SAFETEA-LU earmarks of \$160 million for 1-5 bridges and \$40 million for statewide bridges will be allocated to specific projects when that information is available.

Specific coordination issues are identified in Attachment 1.

Other State and SAFETEA-LU Implementation Programs

The region is interested in information regarding how ODOT intends to implement the Safe Routes to Schools program and any other new SAFETEA-LU authorized programs.

The region would like to support funding of travel options marketing program within the Public Transit Division budget in the 2010-11 biennium.

~~The region would also request information about whether the funding proposal activities associated with the Oregon Innovative Partnership Program need to be identified in the STIP to ensure eligibility of project funding.~~

Sincerely,

Rex Burkholder
IPACT Chair

David Bragdon
Metro Council President

Attachment 1

The following comments are to provide ODOT staff with information about local activities that may influence consideration of project ripeness, project timing or project scope.

Preservation Program Coordination

- US 26: North Plains to Cornell (2009). A modernization project has been identified on US 26: 185th to Cornell: how would these projects be coordinated?
- OR43: McVey to I-205. Two street design studies will be underway within the year on West Linn portions of this segment. Should coordinate design and opportunities for supplemental work to implement new street design recs.
- OR 8: Mintner Bridge to Forest Grove. Need to confirm the location of Mintner Bridge. The Hillsboro 10th Avenue turn lane project and Cornelius Boulevard and 10th Avenue projects could be affected.
- OR 213 (82nd): Killingsworth to Hwy 224. City of Portland has an ITS project on 82nd Avenue scheduled for 2006. Opportunities for Safety project coordination
- Regional flexible funds have been allocated to the St. Johns freight and pedestrian project, currently programmed for construction in 2009. Planning activities to develop a final design option will begin this year and ODOT staff should participate in this City led effort to prepare for the eventual preservation project. Also, US 30B (Lombard). Portland has a main street design per St. Johns/Lombard Plan. The main street elements could be implemented through supplemental funding from SWIP, Preservation Supplemental modernization funds, STA Implementation funding (if created), regional flexible funding or local funding options.
- US 99E: Naef to MP 13.04. The City of Oregon City has a boulevard project programmed for 2008. These projects need to coordinate schedules if the preservation project is prioritized for funding.

Bridge Program Coordination

- The historic Oregon City to West Linn Bridge is proposed for preservation work by ODOT in 2008. Metro will work with ODOT Region One staff and the City of Oregon City on coordination of this work and the McLoughlin Boulevard (OR 99E) boulevard work in the vicinity of this bridge, currently scheduled for 2008, to minimize disruption to the surrounding community with the construction of improved pedestrian treatment on McLoughlin Boulevard. It will be important to upgrade bike/pedestrian facilities on this narrow bridge to the extent feasible.

- OR99E: Viaduct repair – potential to coordinate with Oregon City boulevard retrofit of McLoughlin Boulevard adjacent to bridge project. The viaduct repair project should also consider inclusion of cleaning and painting.

Safety Program Coordination

- US 26 (Powell Boulevard) 122nd to 136th add center turn lane, bike lanes and sidewalks. This project should be evaluated for consistency with the design recommended in the Powell – Foster Corridor Plan.
- OR 213 (82nd Avenue): Foster Road WB and EB right turn lanes. This project should be coordinated with design work on this intersection already completed by TriMet and the City of Portland to improve pedestrian safety and transit stop improvements and the 82nd Avenue ATMS project led by the City of Portland.