A G E N D A

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE PORTLAND, OREGON 97232-2736

METRO

TEL 503-797-1916 FAX 503-797-1930

MEETING: TRANSPORTATION POLICY ALTERNATIVES COMMITTEE

DATE: March 28, 2008

TIME: 9:30 A.M.

PLACE: Metro Regional Center, 370A/B

9:30 AM	**1.**		Call to Order and Declaration of a Quorum	Andy Cotugno
9:30 AM	**2.**		Citizen Communications to TPAC on Non-Agenda Items	
9:35 AM	**3.**	*	Approval of TPAC Minutes for February 22, 2008	Andy Cotugno
9:40 AM	**4.**		Future Agenda Items • Willamette River Bridges • Bicycle Transportation Study (April 25th)	Andy Cotugno
	5.		**ACTION ITEMS**	
9:45 AM	**5.1**	*	Resolution No. 08-3928, For the Purpose of Certifying that the Portland Metropolitan Area is in Compliance with Federal Transportation Planning Requirements – RECOMMENDATION TO JPACT REQUESTED	Andy Cotugno
9:50 AM	**5.2**	*	Resolution No. 08-3929, For the Purpose of Adopting the Federal Fiscal Year 2009 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) – RECOMMENDATION TO JPACT REQUESTED	Andy Cotugno
10:00 AM	**5.3**	*	Resolution No. 08-3934, For the Purpose of Amending the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and 2010-13 Metropolitan Improvement Program (MTIP) to Add a Safe Routes to Schools Pedestrian Project – RECOMMENDATION TO JPACT REQUESTED	Ted Leybold
	6.		**INFORMATION/ DISCUSSION ITEMS**	
10:05AM	**6.1**	*	Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) Federal Earmark Policy – DISCUSSION	Travis Brouwer
10:15 AM	**6.2**	#	RTP Investment Scenarios – DISCUSSION	Kim Ellis
10:35 AM	**6.3**	*	Review of MTIP Allocation to Regional Programs – DISCUSSION	Andy Cotugno Ted Leybold
11:35 AM	**7.0**		ADJOURN	Andy Cotugno

* Material available electronically. Please call 503-797-1916 for a paper copy

** Material to be emailed at a later date.

\# Material provided at meeting. All materials will be available at the meeting.

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736
TEL 503 797 1756 | FAX 503 797 1930

METRO

TRANSPORTATION POLICY ALTERNATIVES COMMITTEE
February 22, 2008
Metro Regional Center, 370A/B

MEMBERS PRESENT	AFFILIATION
Sorin Garber	Citizen
Nancy Kraushaar	City of Oregon City/Cities of Clackamas County
Mike McKillip	City of Tualatin/Cities of Washington County
Dave Nordberg	DEQ
Louis A. Ornelas	Citizen
Satvinder Sandhu	FHWA
Sreya Sarkar	Citizen
Phil Selinger	TriMet
Karen Schilling	Multnomah County
Paul Smith	City of Portland

MEMBERS ABSENT	AFFILIATION
Jack Burkman	WASDOT
Elissa Gertler	Clackamas County
April Siebenaler	Citizen
John Reinhold	Citizen
Rian Windsheimer	ODOT
Bret Curtis	Washington County
John Hoefs	C-TRAN
Susie Lahsene	Port of Portland
Dean Lookingbill	SW Washington RTC
Ron Papsdorf	City of Gresham

ALTERNATES PRESENT	AFFILIATION
Clark Berry	Washington County
Jonathan David	City of Gresham
Lynda David	SW Washington RTC
Lidwien Rahman	ODOT
Diane Stockton	C-TRAN
Ron Weinman	Clackamas County
Andy Back	Washington County
Robin McCaffrey	Port of Portland

GUESTS PRESENT	AFFILIATION
Kenny Asher	City of Milwaukie
Mike Coleman	Kittleson & Assoc.
Evan Dust	HDR
Steven Matthews	Principle Management Ltd.
Margaret Middleton	City of Beaverton
Lawrence Odell	Washington County
Derek Robbins	City of Forest Grove

STAFF
Andy Cotugno, Tom Kloster, Josh Naramore, Pat Emmerson, Kim Ellis, Anthony Butzek, Ted Leybold, Kelsey Newell, Tom Chaimov, Deena Platman, Pam Peck, John Mermin, Caleb Winter

1. CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

Chair Andy Cotugno declared a quorum and called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO TPAC ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were none.

3. APPROVAL OF TPAC MINUTES FOR JANUARY 25, 2008

MOTION: Mr. Phil Selinger moved, Ms. Karen Schilling seconded, to approve the January 25, 2008 meeting minutes.

ACTION TAKEN: With all in favor, the motion passed.

4. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Future agenda items were not discussed.

5. ACTION ITEMS

5.1 Resolution No. 08-3911, For the Purpose of Approving the Air Quality Conformity Determination for the Federal Component of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan and Reconfirming the 2008-11 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement program

Mr. Mark Turpel of Metro stated that the technical and public comment review of the air quality conformity determination report has completed. The report demonstrates that the 2035 RTP and 2010-13 MTIP are in compliance with the Clean Air Act. He stated that the Carbon Monoxide levels are projected to significantly decrease through 2035. JPACT and the Metro Council are scheduled to take action on February 26th and February 28th respectively. Following their

approval, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) will consider the resolution and report as part of the complete 2035 RTP package. In addition, Mr. Turpel stated that the report demonstrated that the transportation control measures for transit service and bike and pedestrian improvements have been met.

Both TPAC's DEQ and FHWA representatives supported the resolution and report.

MOTION: Mr. Dave Nordberg moved, Mr. Louis Ornelas seconded, to approve Resolution No. 08-3911.

ACTION TAKEN: With all in favor, the motion passed.

5.2 Diesel Emission Reduction & CMAQ Funds

Mr. Kevin Downing of DEQ appeared before the committee and provided information on CMAQ funding for clean diesel. (Presentation included as part of the meeting record.) His presentation included information on:

- SAFETEA-LU
- Diesel engines and air quality
- Diesel exhaust health effects
- Concerns in Oregon
- Global Warming factors
- Pollution reduction cost effectiveness
- House Bill 2172 Oregon Clean Diesel
- Potential project areas: school buses, construction equipment and municipal fleet
    - Exposure inside school buses
    - Clean school bus goal
    - Emission inventory in the Portland area
    - Municipal fleet retrofit
- Oregon Clean Diesel Initiative

Mr. Downing stated that DEQ would apply for approximately $4.6 million of the available 2010-13 MTIP dollars for retrofit of school buses for the metropolitan region. He stated that replacement of the school buses, municipal and construction fleet vehicles could be completed in stages as funding sources become available. Mr. Downing did not provide a financial quote for municipal or construction replacement vehicles for the upcoming MTIP cycle.

Committee discussion included use and expenses associated with natural gas, contracts with privately owned bus fleets and increasing public outreach with the private sector.

5.3 Resolution No. 08-3916, For the Purpose of Adopting the Policy Direction and Program Objectives of the 2009 Regional Flexible Funding Allocation Process and 2010-13 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP)

Mr. Ted Leybold of Metro outlined the draft 2010-13 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Portland Metropolitan Area Policy Report. (All handouts included as part of the meeting record.) The draft report provided an introduction to the MTIP framework and proposed policies for MTIP's three funding categories: Regional Flexible, ODOT Administered and Transit (TriMet and SMART) funds.

ODOT Administered Funds
Mr. Leybold briefly overviewed the Oregon Transportation Commission's (OTC) process and timeline for establishing criteria for the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The draft MTIP report includes the OTC's prioritization factors for the 2010-13 STIP cycle.

Ms. Lidwien Rahman recommended ODOT staff provide a presentation on the STIP bridge, preservation and safety programs to TPAC and JPACT at an upcoming meeting.

Regional Flexible Funds
Mr. Leybold stated that responses received from JPACT, the Metro Council, MPAC, TPAC and the general public framed the initial policy priorities.

Two-step Process
Committee members recommended simplifying the MTIP process by carrying out the two-step process; allocating regionally administered programs in step one and local projects in step two. TPAC identified five programs to be considered for funding in step one: Transit Oriented Development (TOD), Regional Transportation Options (RTO), Intelligent Transportation System (ITS), Metro Regional Planning and High Capacity Transit (HCT) Implementation. The remaining funds would be available for financing local projects and programs.

Although the committee emphasized the need to refine the existing 2035 RTP regional system definition, members did not feel there was sufficient time to establish a definition prior to the 2010-13 MTIP cycle. Members recommended proceeding with the two-step process and continuing discussion of the system definition for the next cycle.

Additional committee discussion included localized bike and pedestrian project funding, federal earmarking, cost effectiveness, project leverage and establishing minimum funding amounts for projects seeking funding for preliminary engineering or construction.

Policy Priorities from Outreach
Mr. Leybold highlighted six additional priorities identified by the public outreach. The committee identified common themes among the public's prorities and was able to collate the comments into three policies regarding RTP Goal 6: Promote environmental stewardship and Goal 7: Enhance human health. The new policies target lower carbon emissions and reduction of

impervious surface coverage, storm water runoff and pollution impacts to residents. Staff will incorporate these policies into the MTIP policy report for JPACT's review.

5.4 Resolution No. 08-3919, For the Purpose of Adopting the Regional Travel Options 2008-13 Strategic Plan

Ms. Pam Peck of Metro appeared before the committee and provided a presentation on the 2008-13 Regional Travel Options Strategic Plan. (Presentation included as part of the meeting record.) Her presentation included information on:

- Strategic planning process
- Mission statement
- Program partners
- Policy framework
- Benefits
- Goals
  - Increase awareness and use of travel options
  - Increase the use of travel options for commute trips
  - Provide information and services to increase use of travel options in local downtown and centers
  - Report progress to aid decision making and encourage innovation
  - Follow a decision-making structure that provides oversight and advance RTP goals
- Priorities

Committee discussion included climate change, telecommuting and flexible work schedules, vanpool and MTIP funding allocations.

MOTION: Mr. Orenlas moved, Mr. Mike McKillip second, to approve Resolution No. 08-3919.

ACTION TAKEN: With all in favor, the motion passed.

6. INFORMATION / DISCUSSION ITEMS

6.1 RTP State Work Program

Ms. Kim Ellis briefly overviewed the draft timeline for the RTP state component. A joint MTAC/TPAC workshop has been scheduled to discuss the RTP state work program on March 3rd from 2:00 – 4:00 p.m. at Metro.

Ms. Ellis highlighted that the draft schedule extends the state component of the RTP update to Fall 2009 in response to input provided by local and state agency staff. TPAC will have an opportunity to further discuss the work program at their regular March meeting.

7. **ADJOURN**

As there was no further business, Chair Cotugno adjourned the meeting at 12:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kelsey Newell
Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR FEBRUARY 22, 2008
The following have been included as part of the official public record:

ITEM	TOPIC	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT NO.
5.3	Memo	2/19/08	To: TPAC From: Ted Leybold RE: Consideration of draft Policy Report for the 2010-13 MTIP	022208t-01
5.3	Report	2/2008	Draft 2010-13 MTIP Portland Metropolitan Area Policy Report	022208t-02
5.4	PowerPoint	2/22/08	Regional Travel Options 2008-13 Strategic Plan presentation provided by Pam Peck	022208t-03

DRAFT

JOINT RESOLUTION OF THE
METRO COUNCIL
AND
OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

FOR THE PURPOSE OF CERTIFYING THAT THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING REQUIREMENTS	)))))	RESOLUTION NO. 08-3928 Introduced by Michael Jordan, Chief Operating Officer with the Concurrence of Council President Bragdon

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, by the Metro Council that the Council adopts the findings contained in Exhibit A and certifies 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, Parts 450 and 500, and Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 613.

BE IT RESOLVED, by the Oregon Department of Transportation 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, Parts 450 and 500, and Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 613.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this _____ day of April 2008.

_____
David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to form:

_____
Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

APPROVED by the Oregon Department of Transportation this _____ day of _____ 2008.

_____
Jerri L. Bohard
Transportation Development Administrator

Metro Self-Certification

DRAFT

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, and operates in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 134 and 49 U.S.C. 5303.

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). 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 Memorandum of Agreement between Metro and the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC) delineates areas of responsibility and coordination. Executed in April 2006, to be updated in April 2009.

b. In accordance with 23 CFR 450.314, an intergovernmental agreement (IGA) between TriMet, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), and Metro was executed effective as of August 2007.

c. Yearly agreements are executed between Metro and ODOT defining the terms and use of FHWA planning funds.

d. 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.

e. A Memorandum of Understanding between Metro and the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) describing each agency's responsibilities and roles for air quality planning. Executed in July 2007, to be updated in July 2010.

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

4. Responsibilities, Cooperation and Coordination

Metro uses a decision-making structure that 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.

In FY 2007-08, JPACT completed the bylaw review 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 updated December 28, 2005 and addresses the following topics:

- Transportation
- Land use (including the Metro Urban Growth Boundary (UGB)
- Nature in Neighborhoods
- 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 the Environmental Justice and Title VI narrative and individual program narratives; elderly and disabled planning tasks have been identified in the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Planning program narrative.

b. Regional Transportation Plan

JPACT and the Metro Council approved the 2035 Federal RTP in December 2007. This update was limited in scope and does not attempt to revisit the requirements of the Oregon Transportation Planning Rule. However, the 2035 Federal RTP includes a new policy for the purpose of transportation planning and project funding to address SAFETEA-LU provisions and key issues facing the region.

As required by Metro's 2004 Federal Review the 2035 update addressed operating and maintenance costs paid by member jurisdictions. The 2035 RTP revenue forecast and financial analysis for operations and maintenance costs was based on a thorough evaluation of city and county, ODOT, TriMet and SMART cost projections (2035 RTP Sections 5.1 through 5.3). The financially constrained system described in Chapter 6 of the 2035 RTP was specifically developed to comply with SAFETEA-LU planning requirements. The system was developed based on a forecast of expected revenues that was formulated in partnership with ODOT, cities and counties in the Metro region, TriMet and the South Metro Area Rapid Transit (SMART) district. A background research report was also developed during Phase 2 of the update to document current funding trends and sources. The subsequent financial analysis and the background report are included in Appendix 4.3 and Appendix 6.0, respectively.

The projects and programs recommended in the financially constrained system were developed cooperatively with local jurisdictions, ODOT, and port and transit districts, and through workshops sponsored by TPAC. The financially constrained system is intended as the "federal" system for purposes of demonstrating air quality conformity and allocating federal funds through the MTIP process (2035 RTP Sections 7.1 and 7.5). The RTP financial plan and revenue forecast assumptions are described in Chapter 5 of the 2035 RTP. The total reasonably expected revenue base assumed in the 2035 RTP for the road system is approximately $ 9.07 billion.

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 and is being refined as part of the "State" component of the RTP update.

A new map has been added to Chapter 1 of the RTP that identifies the MPO Planning Boundary and the Air Quality Maintenance Area 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 2008 UGB and the 2000 census defined urbanized area boundary for the Portland metropolitan region. FHWA and FTA approved the 2035 RTP and the associated air quality conformity determination on February 29, 2008. Documentation of compliance with specific federal planning requirements is summarized in subsequent sections of this document.

Work is continuing on the State component of the RTP update in 2008. Tasks related to the update are outlined in the FY 2007-08 and FY 2008-09 UPWP.

c. Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program

The MTIP was updated in Summer 2007 and incorporated into the 2008-11 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The 2007 update included the allocation of $63 million of Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality Program (CMAQ) funding, programming of projects for the ODOT Modernization, Bridge, Safety, Preservation, Operations, OTIA III, Enhancements, and Immediate Opportunity Fund projects and programming of transit funding. The first year of programming is considered the priority project funding for the region. Should any of these projects be delayed, projects of equivalent dollar value may be advanced

from the second, third or fourth years of the program without processing formal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) amendments. As recommended in Metro's 2004 Federal Review, the MTIP webpage was linked to ODOT's STIP page.

Metro is in the process of updating the 2010-13 MTIP in the current fiscal year, with adoption of an updated program scheduled for late FY 2008-09.

6. Planning Factors

Currently, Metro's planning process addresses the SAFETEA-LU planning factors in all projects and policies. Table 1 below describes the relationship of the planning factors to Metro's activities and Table 2 outlines Metro's response to how the factors have been incorporated into the planning process. The SAFETEA-LU planning factors are:

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

As noted in Tables 1 and 2, Metro has reviewed and updated both the RTP and MTIP, and revised both documents to be compliant with SAFETEA-LU planning requirements.

Table 1: SAFETEA-LU Planning Factors

Factor	System Planning (RTP)	Funding Strategy (MTIP)	High Capacity Transit (HCT)
1. Support Economic Vitality	• 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 the 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.	• 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."	• 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.

Table 1: SAFETEA-LU Planning Factors

Factor	System Planning (RTP)	Funding Strategy (MTIP)	High Capacity Transit (HCT)
2. Increase Safety	• 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). • The RTP includes a number of investments and actions aimed at further improving safety in the region, including: ◦ Investments targeted to address known safety deficiencies and high-crash locations. ◦ Completing gaps in regional bicycle and pedestrian systems. ◦ Retrofits of existing streets in downtowns and along main streets to include on-street parking, street trees marked street crossings and other designs to slow traffic speeds to follow posted speed limits. ◦ Intersection changes and ITS strategies, including signal timing and real-time traveler information on road conditions and hazards. ◦ Expanding safety education, awareness and multi-modal data collection efforts at all levels of government. ◦ Expand safety data collection efforts and create a better system for centralized crash data for all modes of travel.	• 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.	• Station area planning for proposed HCT improvements is primarily driven by pedestrian access and safety considerations.

Table 1: SAFETEA-LU Planning Factors

Factor	System Planning (RTP)	Funding Strategy (MTIP)	High Capacity Transit (HCT)
3. Increase Security	• System security was incorporated into the 2035 Federal RTP. • Security and emergency management activities are summarized in Section 2.4.7.4 of the 2035 RTP. • Policy framework in Section 3.3 of the 2035 RTP includes, "Goal 5: Enhance Safety and Security," and specific security objectives and potential actions to increase security of the transportation system for all users. • Includes investments that increase system monitoring for operations, management and security of the regional mobility corridor system. • Actions direct Metro to work with local, state and regional agencies to identify critical infrastructure in the region, assess security vulnerabilities and develop coordinated emergency response and evacuation plans. • Actions direct transportation providers to monitor the regional transportation and minimize security risks at airports, transit facilities, marine terminals and other critical infrastructure	• Transportation security will be factored into the next MTIP update, following completion of the new RTP.	• System security has been a routine element of the HCT program, and does not represent a substantial change to current practice.

Table 1: SAFETEA-LU Planning Factors

Factor	System Planning (RTP)	Funding Strategy (MTIP)	High Capacity Transit (HCT)
4. Increase Accessibility	• 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. • The plan emphasizes accessibility and reliability of the system, particularly for commuting and freight, and includes a new, more customized approach to managing and evaluating performance of mobility corridors. This new approach builds on using new, cost-effective technologies to improve safety, optimize the existing system, and ensure that freight transporters and commuters have a broad range of travel options in each corridor.	• 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.	• 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.

Table 1: SAFETEA-LU Planning Factors (continued)

Factor	System Planning (RTP)	Funding Strategy (MTIP)	High Capacity Transit (HCT)
5. Protect Environment and Quality of Life	• 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. • Many new transit, bicycle, pedestrian and TDM projects have been added to the plan to provide a more balanced multi-modal system that maintains livability. • RTP transit, bicycle, pedestrian and TDM projects 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. • The region's parking policies (Title 2 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan) are also designed to encourage the use of alternative modes, and reduce reliance on the automobile, thus promoting energy conservation and reducing air quality impacts.	• The MTIP conforms to the Clean Air Act and continues to comply with the air quality maintenance plan in accordance with sections 174 and 176 (c) and (d) of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7504, 7605 (c) and (d)) and 40 CFR part 93. • 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.	• 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: SAFETEA-LU Planning Factors (continued)

Factor	System Planning (RTP)	Funding Strategy (MTIP)	High Capacity Transit (HCT)
6. System Integration/ Connectivity	• 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 links in the region.	• Projects funded through the MTIP must be consistent with regional street design guidelines. • Freight improvements are evaluated according to potential conflicts with other modes.	• 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.
7. Efficient Management & Operations	• The policy component of the 2035 RTP includes specific provisions for efficient system management and operation (2035 RTP Goal 4), with an emphasis on TSM, ATMS and the use of non-auto modal targets (Table 3.17) to optimize the existing and planned transportation system. • Proposed RTP projects include many system management improvements along regional corridors. • The plan also calls for consideration of value pricing in the region to better manage capacity and peak use of the throughway system. However, more work is needed to gain public acceptance of this tool.	• 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.	• Proposed HCT improvements include redesigned feeder bus systems that take advantage of new HCT capacity and reduce the number of redundant transit lines.

* *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. Metro consults with the Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement (MCCI) in the development of individual PIPs. 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 work program and PPP for the 2035 RTP update was developed with input from Metro's Advisory Committees, including Metro's Committee for Citizen Involvement. The 2035 RTP update included workshops, informal and formal input opportunities as well as a 30-day+ comment period for the community, affected public agencies, representatives of transportation agency employees, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation, representatives of users of public transit, and other interested persons. Public involvement opportunities and key decision points were published in the Oregonian and other community newspapers, posted on Metro's web site, e-mailed via the Planning Department E-News to more than 4,500 individuals, and advertised through Metro's transportation hotline. All plan documents were simultaneously published (and regularly updated) on the Metro web site, including draft plan amendments, the update schedule, other explanatory materials and summaries of public comments received. Section 1.5 in the 2035 RTP and Appendix 4.5 describe the public process in more detail.

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 30-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 July 2006, 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 the needs of minority and disadvantaged populations are considered and 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 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).

Metro's DBE program was reviewed and submitted to FTA in August 1999. 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. Affirmative Action

In accordance with 49 U.S.C. 5331, 42 U.S.C. 6101, Section 324 of title 23 U.S.C. and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794) and 49 CFR part 27, Metro states as its policy a commitment to provide equal employment opportunities without regard to race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, disability, sexual orientation, or marital or familial status, except where a bona fide occupational qualification exists. Compliance with this policy is administered by Metro's Human Resources Department.

11. Construction Contracts

Provisions of 23 CFR part 230 do not apply to Metro as Metro does not administer Federal and Federal-aid highway construction contracts.

12. Lobbying

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

Table 2: Metro's Response to SAFTETEA-LU Provisions

SAFTETEA-LU Provision for all MPOs	**Metro Response**
Consult/Coordinate with planning officials responsible for planned growth, economic development, environmental protection, airport operations, and freight movement.	Metro's transportation planning and land-use planning functions are within the same department and coordinate internally. • Metro facilitates this consultation, coordination and decision-making through four advisory committee bodies –the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC), the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) and the Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC). 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 also coordinates with freight, rail, airport operations and business interests through the Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force and Regional Freight and Goods Movement Technical Advisory Committee.
Promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development.	Metro transportation and land-use planning is subject to approval by the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development.
Give safety and security due emphasis as separate planning factors.	Metro addressed security and safety as individual factors in the update to the RTP in 2007. • Separate background research papers were developed during Phase 2 of the update to document current safety issues and planning efforts, and current security planning efforts in the region. This research is included Appendix 6.0 was considered during the formulation of the 2035 RTP goals, objectives, projects and potential actions included in Chapter 3 and investment priorities in Chapter 6 of the 2035 RTP. Additionally, Metro staffs the Regional Emergency Management Group (REMG), which has expanded its scope to include anti-terrorism preparedness, TriMet's responsibility for transit security plans, ODOT's responsibility for coordination of state security plans, Port of Portland's responsibility for air, marine and other Port facilities security plans and implementation of system management strategies to improve security of the transportation system (e.g., security cameras on MAX and at transit stations). The group brings together local emergency managers to plan responses to security concerns and natural hazards.

Table 2: Metro's Response to SAFTETEA-LU Provisions (continued)

SAFTETEA-LU Provision for all MPOs	**Metro Response**
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.	SAFETEA-LU provisions for additional consultation with state and federal resource agencies, and tribal groups that were not already part of Metro's existing committee structure were met through a consultation meeting held on October 16, 2007 with the Collaborative Environmental Transportation Agreement for Streamlining (CETAS) work group, consisting of the Oregon Department of Transportation and ten state and federal transportation, natural resource, cultural resource and land-use planning agencies. A background research paper was also developed during Phase 2 of the update to document current environmental trends, issues and current mitigation strategies in the region. This research was considered during the formulation of the 2035 RTP goals, objectives, projects and potential actions included in Chapter 3 and investment priorities in Chapter 6 of the 2035 RTP. In addition, staff conducted an analysis of the potential environmental effects of transportation investments. The background research report and environmental considerations analysis is included in Appendix 6.0.
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.	SAFETEA-LU provisions for additional consultation with state and federal resource agencies, and tribal groups that were not already part of Metro's existing committee structure were met through a consultation meeting held on October 16, 2007 with the Collaborative Environmental Transportation Agreement for Streamlining (CETAS) work group, consisting of the Oregon Department of Transportation and ten state and federal transportation, natural resource, historic, cultural resource and land-use planning agencies. A background research paper was also developed during Phase 2 of the update to document current environmental trends, issues and mitigation strategies in the region. This research was considered during the formulation of the 2035 RTP goals, objectives, projects and potential actions included in Chapter 3 and investment priorities in Chapter 6 of the 2035 RTP. In addition, staff conducted an analysis of the potential environmental effects of transportation investments – this analysis included a comparison of the RTP investments with available State Conservation maps and inventories of historic resources. The background research report and environmental considerations analysis is included in Appendix 6.0.

Table 2: Metro's Response to SAFTETEA-LU Provisions (continued)

SAFTETEA-LU Provision for all MPOs	**Metro Response**
Include operation and management strategies to address congestion, safety, and mobility in the transportation plan.	• System management policies in the RTP (2035 RTP Section 3.4.4) and resulting projects and programs are intended to maximize the use of existing facilities to address congestion, safety and mobility. • The regional congestion management process (CMP) also requires local jurisdictions to explore system management solutions before adding roadway capacity to the regional system (2035 RTP Section 7.6.3). These provisions are implemented through potential actions included in Section 3.3 (particularly Goals 4 and 5), and a number of projects and programs recommended in the updated plan, and are listed in Chapter 6 of the 2035 RTP. • The plan also calls for consideration of value pricing in the region to better manage capacity and peak use of the throughway system. • RTP projects in Chapter 6 include many system management improvements along regional mobility corridors and the supporting arterial system. Work will continue in the state component of the RTP update to further expand implementation of these strategies. • 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.

Table 2: Metro's Response to SAFTETEA-LU Provisions (continued)

SAFTETEA-LU Provision for all MPOs	**Metro Response**
Develop a participation plan in consultation with interested parties that provides reasonable opportunities for all parties to comment on transportation plan.	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. The work program and PPP for the 2035 RTP update was developed with input from Metro's Advisory Committees, including Metro's Committee for Citizen Involvement. Approval of the 2035 RTP, Resolution No. 07-3831B, followed JPACT and Metro Council consideration of nearly than 300 comments received during the public comment period. The comments were summarized into a comment log and Public Comment Summary Report. Refinements were recommended to respond to the comments received. The comment period for the Air Quality Conformity Determination provided an opportunity for public review and comment on the air quality conformity methodology and results. *Section 1.5 in the 2035 RTP and Appendix 4.5 describe the public process in more detail.*
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.	On a regular basis, Metro employs visualization techniques. Examples include: • RTP document is available on Metro's website • RTP newsletters and maps • MTIP document is available on Metro's website • GIS maps to illustrate planning activities • Participation in FHWA GIS Web Training Video simulation of light rail on the Portland Mall and I-205 Corridor.
Update the plan at least every 4 years in non-attainment and maintenance areas, 5 years in attainment areas.	2035 Federal RTP update was completed by March 5, 2008.
Update the TIP at least every 4 years, include 4 years of projects and strategies in the TIP.	Initiated MTIP and STIP update for August 2009.
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.	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 has been integrated into the 2008 RTP update. Additional work will be completed during the state component of the RTP update in 2008.

DRAFT

STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 08-3928 FOR THE PURPOSE OF CERTIFYING THAT THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING REQUIREMENTS

Date: April 17, 2008 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. 08-3928.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. **Known 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, Parts 450 and 500 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, 2008, 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. 08-3928; certifying that the Portland metropolitan area is in compliance with federal transportation planning requirements.

DRAFT

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE FY 2009 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM	)))))	RESOLUTION NO. 08-3929 Introduced by Michael Jordan, Chief Operating Officer with the Concurrence of Council President Bragdon

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 2009; and

WHEREAS, the FY 2009 UPWP indicates federal funding sources for transportation planning activities carried out by Metro, Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council, the cities of Damascus, Hillsboro, Portland, and Wilsonville, Clackamas County, Multnomah County, Washington County, TriMet, and Oregon Department of Transportation; and

WHEREAS, approval of the FY 2009 UPWP is required to receive federal transportation planning funds; and

WHEREAS, the FY 2009 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 2009 UPWP is adopted.

2. That the FY 2009 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 2008.

_____
David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to form:

_____
Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

Resolution No. 08-3929
Exhibit A

FY 2008-09
Unified Planning Work Program

Transportation Planning in the Portland/Vancouver Metropolitan Area

Metro
City of Damascus
City of Hillsboro
City of Portland
City of Wilsonville (SMART)
Clackamas County
Multnomah County
Washington County
TriMet
Oregon Department of Transportation
Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council

CLICK HERE FOR REPORT

DRAFT

March 28, 2008

DRAFT

STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 08-3929 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE FY 2009 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM

Date: April 17, 2008 Presented by: Andrew C. Cotugno

BACKGROUND

The FY 2009 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, 2008. Included in the document are federally funded studies to be conducted by Metro, Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC), the cities of Damascus, Hillsboro, Portland, and Wilsonville, Clackamas County, Multnomah County, Washington County, TriMet, and Oregon Department of Transportation.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. **Known 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, 2008, in accordance with established Metro priorities.

4. **Budget Impacts -** The UPWP matches the projects and studies reflected in the proposed Metro FY 2008-09 budget submitted by the Council President 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. 08-3929 which adopts the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) continuing the transportation planning work program for FY 2009; and authorize submittal of grant applications to the appropriate funding agencies.

Draft

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE 2035 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND THE 2008-11 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) TO ADD A SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOLS PEDESTRIAN PROJECT	))))))	RESOLUTION NO. 08-3934 Introduced by Councilor Rex Burkholder

WHEREAS, the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) contains the list of projects eligible for federal funding and the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) prioritizes projects from the RTP to receive transportation related funding; and

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

WHEREAS, the JPACT and the Metro Council approved the 2035 RTP on December 13, 2007 and the 2008-11 MTIP on August 16, 2007; and

WHEREAS, the City of Portland was awarded a federal Safe Routes to Schools grant administered through the Oregon Department of Transportation in the amount of $499,000 to provide pedestrian safety improvements near 20 Portland elementary schools; and

WHEREAS, all federal transportation funds allocated in the Metropolitan area must be included in the Regional Transportation Plan's financially constrained system and the MTIP financial plan; and

WHEREAS, these discretionary funds were not previously forecast to be available and therefore represent new funding within a financially constrained RTP and MTIP financial plan; and

WHEREAS, this change to programming for these projects is exempt by federal rule from the need for a conformity determination with the State Implementation Plan for air quality; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council hereby adopts the recommendation of JPACT to add the Portland Safe Routes to School Pedestrian safety projects to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan financially constrained project list and the 2008-11 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program and adjust the RTP financial forecast and MTIP financial plan accordingly.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this __th day of April 2008.

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 08-3934, FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE 2035 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND THE 2008-11 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) TO ADD A SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOLS PEDESTRIAN PROJECT

Date: April 17, 2008 Prepared by: Ted Leybold

BACKGROUND

The 2035 Regional Transportation Plan is required to complete a financial forecast of reasonably likely revenues for the purpose of constraining the cost of the list of capital improvement projects planned to be built during the planning period. All projects funded with federal transportation funds in the Metro area must be included in the Regional Transportation Plan's financially constrained system and programmed in the MTIP.

The City of Portland recently received a discretionary grant from the new Safe Routes to Schools federal funding program, administered in Oregon by the Oregon Department of Transportation. As this program is new, relatively small (approximately $1 million available statewide) and discretionary, no funding from this source was previously forecast as available for projects in the Metro area.

To be eligible to receive these funds, the RTP and MTIP financial plans need to be amended and the project needs to be added to the list of projects in the RTP's financially constrained system and programmed into the MTIP. The grant will provide the ability to do a series of small pedestrian safety improvements at twenty elementary schools within the city of Portland.

Pedestrian projects are exempt from needing to perform conformity analysis to demonstrate compliance with the State Implementation Plan for air quality.

The Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation and the Metro Council must approve amendments to the RTP and the MTIP.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. **Known Opposition** None known at this time.

2. **Legal Antecedents** Amends the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan adopted by Metro Council Resolution 07-3831B (For the Purpose of Approving Federal Component of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update, Pending Air Quality Conformity Analysis) on December 13, 2007 and the 2008-11 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program adopted by Metro Council Resolution 07-3825 (For the Purpose of Approving the 2008-11 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program for the Portland Metropolitan Area) on August 16, 2007.

3. **Anticipated Effects** Adoption of this resolution will make available federal transportation project funding for the construction of the Portland Safe Routes to Schools pedestrian safety projects.

4. **Budget Impacts** None.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Metro staff recommends the approval of Resolution No. 08-3899.

Background on ODOT Draft Earmark Policy

SAFETEA-LU, the federal surface transportation authorization act that became law in 2005, included $327 million in project-specific highway earmarks in Oregon. This is more than twice as much funding per year as provided by ODOT's modernization program in the 2008-2011 and 2010-2013 STIPs.

Congress will again take up a surface transportation authorization bill in 2009. Given the large amount of money allocated in the reauthorization legislation, the state and its partners have a strong interest in ensuring that earmarks are allocated to projects that have been identified as priorities and that address challenges facing Oregon's transportation system.

In order to help focus earmarks on identified priorities that can be delivered, ODOT is developing a policy on reauthorization legislation earmarks that lays out expectations, roles and responsibilities, and a process for prioritization of projects by ODOT advisory bodies, including ACTs. ODOT hopes that this policy and process will make clear the responsibilities that earmark recipients take on and improve communication between ODOT and local agencies that are seeking money for state highway projects.

The draft policy has two primary components.

- *Policy:* The policy would reiterate previous policy statements by the Oregon Transportation Commission that local agencies that receive earmarks take on the role of project sponsor and are responsible for providing funding to fully fund the project; the OTC will not plan to budget additional state resources to cover matching funds or make up funding shortfalls for projects not officially requested by the OTC. The OTC will also set criteria for the earmarks it will request from the congressional delegation.

- *Process:* The draft policy lays out a process whereby ACTs and other advisory bodies will prioritize projects proposed by ODOT staff and local agencies. The OTC will forward an official earmark request list to the Oregon congressional delegation that will be largely drawn from the recommendations made by advisory bodies. This process is designed to help improve communication between ODOT and local agencies on earmark requests, provide input on regional and statewide priorities to the congressional delegation, and help the OTC request projects that are recognized priorities for funding.

Local agencies would be asked to submit their likely earmark requests to ACTs for consideration and prioritization. Nothing in the policy would prevent a local agency from requesting an earmark for a project that is not prioritized by an ACT.

Local agencies and ACT members are encouraged to provide feedback on the draft policy and guideline documents. Comments should be provided to ODOT staff by early April, in advance of the OTC's consideration of the draft policy. ACTs will be asked to prioritize projects in May through September, and final guidance that responds to feedback will be issued in May.

Oregon Transportation Commission	NUMBER **TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION-99**	SUPERSEDES **TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION-99**
# POLICY (Draft Date: 11/19/07)	EFFECTIVE DATE 99/99/99	PAGE NUMBER 01 OF 99
	REFERENCE **OREGON TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MINUTES** – **Month day, 2007** **POLICY ON FORMATION AND OPERATION OF AREA COMMISSIONS ON TRANSPORTATION** **STIP PROJECT ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND PRIORITIZATION FACTORS**	
SUBJECT **Project Earmark Requests**		

PURPOSE

The Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) establishes the following policy to increase the likelihood that congressional earmarks in the surface transportation reauthorization legislation will contribute to advancing or completing projects that have been identified as priorities by the OTC's regional or statewide transportation advisory committees.

POLICY

The Oregon Transportation Commission intends to advance an official OTC Earmark Requests List, containing a limited number of earmark requests in the federal surface transportation reauthorization legislation for projects that are strategic investments in Oregon's transportation system and have broad support. ODOT will provide or help provide matching funds and funds to make up any shortfalls for projects on the OTC list.

In developing the official OTC Earmark Requests List, the Commission will consider recommendations from Area Commissions on Transportation (ACTs) and other advisory bodies, statewide priorities, and available budget for providing required match and fully funding the project. The Commission may give preference to earmark requests that will complete the funding necessary to fully construct a project over requests that will fund only earlier phases, such as project development activities or right-of-way acquisition, or only beginning construction of a new project.

ODOT region staff and local government agencies are expected to work together through the Area Commission on Transportation (ACT) or similar body to identify and recommend appropriate projects that are high priorities for the area, have broad support, and meet the criteria laid out in this policy. The ACTs are to prepare the ACT Earmark Recommendation Lists and supporting documentation that demonstrates how each project meets the Earmark Project Requirements. The OTC

will review and consider projects on the ACT Earmark Recommendation Lists to prepare the official OTC Earmark Requests List. The OTC may also consider recommendations from its statewide advisory committees such as the Public Transportation Advisory Committee (PTAC) or the Oregon Freight Advisory Committee (OFAC). Projects that have the support of multiple parties including local governments, area and statewide transportation advisory committees, and the ODOT region will be preferred over ones that have less support.

Earmark Project Requirements
The Commission establishes the following criteria for earmark requests:

- *Strategic Investment:* The project is a strategic investment to improve Oregon's transportation system, is included in an existing transportation plan document, and has been identified as a regional or state priority.
- *Meets STIP Criteria:* Projects recommended for earmark requests must meet the approved Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) criteria as set forth in the *STIP Project Eligibility Criteria and Prioritization Factors*.
- *Support:* The project has strong support, including support from local government agencies, area and/or statewide advisory bodies, the public, and the business community.
- *Readiness:* The project has been developed enough to identify potential environmental concerns and demonstrate that it has no known fatal flaws. Earmark funding received will be used to complete the project or a project phase, including accomplishing a project development milestone, and the work will begin during the timeframe of the transportation authorization legislation.
- *Funding:* Earmarks should provide the "last dollar" for a project or project phase to fill a shortfall after other funding has been allocated. The project may be structured in phases so that the earmark funds received will complete a segment of the project.

The OTC will only make requests for projects that meet these criteria. ACTs should only recommend projects that meet these criteria.

Local Agency Roles and Responsibilities

A local agency that secures earmark funding for a project not on the official OTC Earmark Requests List takes on the role of the project's sponsor. The local agency must provide matching funds and cover any funding shortfalls for the project. Except for funding already allocated in the STIP, ODOT does not intend to allocate additional funds to provide matching funds or cover any shortfalls for earmarks received by other agencies for projects not on the official OTC list. This policy will apply when the local agency's earmark is for a project on the state system in addition to when the earmark is for a project on the local agency's system. A local agency that secures an earmark for a local agency project also is responsible for developing and delivering

the project according to all applicable federal and state requirements, with oversight and technical assistance from ODOT.

ODOT often enters into agreements with local governments for local contribution to projects. Local agency earmarks will not be counted toward local contributions to projects unless the local agency receives prior approval from the ODOT region. ODOT may allow this in certain situations, including financial hardship for the local government and projects for which a local agency is making other transportation system improvements or other significant infrastructure improvements as part of a larger development effort.

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 1930

METRO

DATE: March 20, 2008

TO: TPAC and Interested Parties

FROM: Ted Leybold: MTIP Manager

SUBJECT: Regional Program applications for Regional Flexible Funds

* * * * * * *

The policy update to the 2010-13 MTIP has directed technical staff to develop a two-step process for the allocation of regional flexible funds. The first step would be to consider the allocation of funding to regional programs prior to solicitation of applications for locally administered projects.

To maintain a schedule that remains coordinated with the consideration of ODOT administered funding programs, a recommendation on the funding of regional programs is needed at the April TPAC and May JPACT meetings.

The policy report defines that consideration will be given in the first step to:

- High Capacity Transit implementation
- Metro Planning
- Regional Travel Options (RTO)
- Transit Oriented Development (TOD)/Centers Program
- Transportation System Management and Operations Program (TSMO)
- Willamette River Bridges
- Pedestrian and Bicycle Program

Attached are the regional program applications for regional flexible funds and a summary table of the available funding and requested program costs. A summary presentation of these materials will be provided at the meeting in preparation for a TPAC recommendation on funding of the regional programs at your April 25th meeting. Also, included in the TPAC packet are copies of the newly adopted RTO Strategic Plan and the 2007 TOD/Centers Program Annual Report.

Historic Allocation of Transportation Capital Project Funds
Metro Area

	Proposed FFY 2012-13	FFY 2010-11	FFY 2008-09	FFY 2006-07	FFY 2004-05
Capital Funding Programs (Metro area only):					
New Starts Funding					
ODOT Modernization					
OTIA State Projects					
OTIA Local Projects					
OTIA State Bridge					
OTIA Local Bridge					
HBR: State					
HBR: Local					
Regional Flexible Fund Allocation Amount	**$67,800,000**	**$64,000,000**	**$63,116,000**	**$54,168,000**	**$50,540,000**
High Capacity Transit - Base Allocation	$18,600,000	$18,600,000	$18,600,000	$16,000,000	$12,000,000
Milwaukie LRT/Commuter Rail Supplemental	$7,400,000				
DEIS/FEIS supplemental	$4,000,000	$2,000,000	$3,688,000		$4,000,000
High Capacity Transit Subtotal	$30,000,000	$20,600,000	$22,288,000	$16,000,000	$16,000,000
Existing Regional Programs:					
Planning - Base Allocation	$2,115,500	$1,992,630	$1,881,000	$1,778,000	$1,665,000
Planning - Supplemental	$850,500	$675,000	$500,000	$700,000	$300,000
RTO - Base Allocation	$4,406,000	$4,279,000	$4,100,000	$3,047,000	$2,139,000
RTO - Supplemental	$2,300,000				
TOD - Base Allocation	$5,000,000	$5,000,000	$4,000,000	$4,000,000	$1,500,000
TOD - Supplemental	$1,000,000		$2,000,000	$2,000,000	$800,000
TSMO - Base Allocation	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	$520,000	$0	$1,625,000
Subtotal - Base Allocation	$14,521,500	$14,271,630	$10,501,000	$8,825,000	$6,929,000
Subtotal - Supplemental	$4,150,500	$675,000	$2,500,000	$2,700,000	$1,100,000
Potential Regional Programs:					
Willmette River Bridges	$8,000,000	$0	$2,000,000	$0	$1,345,000
Bike & Pedestrian	$6,800,000	$6,767,000	$6,790,000	$6,551,000	$8,429,000
Remaining Allocation	$4,328,000	$21,686,370	$19,037,000	$20,092,000	$16,737,000
Percent of Total Allocation Amount					
High Capacity Transit - Base Allocation	27.43%	29.06%	29.47%	29.54%	23.74%
High Capacity Transit - Supplemental	16.81%	3.13%	5.84%	0.00%	7.91%
Existing Regional Programs - Base	21.42%	22.30%	16.64%	16.29%	13.71%
Existing Regional Programs - Supplemental	6.12%	1.05%	3.96%	4.98%	2.18%
Potential Regional Programs:					
Willmette River Bridges	11.80%	0.00%	3.17%	0.00%	2.66%
Bike & Pedestrian	10.03%	10.57%	10.76%	12.09%	16.68%
Remaining Allocation	6.38%	33.88%	30.16%	37.09%	33.12%

Notes:

Metro Planning includes MPO Required Planning, Freight Planning, Corridor Plan, and Household Survey funding.

TSMO became a regional program in the 2007 allocation. Previous allocations were to local agency applications.

High Capacity Transit has included EIS, Project Development and Construction funding toward Interstate LRT, I-205/Mall LRT, Commuter Rail, South Waterfront Streetcar and Lake Oswego AA

TOD/Centers projects have been committed to date in Gresham, Portland, Beaverton, Hillsboro, Washington County and Milwaukie; Projects are eligible adjacent to LRT, Streetcar, Commuter Rail and Frequent Bus.

3/21/08

Regional Flexible Fund Allocation to Regionally Administered Programs

High Capacity Transit Program

1. Program Description

This region's celebrated quality of life is in no small part as result of careful transportation and land use planning. Transit is an integral part of the region's culture and identity. For 30 years the region has made light rail transit, now supplemented with commuter rail, the basis for the regional high capacity transit (HCT) system. Each addition has had exponential benefits and the system must be completed if it is to respond to the region's continued growth.

The region has been successful in bringing an average $65 million of Federal New Starts funding per year (1992 to 2011), leveraged by a mix of local sources of funding. A decline in Federal contributions (from 88% for the Banfield project to 60% for the Green Line) and increasing construction costs have made it necessary to look to a contribution from the region's MTIP to help close the funding gap for these HCT projects. The program will implement the Regional Transportation Plan and the Regional High Capacity Transit Plan supporting the highest priority regional High Capacity Transit Projects. This request addresses the needs of two key components of the Regional High Capacity Transit Program:

1. The Portland-to-Milwaukie light rail project will construct a 6.5-mile MAX extension from Portland State University to downtown Milwaukie with a multi-modal river crossing and serving the South Waterfront, OMSI, SE Portland, Brooklyn, West Mooreland and Sellwood neighborhoods. While several alignment and design options are still under consideration, the estimated cost of a baseline project (as of 3/08) is $1.25 billion. The project will complete a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement this spring. In total, $1 Billion in transportation funding is expected to be leveraged by this project through (1) a proposed $750 million Section 5309 New Starts share; and (2) $250 million in lottery bonds approved by the Oregon legislature in 2007. The requested multi-year commitment of MTIP funds would provide net proceeds of $75.0 million toward the local match requirement for Milwaukie LRT in 2011 and $1.2 million toward Preliminary Engineering/Final Environmental Impact Statement in 2008. The remaining local match requirement will come from TriMet, benefited local governments, benefited land owners, and land donation sources.

2. As proposed, MTIP funds would provide net proceeds of $13.3 million (2008 dollars) to offset certain essential and necessary costs associated with the 14.7-mile WES Commuter Rail line that is scheduled to open in October 2008.

The most efficient method of providing these funds will probably require using the MTIP funds to acquire buses, freeing up TriMet general funds to be used to provide additional funding for these High Capacity Transit projects.

2. Policy objectives for the RFF Allocation Process addressed by High Capacity Transit Program

RTP Goals	RTP policy objectives	How Program Addresses Policy Objectives
Goal 1, Goal 2	A. Retain and attract housing and jobs by addressing system gaps or deficiencies to improve multi-modal access in primary 2040 target areas (central city, regional centers, industrial areas and passenger and freight inter-modal facilities) as the highest priority, secondary areas (town centers, main streets, station communities and corridors) as next highest priority, and other areas (employment areas, inner and outer neighborhoods) as the lowest priority.	The Portland region has demonstrated how high capacity transit can define and reinforce regional and town centers that are characterized by more dense, mixed-use development with strong pedestrian orientation. The region continues to leverage light rail to take advantage of land development opportunities around light rail. Transit-supported centers and station areas can absorb more housing and more employment than other land use types with less dependence on the road infrastructure. Regional and town centers interconnected with high capacity transit reduce the burden on the regional and interstate road system. Station communities that are not otherwise "centers" have a secondary but nonetheless important priority. The Milwaukie line serves the central eastside industrial area, industrial areas in SE Portland, and Milwaukie's north Industrial area. The commuter rail provides key employment connections in the Wilsonville, Tualatin, Tigard, Beaverton corridor. .
Goal 1, Goal 2	B. Address gaps and deficiencies in the reliable movement of freight and goods on the RTP regional freight system, and transit, pedestrian and bicycle access and inter-modal connections to labor markets and trade areas within or between 2040 target areas (Primary areas are highest priority, Secondary areas are next highest priority, other areas are lowest priority).	The high capacity transit system compliments the road system by carrying regional trips at peak travel times of the day. This takes pressure off of the road systems, thus facilitating the free flow of freight and commerce. An interconnected high capacity transit system backed up by more localized bus services also provides multi-directional access to jobs. That HCT system today is incomplete and its development will multiply options for live-work combinations, regardless of location and type of work. A multi-directional high capacity transit system will also be less downtown centric but focused on regional centers and will increase live/work options while reducing travel time for a greater share of the population.
Goal 3, Goal 8	C. Provide access to transportation options	Jurisdictions are increasingly zoning for affordable and senior housing within in high capacity transit

	for underserved populations (low income and minority populations and elderly and people with disabilities).	station communities. HCT expands live/work/travel options for these populations whether they live in the city or suburban station-area communities at a lower cost than car ownership. Access to high capacity transit for these populations is further extended with feeder bus services.
Goal 4	D. Invest in Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) in regional mobility corridors.	Light/commuter rail serves regional mobility corridors generally alongside the major road system. Bus rapid transit, while not yet used in this region, is another HCT mode that is typically integrated with road management systems to increase the through-put of existing travel corridors. Light/commuter rail transit serves these major corridors providing a highly reliable option to the road facilities and a backup for when those facilities are blocked or congested. Light/commuter rail transit is also efficient use of the right of way, with each track providing the equivalent of 1.5 freeway lanes.
Goal 5	E. Address recurring safety issues, including gaps in the bike and pedestrian system.	All transit vehicles carry bikes and additionally many light rail stations provide lockable bike lockers. Transit thus is an extension of both the bike and pedestrian systems, but is also highly dependent on those systems for safe access and egress. Sections of high capacity transit rights of way also serve as direct bike routes – without the noise and exhaust associated with roadway bike lanes. TriMet works with all road jurisdictions to assure safe access to HCT facilities and has increasingly aggressive standards for safe use of the transit system – on and off the transit vehicles.
Goal 6	F. Minimize transportation-related storm-water run-off.	With its high person-carrying capacity, transit can reduce the footprint of transportation infrastructure. Each light rail tack carries the equivalent of 1.5 freeway lanes with a smaller cross section and, in many places, over permeable, ballasted track. TriMet also employees green design features into its park & ride lots and stations (e.g. using dry set pavers and bioswales).
Goal 6, Goal 7	G. Reduce or minimize energy consumption, carbon emissions and other pollution impacts.	The high person-carrying capacity of high capacity transit is inherently more energy efficient than most alternatives. Light rail uses clean electric energy. Bus Rapid Transit vehicles increasingly use hybrid technology and biodiesel fuel.
	H. the project mode of program service type has no other or limited sources of transportation-related funding available.	This region has historically competed well for Federal New Starts funds, but the Federal share has been receding from 88% to now 60%. Covering the full program costs has been difficult without the supplemental use of MTIP funds. MTIP funds are thus to be used to “top off” Federal and

		other state and local funding.
Goal 9	I. efficiently and cost effectively use federal funds.	The region has acquired project development expertise, a favorable project delivery track record and has secured an average on $65 million in Federal New Starts funds annually over the past 15 years. While the local match ratio, by Federal policy is generally now at 40%, each $1.00 0f local funds (including formula federal funds) leverage about $1.68 of discretionary federal funds.

3. Summarize the program's funding request

The Regional High Capacity Transit Program will apply the following principles as it utilizes Regional Flexible MTIP Funds:

1. The region will make every effort to maximize the Federal Section 5309 contribution to the program, at this time 60% or more.
2. At least 50% of the remaining State and local share (matching funds) for the program will come directly from the collective project sponsors.

The requested MTIP funds will support a financing plan providing about $76.45 million in net bond proceeds (2011 dollars) to the Milwaukie LRT Project and $13.3 million (2008 dollars) to the WES Commuter Rail Project. The financing program may include bonding, other types of borrowing, and/or eligible funding offsets for other regional transit needs (e.g. purchase of replacement buses) that allows for the efficient financing of the Regional High Capacity Transit Program. These funds would be managed through an Intergovernmental Agreement between TriMet and Metro, consistent with an existing agreement managing the MTIP contributions to the South Corridor Green Line, Commuter Rail and North Macadam projects.

Program Funding Request: $3.7 million per year in FY '12 and '13 and a long-term funding commitment through 2025.

	Regional High Capacity Transit Funding (millions)		
Federal Fiscal Year	**Existing Commitment**	**New Request**	**Total Existing and New**
2006	$ 4.0	$ 0.0	$ 4.0
2007	$ 8.0	$ 0.0	$ 8.0
2008	$ 9.3	$ 0.0	$ 9.3
2010	$ 9.3	$ 0.0	$ 9.3
2011	$ 9.3	$ 0.0	$ 9.3
2012	**$ 9.3**	**$ 3.7**	**$ 13.0**
2013	**$ 9.3**	**$ 3.7**	**$ 13.0**
2014	$ 9.3	$ 3.7	$ 13.0
2015	$ 9.3	$ 3.7	$ 13.0
2016	$ 0.0	$ 13.0	$ 13.0
2017	$ 0.0	$ 13.0	$ 13.0
2018	$ 0.0	$ 13.0	$ 13.0
2019	$ 0.0	$ 13.0	$ 13.0
2020	$ 0.0	$ 13.0	$ 13.0
2021	$ 0.0	$ 13.0	$ 13.0
2022	$ 0.0	$ 13.0	$ 13.0
2023	$ 0.0	$ 13.0	$ 13.0
2024	$ 0.0	$ 13.0	$ 13.0
2025	$ 0.0	$ 13.0	$ 13.0
Total in Millions	$ 86.4	$ 144.8	$ 231.2

.

High Capacity Transit Program
Lake Oswego to Portland Streetcar Project

1. Program Description

This $4 million request is for the Lake Oswego to Portland Streetcar Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It is anticipated that this funding will be matched by $1.5 million in local funding from project partner jurisdictions.

A federal appropriations request has been made for federal fiscal year 2009 for $4.0 million in Federal Transit Administration Section 5339 funding for this DEIS. The funding requested in this FY 12 – 13 MTIP request would be used to complete the funding plan for the DEIS in the event that the entire $4.0 million is not received in FY 09 and FY 10. These FY 12 – 13 funds would need to be moved forward to FY 09 or FY 10.

If the entire $4.0 million in FTA Section 5339 funds is received in FY 09, the $4.0 million in this request would be used to complete the project's Final Environmental Impact Statement in FY 10.

Metro provides services to the region by leading the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Environmental Impact Statements and the Federal Transit Administration New Starts processes in order to gain approval and funding for new high capacity transit projects.

2. Policy objectives of the RFF Allocation Process addressed by the High Capacity Transit Program

RTP Goals	RFF policy objectives	How Program Addresses Policy Objectives
Goal 1, Goal 2	A. Retain and attract housing and jobs by addressing system gaps or deficiencies to improve multi-modal access in primary 2040 target areas (central city, regional centers, industrial areas and passenger and freight inter-modal facilities) as the highest priority, secondary areas (town centers, main streets, station communities and corridors) as next highest priority, and other areas	The Portland region has demonstrated how high capacity transit can define and reinforce regional and town centers that are characterized by more dense, mixed-use development with strong pedestrian orientation. The region continues to leverage light rail to take advantage of land development opportunities around light rail. Transit-supported centers and station areas can absorb more housing and more employment than other land use types with less dependence on the road infrastructure. Regional and town centers interconnected with high capacity transit reduce the burden on the regional and interstate road system. Station communities that are not otherwise "centers" have a secondary but nonetheless important priority.

	(employment areas, inner and outer neighborhoods) as the lowest priority.	
Goal 1, Goal 2	B. Address gaps and deficiencies in the reliable movement of freight and goods on the RTP regional freight system, and transit, pedestrian and bicycle access and inter-modal connections to labor markets and trade areas within or between 2040 target areas (Primary areas are highest priority, Secondary areas are next highest priority, other areas are lowest priority).	The high capacity transit system compliments the road system by carrying regional trips at peak travel times of the day. This takes pressure off of the road systems, thus facilitating the free flow of freight and commerce. An interconnected high capacity transit system backed up by more localized bus services also provides multi-directional access to jobs. That HCT system today is incomplete and its development will multiply options for live-work combinations, regardless of location and type of work. A multi-directional high capacity transit system will also be less downtown centric but focused on regional centers and will increase live/work options while reducing travel time for a greater share of the population.
Goal 3, Goal 8	C. Provide access to transportation options for underserved populations (low income and minority populations and elderly and people with disabilities).	Jurisdictions are increasingly zoning for affordable and senior housing within in high capacity transit station communities. HCT expands live/work/travel options for these populations whether they live in the city or suburban station-area communities at a lower cost than car ownership. Access to high capacity transit for these populations is further extended with feeder bus services.
Goal 4	D. Invest in Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) in regional mobility corridors.	Light/commuter rail serves regional mobility corridors generally alongside the major road system. Bus rapid transit, while not yet used in this region, is another HCT mode that is typically integrated with road management systems to increase the through-put of existing travel corridors. Light/commuter rail transit serves these major corridors providing a highly reliable option to the road facilities and a backup for when those facilities are blocked or congested. Light/commuter rail transit is also efficient use of the right of way, with each track providing the equivalent of 1.5 freeway lanes.
Goal 5	E. Address recurring safety issues, including gaps in the bike and pedestrian system.	All transit vehicles carry bikes and additionally many light rail stations provide lockable bike lockers. Transit thus is an extension of both the bike and pedestrian systems, but is also highly dependent on those systems for safe access and egress. Sections of high capacity transit rights of way also serve as direct bike routes – without the noise and exhaust associated with roadway bike lanes. TriMet works with all road jurisdictions to assure safe access to HCT facilities and has increasingly aggressive standards for safe use of the transit system – on and off the transit vehicles.

Goal 6	F. Minimize transportation-related storm-water run-off.	With its high person-carrying capacity, transit can reduce the footprint of transportation infrastructure. Each light rail tack carries the equivalent of 1.5 freeway lanes with a smaller cross section and, in many places, over permeable, ballasted track.
Goal 6, Goal 7	G. Reduce or minimize energy consumption, carbon emissions and other pollution impacts.	The high person-carrying capacity of high capacity transit is inherently more energy efficient than most alternatives. Light rail uses clean electric energy. Bus Rapid Transit vehicles increasingly use hybrid technology and biodiesel fuel.
	H. the project mode of program service type has no other or limited sources of transportation-related funding available.	
Goal 9	I. efficiently and cost effectively use federal funds.	

3. Summarize the program funding request

Program Element Title	Base Funding Request	Additional Funding Request
Lake Oswego to Portland Streetcar DEIS/FEIS		$4,000,000
Total Program		**$4,000,000**

4. Historical Funding Levels

HCT Project Development	FFY 2012-13	FFY 10-11	FFY 08-09	FFY 06-07	FFY 04-05	FFY 02-03	10-year Total Allocation
Lake Oswego to Portland Streetcar DEIS/FEIS	$4,000,000						$4,000,000
Milwaukie to Portland LRT PE/FEIS		$2,000,000					$2,000,000
Milwaukie to Portland LRT DEIS			$2,000,000				$2,000,000
Portland Streetcar Loop (Eastside) AA			$1,000,000				$1,000,000
Lake Oswego to Portland AA			$688,000	$300,000			$988,000
South Corridor AA/DEIS/PE					$4,000,000		$4,000,000
Wash Co. Commuter Rail EA/PE						$1,000,000	$1,000,000
Total: HCT Project Development	**$4,000,000**	**$2,000,000**	**$3,688,000**	**$300,000**	**$4,000,000**	**$1,000,000**	**$14,988,000**

Metro Planning

1. Program Description

A. MPO-Required Planning - Allocation of Regional Flexible Funds to Metro provides support for meeting MPO mandates, established through federal transportation authorization bills. Examples of these requirements include:

- Development and adoption of a long-range plan (RTP);
- Development and adoption of a short-range transportation improvement program (TIP);
- Support for a decision-making structure that includes local governments and state and regional transportation providers;
- Participation in the development of local plans and projects that implement regional policy;
- Maintenance of travel demand models for planning by Metro, local governments and state and regional transportation service providers;
- Maintenance of land use, economic, demographic, GIS and aerial photo services for planning by Metro, local governments, and state and regional transportation providers;
- Compliance with federal certification requirements, including public participation, Environmental Justice, air quality, coordination with environmental resource agencies, grants and contracting requirements

This element of the allocation of Regional Flexible Funds came about in the mid-1980's when Metro abandoned the assessment of local government dues on cities and counties, TriMet and the Port of Portland. The amount allocated has been consistent over time with an inflation factor applied.

Proposed Allocation: This should be viewed as the Base allocation in the Planning category. The proposed allocation is $1.949 million for the 2-year period including a 3% per year escalator.

B. Freight Planning – In the last 5-years, there has been an increased level of concern and attention to freight planning. As a result, an increasing share of Metro's base planning funds have been dedicated to freight planning. In addition, there has been a series of Regional Flexible Funds allocations to freight planning to support improved data collection, improved forecasting of overall regional commodities, improvements to the regional travel demand models to upgrade forecasts of truck volumes on the road and highway network, facilitation of a regional freight advisory committee, participation in state freight planning and development of a freight component to the RTP. Continuation of this added allocation would enable continued support of involvement with freight interest groups and follow-through on implementation of freight plan recommendations.

Proposed Allocation: This supplemental freight allocation is proposed at $166,500 for the 2-year period including a 3% escalator.

C. Multi-Modal Corridor Plans – Following adoption of the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan, a multi-year work plan was identified to carry out a series of corridor plans to better define needed improvements in various corridors throughout the region. Priorities for addressing these corridors were established through Resolution No. 01-3089 and Resolution No. 05-3616A. To support carrying out those corridor plans, MTIP funds have been allocated through a series of MTIP cycles since 2002. To date, corridor plans have been completed for the I-5 Trade Corridor, the Hwy 217 Corridor, the Powell-Foster Corridor and is now underway for a Regional HCT System Plan. Upon completion of the next RTP update, these corridor priorities will be updated. This allocation would set aside funds in FY '12 and FY '13 to contribute toward the next priority corridor. In the past there has been a practice to define the scope of work for the corridor plans and supplement this funding set-aside with other state, regional and local contributions. Consideration will be given to the priorities established through Resolution No. 05-3616A which included the I-84/US 26 Connector, I-5 South, I-205 and the I-5/I-405 Loop. However, final priorities are subject to conclusions reached through the RTP update.

Proposed Allocation: This supplemental corridor planning allocation is proposed at $500,000 for the 2-year period. Most of the funding is used for contractual services.

D. Household Travel Behavior Survey – Metro fields a comprehensive household travel behavior survey about every decade to inform policy makers on changing travel patterns and to update travel forecasting models to accurately predict future travel. The last survey was 1994. This update was delayed from 2004 to 2010 because the significant disruption due to downtown Portland construction would skew the results. In the meantime, Metro staff has been working with ODOT staff and staffs from the other Oregon MPOs to design and test the survey instrument and begin fielding surveys in other metropolitan areas of the state. By having a common survey instrument and contractor, all of the parties receive information from the other regions to use in their own work and an economy of scale results in lower costs.

The survey is designed to cover 6,000 households throughout the 4-county region, 25% in Clark Co. and 75% in the Oregon tri-county area. In addition, ODOT and the Salem MPO are fielding the same survey in Marion and Yamhill Counties which should yield some records for travelers into the Metro region. 10% of the surveys would use GPS technology with 90% using paper surveys. The GPS surveys will be for a 5-day period and the paper surveys for a 1-2 day period. All of the surveys will be for all of the trips of the household, including children. With this base level survey, there is an opportunity for others to add to the survey to obtain a higher sample size for particular areas of interest (such as a smaller geography, a specialized land use like TODs, a particular demographic or a particular mode of travel like bikes or transit).

The overall survey cost is projected at $1,402,000 for consultant services (the Metro staff cost is already covered through the base MPO-related planning allocation). The cost is proposed to be split 25% each between Metro, ODOT, TriMet and SW Washington RTC consistent with past practice.

Proposed Allocation: This proposed supplemental allocation is for the 25% Metro share of $350,500.

2. Policy objectives for the RFF Allocation Process addressed by Metro Planning

RTP Goals	RFF policy objectives	How Program Addresses Policy Objectives
Goal 1, Goal 2	A. Retain and attract housing and jobs by addressing system gaps or deficiencies to improve multi-modal access in primary 2040 target areas (central city, regional centers, industrial areas and passenger and freight inter-modal facilities) as the highest priority, secondary areas (town centers, main streets, station communities and corridors) as next highest priority, and other areas (employment areas, inner and outer neighborhoods) as the lowest priority.	The MPO Planning activities and Multi-Modal Corridor Plans will include elements that improve access to Primary and Secondary 2040 target areas. The freight planning will address access to industrial areas.

Goal 1, Goal 2	B. Address gaps and deficiencies in the reliable movement of freight and goods on the RTP regional freight system, and transit, pedestrian and bicycle access and inter-modal connections to labor markets and trade areas within or between 2040 target areas (Primary areas are highest priority, Secondary areas are next highest priority, other areas are lowest priority).	The freight planning will directly address access to industrial areas. The MPO planning and Multi-Modal Corridor Planning will address access to Primary 2040 Target areas.
Goal 3, Goal 8	C. Provide access to transportation options for underserved populations (low income and minority populations and elderly and people with disabilities).	The MPO Planning will address transportation options for underserved populations and support addressing Environmental Justice requirements.
Goal 4	D. Invest in Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) in regional mobility corridors.	The MPO Planning funds provides Metro the ability to address TSMO needs and provide staff support to the TransPort Committee. The Multi-Modal Corridor planning will include addressing TSMO options as part of the corridor plan.
Goal 5	E. Address recurring safety issues, including gaps in the bike and pedestrian system.	The MPO Planning funds include addressing safety issues and bike/ped. Issues.
Goal 6	F. Minimize transportation-related storm-water run-off.	The MPO Planning funds includes staff support for the Liveable Streets/Green Streets manuals and staff support to assist in incorporating green features into project scopes funded through the MTIP.
Goal 6, Goal 7	G. Reduce or minimize energy consumption, carbon emissions and other pollution impacts.	The MPO Planning includes addressing air quality requirements and multi-modal planning aimed at reducing VMT and therefore energy and carbon emissions.
	H. the project mode of program service type has no other or limited sources of transportation-related funding available.	Metro's Planning program receives federal highway and transit planning funds through a formula distribution and local matching funds through Metro's budget process. In addition, TriMet and ODOT contribute local funds to support these planning functions. However, Metro does not have access to state and local sources of transportation funding.

Goal 9	I. efficiently and cost effectively use federal funds.	These Planning funds provide the support for meeting federal and state planning requirements, thereby allowing construction funds to be accessed for implementing projects. Without these funds, the region would be in jeopardy of losing federal certification which would disrupt the flow of federal construction funding.

3. Summarize the program funding request

The funding request is for program funding authority from federal fiscal years 2012 and 2013. Actual funding authority awarded may be programmed over any of the federal fiscal years 2010 through 2013.

Program Element Title	Base Funding Request	Additional Funding Request
MPO Required Planning	$1,949,000	
Freight Planning	$ 166,500	
Multi-Modal Corridor Plans		$500,000
Household Travel Behavior Survey		$350,500
Total Program	**$2,115,500**	**$850,500**
GRAND TOTAL	**$2,966,000**	

Historical MTIP allocation to Planning related programs:

	MPO-Required Planning	Freight Planning	Multimodal Corridor Plans	Best Practices Manuals	Household Travel Survey	Total
FY '02	$ 705,000	$ 50,000				$ 755,000
FY '03	$ 705,000	$ 50,000	$ 250,000			$ 1,005,000
FY '04	$ 738,000	$ 75,000				$ 813,000
FY '05	$ 777,000	$ 75,000	$ 300,000			$ 1,152,000
FY '06	$ 801,000	$ 75,000				$ 876,000
FY '07	$ 827,000	$ 75,000	$ 700,000			$ 1,602,000
FY '08	$ 853,000	$ 75,000				$ 928,000
FY '09	$ 878,000	$ 75,000	$ 500,000			$ 1,453,000
FY '10	$ 904,340	$ 77,250				$ 981,590
FY '11	$ 931,470	$ 79,570	$ 300,000	$ 375,000		$ 1,686,040
Proposed FY '12	$ 960,000	$ 82,000				$ 1,042,000
Proposed FY '13	$ 989,000	$ 84,500	$ 500,000		$ 350,500	$ 1,924,000
FY '12/'13 Total	$ 1,949,000	$ 166,500	$ 500,000	$ -	$ 350,500	$ 2,966,000

Proposed Budget for Household Survey:

	FY2008-2009	FY2009-2010	FY2010-2011	FY2011-2012	Totals
Survey Design					
RTC (1500 hh - 10% w/ GPS)	$31,500				
Oregon (4500 hh - 10% w/ GPS)	$94,500				
Survey Data Collection					
RTC (1500 hh - 10% w/ GPS)		$319,000			
Oregon					
Phase 1 (2250 hh - 10% w/ GPS)			$478,500		
Phase 2 (2250 hh - 10% w/ GPS)				$478,500	
	$126,000	$319,000	$478,500	$478,500	**$1,402,000**
RTC	$31,500	$319,000			$350,500
ODOT	$94,500		$128,000	$128,000	$350,500
TriMet			$350,500		$350,500
MTIP				$350,500	$350,500
	$126,000	$319,000	$478,500	$478,500	$1,402,000

Assumptions

Survey design per hh
w/ 10% GPS => $21

Data capture per hh
w/ 10% GPS => $196

$217

Region Travel Options (RTO)

1. Program Description

The Regional Travel Options (RTO) Program carries out regional strategies to increase use of travel options, reduce pollution and improve mobility. Regional travel options include all of the alternatives to driving alone – carpooling, vanpooling, riding transit, bicycling, walking and telecommuting. The program maximizes investments in the transportation system and relieves traffic congestion by managing travel demand, particularly during peak commute hours.
RTO is a key implementation strategy to meet required 2040 non-drive alone modal targets. These modal targets are the regionally selected measurement to demonstrate compliance with per capita travel reductions required by the State Transportation Planning Rule. Implementing the 2008-2013 RTO Strategic Plan is expected to reduce 86,600,000 vehicle miles of travel (VMT) per year. Expected VMT reductions are based upon past program performance and carrying out cost-effective strategies that leverage investments in transit, trails and other infrastructure by marketing new options to potential users.

The RTO program supports federal, state and regional air quality regulations, reduces the consumption of gasoline and increases the share of trips made with less polluting modes of travel. RTO supports employers affected by Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Employer Commute Options Rules to reduce employee auto trips. The program results in significant reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. The Governor's Climate Change Integration Group, January 2008 report, "A Framework for Addressing Rapid Climate Change," recommends continued implementation of "transportation choices" programs and notes that Oregon must reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 42% to meet the State's 2020 goals.

Proposed Allocation
$4.407 million base program supports the following programs and projects:

- Collaborative marketing programs increase public awareness of the personal and community benefits of travel options; and, motivate people to choose more efficient transportation. RTO manages regional, collaborative marketing; currently Drive Less/Save More. Additional funds from ODOT (separate from MTIP) purchase television and radio ads for the campaign.
- Individualized marketing projects (TravelSmart™ or Smart Trips) identify individuals who want to change their travel behavior and provides them customized information. One large scale or two smaller scale projects are included in the base program.
- Employer outreach to employers to reduce auto trips by increasing employer-offered transportation benefits. The non-drive alone rate has risen from 26% in 1996 to 35% in 2006, representing 150,000 employees. RTO efforts are expected to pass 40% non-drive alone commute trips by 2013. DEQ, Metro, TriMet, Wilsonville SMART, area TMAs and other partners carry out employer outreach programs.
- Transportation Management Association (TMA) and RTO grant programs support local travel options projects and programs.

2. **Policy objectives of the RFF Allocation Process addressed by RTO**

RTP Goals	RFF policy objectives	How Program Addresses Policy Objectives
Goal 1, Goal 2	A. Retain and attract housing and jobs by addressing system gaps or deficiencies to improve multi-modal access in primary 2040 target areas (central city, regional centers, industrial areas and passenger and freight inter-modal facilities) as the highest priority, secondary areas (town centers, main streets, station communities and corridors) as next highest priority, and other areas (employment areas, inner and outer neighborhoods) as the lowest priority.	RTO preserves multi-modal access in primary 2040 target areas by reducing drive-alone auto trips. RTO centers analysis in 2003 showed the following number of employment sites meeting or making progress to a 10% reduction in auto trips: • 171 employment sites in the Central City • 55 employment sites in Regional Centers The 2006 RTO evaluation showed the program reducing over 40 million vehicle miles traveled each year; taking over 10,000 vehicles out of the peak commute each weekday.
Goal 1, Goal 2	B. Address gaps and deficiencies in the reliable movement of freight and goods on the RTP regional freight system, and transit, pedestrian and bicycle access and inter-modal connections to labor markets and trade areas within or between 2040 target areas (Primary areas are highest priority, Secondary areas are next highest priority, other areas are lowest priority).	RTO preserves multi-modal access in primary and secondary 2040 target areas by reducing drive-alone auto trips. RTO also supports connections to labor markets. These two areas are addressed through RTO employer outreach which has reached one-quarter of the region's employees and has measured results for one-fifth of all employees. Non-drive alone trip rates have steadily climbed from 26% in 1996 to 34% in 2006.
Goal 3, Goal 8	C. Provide access to transportation options for underserved populations (low income and minority populations and elderly and people with disabilities).	Grant proposals that connect programs to underserved populations score more points. RTO outreach features materials written in Spanish.

Goal 4	D. Invest in Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) in regional mobility corridors.	RTO implements transportation demand management that is a component, like TSMO, of managing the system. RTO staff are actively partnering with TSMO staff. RTO traveler information is just one strategy RTO shares with TSMO.
Goal 5	E. Address recurring safety issues, including gaps in the bike and pedestrian system.	RTO provides outreach and materials to address safety issues. Bike maps show safer routes and include practical information for navigating the bike system safely. Walking maps serve a similar function. RTO individualized marketing projects address safety barriers one-on-one with novice users of the bike and pedestrian system.
Goal 6	F. Minimize transportation-related storm-water run-off.	RTO reduces auto trips which reduces all auto-related run-off including toxics. RTO influences the demand for parking which will reduce impervious surfaces in the long-term.
Goal 6, Goal 7	G. Reduce or minimize energy consumption, carbon emissions and other pollution impacts.	RTO measurement shows that the program is on track to reduce gasoline consumption by 4.5 million gallons in the year 2012, save 45,000 tons of carbon-dioxide from being released into the atmosphere and tons of carcinogenic particulate matter and air toxics (expected results are based on past program evaluation).
	H. The project mode of program service type has no other or limited sources of transportation-related funding available.	Past MTIP Technical Evaluation has rated RTO as “low” for availability of other funding sources. In the most optimistic scenario, MTIP would make up 63% of RTO revenue, not including local match.
Goal 9	I. Efficiently and cost effectively use federal funds.	RTO staff estimate most programs reduce one vehicle mile traveled for five cents ($.05) or less. RTO is in line with the second most cost-effective regional approaches to transportation demand management in the nation (comparing RTO among the eight national programs included in the 2002 Transportation Research Board assessment of CMAQ (Special Report 264)).

3. RTO Program funding request

Program Element Title	Base Funding Request	Additional Funding Request
Regional Travel Options implementing transportation demand management	$4,407,000	0
Employer Outreach Evolution		$700,000
New Phase of Life		$600,000
Safety		$1,000,000
Total Program	$4,407,000	$2,300,000

Historical MTIP allocation to RTO Programs and Base Funding Request

		Base		TMAs and Grants		Total
FY '01	$	700,000	$	767,000	$	1,467,000
FY '02	$	700,000			$	700,000
FY '03	$	999,000	$	500,000	$	1,499,000
FY '04*	$	700,000	$	425,757	$	1,125,757
FY '05	$	700,000	$	320,000	$	1,020,000
FY '06	$	700,000	$	757,000	$	1,457,000
FY '07	$	883,000	$	295,000	$	1,178,000
FY '08	$	883,000	$	337,544	$	1,220,544
Base and TMA/Grants to be determined by RTO Subcommitee						
		MTIP Allocation				
FY '09	$	1,800,000	→	tbd	$	1,800,000
FY '10	$	1,897,000	$500,000** +	tbd	$	2,397,000
FY '11	$	1,882,000	→	tbd	$	1,882,000
Proposed FY '12	$	2,203,685	→	tbd	$	2,203,685
Proposed FY '13	$	2,203,685	→	tbd	$	2,203,685
FY '12 & FY'13 Total (rounded)	$	4,407,000	→	tbd	$	4,407,000

*MTIP funding cut this year

**$500,000 is dedicated to individualized marketing

The following pie charts illustrate:

1. the likely split between local and regional expenditures of the $4.4 million MTIP application for the RTO funding base.
2. the projected amount of MTIP, match and leveraged funding, totaling $7.1 million.





Additional Funding Requests

On March 12, 2008, the RTO Subcommittee of TPAC recommended three requests for additional funding.

1. Employer Outreach Evolution

Currently, the employer outreach program reaches one-quarter of the region's employees. This program would continue leveraging transportation and sustainability coordinators at employers throughout the region, conduct outreach, trip planning and/or individualized marketing to employees at businesses of all sizes. TriMet has a solid track record working with employer coordinators since 1996, helping to bring RTO commute mode splits from 26% non-drive alone trips in 1996 to 35% in 2006, representing 150,000 employees. The City of Portland has had success with individualized marketing to employees. Portland's early results show that contact with 90 downtown employers generated 6,000 interested commuters who now reduce their drive-alone commuting by 18%.

$700,000 is requested to reach 100,000 additional employees. Program elements include:

- Development of local and personalized transportation options toolkits and online resources.
- Partnerships with transit agencies, local jurisdictions and Transportation Management Associations (TMAs) would build local capacity to provide transportation sustainability expertise to businesses, especially those that are new, relocating, applying for LEED ratings or have physical exercise goals for their workforce.
- Outreach to office parks, building managers in centers and industrial/employment areas to reach employees. Examples include the Kruse Way employment area and the Clackamas industrial area.

2. Individualized Marketing for a New Stage of Life

People make many changes in at least three distinct phases in life: becoming an independent adult, forming a family and post-retirement. Often, their transportation decisions come after a move to the region or within the region. This program would be based on individualized marketing and community-based marketing to reach targeted demographic groups. $600,000 is requested to reach 60,000 residents over two years with a cost-efficient version of individualized marketing, estimated at $10/person. Funding would support:

- Contacting residents and fulfilling their request for personalized transportation information.
- Partnering with residential developers seeking LEED ratings.
- Partnering with developing centers to promote location-efficient choices within short distance of new residents.
- Outreach to targeted populations: students entering post-secondary education; new families; and retirees and seniors.

3. Safety Partnership and Safer Crossings

The region lacks a coordinated effort for safety. Safety is both a real and perceived barrier for much of the public who are not using transportation options. Forty percent of residents who do not already use alternative modes, said improved safety would motivate them to use transit, walk or bike (2004 Travel Behavior Barriers and Benefits Research). More in-depth research and careful development would guide this initiative. Through advocacy and legislation, laws are updated; however, the public is often unaware. Engineering advancements are making some road intersections safer for all modes, but these advancements could be implemented on a greater scale.

$1,000,000 is requested to develop and carry out a regionally coordinated safety initiative that includes an education campaign, enforcement actions and engineering solutions. A Safety Partnership between RTO and Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) would convene state agencies (ODOT, DEQ), local law enforcement, auto clubs like AAA, insurance providers (motor vehicle and health), advocacy groups like BTA and community members. The partnership would implement this safety initiative and develop a funding strategy to continue work past 2013.

Based on research and development, funding could support:

- An education campaign that brings efforts such as Portland's "I Share the Road" and "I Brake for People" to the rest of the region. Education informs road and transit users of new laws, provides guidance for staying safe and disseminates research-based information to distinguish real safety issues from perceived safety barriers. The partnership would develop communication strategies, deciding between large- and small-scale efforts, choosing which forms of media to pursue, and ways to generate earned media. Messaging would be directed to novice transit riders, cyclists and walkers, as well as motorists.
- Enforcement actions would be carried out by local police departments. A partnership with law enforcement would bring red traffic light cameras and other techniques to problem intersections and pedestrian crossings. One option is to follow Portland's model, to use a portion of ticket revenue to fund ongoing local enforcement, regional safety coordination and

safer intersections. Traffic safety officers around the region would select an enforcement action to highlight a specific danger to raise awareness.

- Engineering solutions would likely focus on making safer crossings at key intersections. Intersection improvements would be based on criteria for areas where pedestrian, cycling and motorist activity is high or likely to grow; for example, near major transit stops, near schools, near senior centers and in developing centers. New data show that signals can be optimized for motorists or pedestrians based on usage by time of day. Safer crossings would also focus on locations where low auto-traffic, through streets cross arterials. Signals could be upgraded, such as the one on N Columbia Boulevard at Macrum, where a busy freight corridor borders a residential neighborhood. In this example, a road sensor calculates the ability for a truck to safely stop before the light turns red and extends green time, which has significantly reduced red-light running at this intersection and increased safety for all modes. Regional coordination would highlight best practices and lessons learned while implementing solutions. New projects would be the focus of earned media efforts to raise safety awareness.

Transit Oriented Development (TOD) / Centers Program

1. Program Description

Metro's Transit-Oriented Development and Centers Implementation Programs (Programs) work directly with developers, landowners and local jurisdictions, creating partnerships to influence development projects that forge strong land use-transportation connections to increase transit ridership and help realize the 2040 Growth Concept. Since the Program's inception 10 years ago, $19 million dollars has been invested throughout the region to stimulate the development of nearly 3,000 new housing units in 30 higher-density mixed-use projects with a functional or physical connection to the transit system.

Transit-oriented development (TOD) projects contribute to compact, relatively dense, mixed-use, mixed-income developments which concentrate retail, housing and jobs in pedestrian-scaled urban environments and increase non-auto trips (transit, bicycle, walking). TODs serve to decrease regional congestion and help mitigate environmental impacts like climate change by decreasing carbon emissions and using land more efficiently. A recent study sponsored jointly by PB Placemaking, Cal Berkely, the Urban Land Institute and Reconnecting America indicates that TOD projects produce up to 50% fewer auto trips than conventional development. This research confirmed Metro's study that was conducted by Portland State University Professor Jennifer Dill, which examined the Merrick, a development that received TOD Program funding, and found that 47% of all trips from the Merrick were made either by walking or using transit. In total, all TOD/Centers Projects to date will add an estimated 3,541 new riders daily or over a million riders annually to the transit system. The Program's innovation and effectiveness were recently nationally recognized by the American Planning Association (APA) and received the 2008 Planning Excellence Award for Best Practice.

Program Operations
The TOD Program utilizes three main strategies to incentivize and facilitate transit-oriented development projects: 1) buying land to develop future transit oriented projects, and 2) purchasing transit-oriented development easements on projects requesting funding, 3) provision of site improvements (plaza, etc.) When the TOD Program jointly purchases land with a local jurisdiction, such as Hillsboro, Beaverton and Milwaukie, a partnership is created to undertake an RFP or RFQ process to select a developer for the site. Both methods use the increase in projected transit ridership which results in a capitalized farebox revenue figure and the anticipated cost premiums associated with higher density mixed-use projects to determine the level of Program funding for each project.

The TOD Program evaluates the cost effectiveness of a higher density transit-oriented project compared to a base case development scenario that reflects what current market conditions would support. As an example typical suburban development occurs in single- use one to three story buildings with surface parking while TOD projects tend to be four stories or higher in

mixed-use buildings with structured parking. The difference in ridership generated by each project provides a metric for evaluating the cost effectiveness of a proposed project.

"Cost per induced rider" is routinely modeled to provide a normalized basis for evaluating the cost-effectiveness of the proposed project, and comparing it to other investment alternatives. The annualized cost divided by the number of induced transit riders per year determines the "cost per induced rider." The TOD Program's costs per induced rider compares extremely well with other transportation investment strategies. For TOD Program projects that have either been completed or are currently under construction, the cost per induced rider is $0.96 which compares very favorably with other transportation investments.

The TOD Program analyzes the additional costs (cost premiums) associated with each specific proposed project, compared to the base case project. The construction methods required for mixed-use buildings are more expensive than single use buildings. TOD Program staff determine the dollar value of each cost premium in a proposed project, and the cost premium total becomes another benchmark against which project funding levels are evaluated. Recommended project funding does not exceed the total value of cost premiums.

The additional farebox revenue that results from induced ridership over the 30-year expected life of the project provides a monetary measure of TOD project benefits. Recommended project funding is derived from the net present value of future farebox revenues, which means that TOD Program funds invested are generally earned-back by the transit system in less than the first 30 years of operations.

A. Transit-Oriented Development Implementation Program

The Transit-Oriented Development Implementation Program *(TOD Program)* in existence since 1996 helps stimulate the construction of "transit villages" and other transit-oriented development projects through public/private partnerships along transit lines and frequent bus routes throughout the Portland Metropolitan region.

To date, program investments and commitments have been made throughout the metro region in 19 station areas in several jurisdictions including Portland (Central City and Gateway Regional Centers), Beaverton, Hillsboro (Regional Center and Orenco Town Center), Gresham, and in Washington County.

Proposed Base Allocation: This should be viewed as the Base allocation in the TOD category. The proposed allocation is $3 million for the 2-year period.

Supplemental Request: The request of $500,000 is to respond to increasing demand in the region for TOD funding and to continue to make strategic site acquisitions as additional light rail and commuter rail lines are planned and/or constructed (i.e. Green Line, Washington County Commuter Rail, and Milwaukie Light Rail). The increased allocation would support between 2-5 additional projects.

B. Centers Implementation Program

The Centers Implementation Program (*Centers Program*) in existence since 2004 is based on Metro's TOD Program and provides investment incentives in local jurisdictions to the private sector for constructing "urban villages" and development projects that demonstrate mixed-use concepts and reduce auto mode share by providing services, housing, jobs with access to transit within centers that are yet to be served by light or commuter rail. The Centers Program is intended to help increase development capacity while protecting existing neighborhoods and to enhance the development potential of 2040 centers to ensure that regional goals to accommodate the majority of new residents and jobs within these strategic locations can be realized. To date, Centers program investments have been made in Hillsdale and Milwaukie Town Centers.

Proposed Base Allocation: This should be viewed as the Base allocation in the Centers category. The proposed allocation is $2 million for the 2-year period.

Supplemental Request: The request of $500,000 is to respond to increasing demand in Centers throughout the region such as Forest Grove, Oregon City, Tigard, Sherwood, and Troutdale in which local partners have identified potential projects in their centers. The increased allocation would support between 2-5 additional projects.

2. **Policy objectives for the RFF Allocation Process addressed by TOD/Centers Program**

RTP Goals	RFF policy objectives	How Program Addresses Policy Objectives
Goal 1, Goal 2	A. Retain and attract housing and jobs by addressing system gaps or deficiencies to improve multi-modal access in primary 2040 target areas (central city, regional centers, industrial areas and passenger and freight inter-modal facilities) as the highest priority, secondary areas (town centers, main streets, station communities and corridors) as next highest priority, and other areas (employment areas, inner and outer neighborhoods) as the lowest priority.	1. The Program invests in mixed-use projects throughout the region that provide both housing and commercial/ office space. The Program leverages private funds to directly impact housing development in strategic 2040 growth areas including the Central City, in station communities, and in regional and town centers: a. Project commitments to date will help realize the development of 2,863 housing units and 68 live/work units in centers and station areas. Of these commitments, 1,834 housing units have been completed or under construction. b. TOD/Centers Program has approved over 1.2 million square feet of office and retail space all included within mixed-use projects. In terms of retail space, TOD/Centers project investments have leveraged 460,000 square feet of retail space, 313,000 of which is constructed or currently under construction and 784,000 square feet of office space, 676,000 of which is constructed or under construction (the majority of office space is located in The Round and Pacific University). 2. TOD/Centers Projects increase efficiency of and access to the transit system by encouraging the development of

		housing and services with a functional or physical connection to high quality transit. It is estimated that program investments for both approved and constructed projects will result in 3,347 new transit riders each day. 3. The TOD/Centers Program investments can help retain existing jobs and housing by increasing the viability of center through direct investment and increasing potential for future private investment over time.
	B. Address gaps and deficiencies in the reliable movement of freight and goods on the RTP regional freight system, and transit, pedestrian and bicycle access and inter-modal connections to labor markets and trade areas within or between 2040 target areas (Primary areas are highest priority, Secondary areas are next highest priority, other areas are lowest priority).	The TOD/Centers Program supports development projects that have a particular urban form that enhances the pedestrian environment to increase walking and biking for non-work trips and decrease the use of autos by providing improved access to alternate modes, in particular high-quality transit, including light rail, streetcar, commuter rail, and frequent bus. Program investments and commitments have been made to projects in 5 regional centers, 3 town centers and 19 station areas all of which have a functional or physical connection to the transit system and will add potentially 3,347 new transit riders each day thus increasing access to jobs and housing by providing direct access to the regional transit system.
Goal 3, Goal 8	C. Provide access to transportation options for underserved populations (low income and minority populations and elderly and people with disabilities).	Program investments and commitments will provide an estimated 2,893 new housing units. Of these, 43%, or 1,224 housing units, are for households earning less than 80% of the area median household income (AMI). Additionally, 344 units of senior housing have been built with direct access to the transit system.
Goal 4	D. Invest in Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) in regional mobility corridors.	N/A

Goal 5	E. Address recurring safety issues, including gaps in the bike and pedestrian system.	1. The TOD/Centers Program invests in mixed-use development projects that include building massing, orientation and pedestrian improvements that reinforce pedestrian relationships and scale and create a walkable community. TOD/Centers Projects also have a functional or physical connection to the transit system and provide pedestrians and cyclists direct access to the system. TOD projects often replace and upgrade existing sidewalks as part of the development. 2. TOD/Centers projects fundamentally increase the safety of an area by adding more housing and more services closer to the transit system and creating nodes of activity thus increasing "eyes on the street."
Goal 6	F. Minimize transportation-related storm-water run-off.	1. TOD/Centers Program investments are premised on bringing more transit riders to they system, and reducing vehicle miles traveled. TOD style development produces 50% fewer auto trips, and areas with good transit and mixed uses have a 42% non-auto mode share split and a reduction of VMT per capita of 55%. Thus TOD development reduces the need for additional roadways to accommodate future growth by changing travel behavior and getting more riders to the system. 2. TOD development is by nature more compact and utilizes land more efficiently. Projects that have completed or approved have consumed 80 acres of land as compared to 504 if the same residential and commercial uses had been built conventionally. 3. The Program encourages developers and local jurisdictions to allow for the lowest parking ratio possible. Parking in TODs is generally structured or underground reducing the amount of impervious surface for parking lots. 4. TOD Program funded projects are encouraged to include sustainable development practices where feasible. Program funds have been leveraged to include stormwater management methods including green roofs, rain gardens and bio swales.

Goal 6, Goal 7	G. Reduce or minimize energy consumption, carbon emissions and other pollution impacts.	1. Because TODs provide access and are oriented to the transit system they reduce regional congestion as non-auto trips increase and VMT decreases by up to 50%, thereby contributing to greenhouse gas reductions. An additional positive byproduct is enhanced public health because walk trips increase significantly in TODs. 2. Mixed-use projects supported by the TOD/Centers Program include smaller units which consume fewer resources than conventional single family development. Additionally, TODs are higher density buildings which are more energy efficient than typical developments.
	H. the project mode of program service type has no other or limited sources of transportation-related funding available.	There are no other funding sources available for this Program. The Program leverages other local, state, and federal funds such as SDC's, urban renewal resources, and affordable housing tax credits.
Goal 9	I. efficiently and cost effectively use federal funds.	1. The TOD/Centers Program have used minimal funds to leverage maximum benefit. For projects either completed or under construction, the TOD/Centers Program has invested $19 million dollars, leveraging $405 million dollars in private investment, a return of over $20 on the dollar. 2. The TOD/Centers Program also helps generate additional revenue on the transit system. On an annual basis TOD/Centers projects are projected to generate between $1 million and $1.2 million dollars in revenue each year. 3. Focusing development around light rail furthers the benefits realized by major public investments by stimulating private investment along the rail line. Such investment enhances and revitalizes downtowns, town centers and main streets. 4. TOD makes efficient use of existing infrastructure, which can reduce the public costs of new development.

3. Summarize the program funding request

The funding request is for program funding authority from federal fiscal years 2012 and 2013. Actual funding authority awarded may be programmed over any of the federal fiscal years 2010 through 2013.

Program Element Title	Base Funding Request	Additional Funding Request
TOD Station Areas Program	$3,000,000	$500,000
TOD Centers Program	$2,000,000	$500,000
Total Program	**$5,000,000**	**$1,000,000**

4. Program funding history

	Program: TOD Station Areas	Program: TOD Centers	Site: Westgate	Site: Gresham Civic Station	Site: Gateway	TOTAL
Proposed FFY 12-13	$3,500,000	$2,500,000				$6,000,000
FFY 10-11	$3,000,000	$2,000,000				$5,000,000
FFY 08-09	$3,000,000	$1,000,000	$2,000,000			$6,000,000
FFY 06-07	$3,000,000	$1,000,000		$2,000,000		$6,000,000
FFY 04-05	$1,500,000				$800,000	$2,300,000
FFY 02-03	$2,000,000					$2,000,000
FFY 99-01	$2,000,000					$2,000,000
FFY 96-98	$3,000,000					$3,000,000

Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) Program

1. Program Description

The Transportation System Management and Operations program includes application of advanced technologies and management strategies to enhance the productivity of the existing transportation infrastructure. The program supports implementation of current federal, state, and regional policies promoting "*operation and management strategies to improve the performance of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the safety and mobility of people and goods.*" – SAFETEA-LU. The TSMO strategy benefits include improvements to congestion hotspots, better travel time reliability, increased safety, and reductions in fuel consumption and air pollutants.

The Portland metropolitan region has a well-established track record for regional coordination on the application of the latest traffic management technologies to improve mobility on the transportation system. TransPort, the TPAC subcommittee on TSMO, has been an active coordinating committee for operations since 1993. Representatives from ODOT, City of Portland, TriMet, Metro, the counties and cities of Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington, FHWA, Portland State University, Port of Portland, WSDOT, C-Tran, and SW Washington RTC work cooperatively to fund and implement creative system management solutions. In addition, TransPort has established a strong relationship with Portland State University's Transportation Research Center, relying on the center to provide system management data maintenance, research, and analysis.
Overall, this program promotes implementation of the TSMO strategies as a regional objective. Pursuing these strategies regionally is critical to managing congestion issues.

Since 2000, many transportation agencies in the Portland metropolitan region have completed Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Plans including ODOT, TriMet, Clackamas County, Gresham/East Multnomah County, Washington County, City of Portland, and Port of Portland. The total estimated capital cost of the operational improvements identified in these plans is over $160 million. TransPort is working toward a comprehensive regional system management plan, which will incorporate the findings from these earlier planning efforts with updated project costs. This process will result in an integrated regional action plan by summer of 2009.

The types of technologies supported by this funding program include those used to monitor or detect traffic activity, including inductive loop detectors in roadways, closed-circuit TV cameras, GPS devices, road-weather sensors and signal interconnects. Technology can also be employed to enhance the communication of information to travelers, such as variable message signs and phone or internet-based travel information services. Supporting infrastructure, such as fiber optic cable, allows control centers to communicate with and utilize devices in the field. All of these technologies are used to accomplish operational goals, such as managing incidents or improving

on-time performance of transit vehicles. Additionally, the system performance data collection and evaluation can be supported with this funding.

Program Allocation**:** The proposed base allocation for this project is $3.0 million for a two-year period.

Over the last decade, the average allocation for system management has been approximately $1.2 million per year, although the year-to-year funding has been highly variable. The MTIP allocations have funded the development of local ITS plans, signal interconnect projects, and Advance Traffic Management Systems (ATMS) including cameras, signals and traffic operation centers, and data collection infrastructure.
Beginning with the FY ’10 - ’11 MTIP, the region provided $3 million in funding for a TSMO program, recognizing both the utility of TSMO solutions to enhance system mobility and the cross-jurisdictional nature of these types of investments. The FY ’10 -’11 funding has not yet been sub-allocated. TransPort is responsible for advancing recommendations on the prioritization of these funds to TPAC. As part of the Regional TSMO Refinement Plan, TransPort will work with TPAC to develop appropriate project selection criteria and identify investments for the previous funding and apply the process to this current round of MTIP funding.

2. Policy objectives of the RFF Allocation Process addressed by TSMO Program

RTP Goals	RFF policy objectives	How Program Addresses Policy Objectives
Goal 1, Goal 2	A. Retain and attract housing and jobs by addressing system gaps or deficiencies to improve multi-modal access in primary 2040 target areas (central city, regional centers, industrial areas and passenger and freight inter-modal facilities) as the highest priority, secondary areas (town centers, main streets, station communities and corridors) as next highest priority, and other areas (employment areas, inner and outer neighborhoods) as the lowest priority.	The TSMO program enhances access to 2040 target areas by improving traffic flow for buses, trucks, and passenger vehicles through signal and communication enhancements, and traveler information.
Goal 1, Goal 2	B. Address gaps and deficiencies in the reliable movement of freight and goods on the RTP regional freight system, and transit, pedestrian and bicycle access and inter-modal connections to labor markets and trade areas within or between 2040 target areas (Primary areas are highest priority, Secondary areas are next highest priority, other areas are lowest priority).	The TSMO program directly addresses the reliable movement of freight, goods, and people by implementing strategies that manage traffic flow on freeways and arterials. Past TSMO projects in the region have shown a 20% reduction in travel times.
Goal 3, Goal 8	C. Provide access to transportation options for underserved populations (low income and minority populations and elderly and people with disabilities).	The TSMO program supports improvements to transit service reliability and traveler information, which benefit traditionally transit dependent users.

Goal 4	D. Invest in Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) in regional mobility corridors.	The TSMO program directly addresses this objective by investing in improvements such as ATMS in regional mobility corridors.
Goal 5	E. Address recurring safety issues, including gaps in the bike and pedestrian system.	The TSMO program directly addresses the objective by investing in improvements that increase safety including ramp meters and incident management.
Goal 6	F. Minimize transportation-related storm-water run-off.	Not applicable.
Goal 6, Goal 7	G. Reduce or minimize energy consumption, carbon emissions and other pollution impacts.	The TSMO program directly addresses this objective by reducing unnecessary engine idling due to congestion and providing real-time traveler information to improve route and mode choice.
	H. The project mode of program service type has no other or limited sources of transportation-related funding available.	Not applicable.
Goal 9	I. Efficiently and cost effectively use federal funds.	The TSMO program directly addresses this objective by investing to maximize the efficiency of existing and planned transportation facilities as a lower cost solution to new capacity. Past TSMO projects funded by the MTIP program such as ATMS have shown benefit-to-cost ratios of 30 to 1,

3. TSMO Program funding request

The funding request is for program funding authority from federal fiscal years 2012 and 2013. Actual funding authority awarded may be programmed over any of the federal fiscal years 2010 through 2013.

Program Element Title	Base Funding Request	Additional Funding Request
TSMO – ITS Implementation	$3,000,000	
Total Program	**$3,000,000**	**$0**
GRAND TOTAL	**$3,000,000**	

4. Historical MTIP Allocation to TSMO-ITS-related programs/projects

Regional Allocation	Proposed FFY 2012-13	FFY 2010-11	FFY 2008-09	FFY 2006-07	FFY 2004-05	FFY 2002-03	FFY 1999-01	FFY 1996-98
Amount	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	$520,000	$0	$1,625,000	$2,420,000	$1,271,000	$0

Willamette River Bridges

1. Program Description

Multnomah County has the responsibility (ORS 382.305) for operating and maintaining six Willamette River Bridges: Sellwood, Hawthorne, Morrison, Burnside, Broadway and Sauvie Island. The current projection for the County's Willamette River Bridges shows a 20-year need of approximately $621 million which includes rehabilitating or replacing the Sellwood Bridge at an estimated cost of $300 million. The Sauvie Island Bridge is currently being replaced and no capital costs are anticipated for this bridge in 20 years.

Including the Sellwood Bridge rehabilitation or replacement, general engineering, maintenance and operations on all the (County's) Willamette River Bridges is expected to be $621 million over the next 20 years (2007 $s). Anticipated revenue over the next 20 years is expected to be $131 million, leaving a $490 million shortfall for Willamette River Bridge capital needs.

Multnomah County is requesting an annual MTIP Regionally Administered Program allocation of $4 million for 20 years. This amount would enable Multnomah County to bond the funds for $50 million. The funds would be used to provide funding for the Sellwood Bridge rehabilitation or replacement. With a cost estimate of $300 million for rehabilitation or replacement, the bonded MTIP funds would be used to leverage other federal, state and local funds.

This request to add the Willamette River Bridges to the Regionally Administered Program will address two concerns. First it would leverage funds for a Sellwood Bridge funding package. Second, it will allow Multnomah County to continue needed capital maintenance on the remaining Willamette River Bridges without diverting those funds to the Sellwood Bridge.

Program Funding Request: $4 million per year for 20 years.

3. Policy Objectives for the RFF Allocation Process addressed by Multnomah River Bridges

RTP Goals	RFF policy objectives	How Program Addresses Policy Objectives
Goal 1, Goal 2	A. Retain and attract housing and jobs by addressing system gaps or deficiencies to improve multi-modal access in primary 2040 target areas (central city, regional centers, industrial areas and passenger and freight inter-modal facilities) as the highest priority,	The Willamette River Bridges (WRB) provide key links in the transportation system in the Central City, accommodating housing to employment; freight movement (trucks and waterborne); connection to inter-modal facilities; transit (bus, streetcar and lightrail); and bicycle/pedestrian facilities. Most notably, streetcar will be added to the Broadway Bridge and a new bicycle/pedestrian facility will be added to the Morrison Bridge in 2008. Providing funds for the Sellwood Bridge will allow for continued operation of the bridge, the only link across the Willamette River for 12 miles to the south at Oregon City.

	secondary areas (town centers, main streets, station communities and corridors) as next highest priority, and other areas (employment areas, inner and outer neighborhoods) as the lowest priority.	Over 80% of the 30,000 vehicle trips per day have a destination or origin outside of Multnomah County, demonstrating its regional priority in connecting housing to jobs.
Goal 1, Goal 2	B. Address gaps and deficiencies in the reliable movement of freight and goods on the RTP regional freight system, and transit, pedestrian and bicycle access and inter-modal connections to labor markets and trade areas within or between 2040 target areas (Primary areas are highest priority, Secondary areas are next highest priority, other areas are lowest priority).	The WRBs provide necessary links between the Central City and primary industrial. Although Tacoma Street is a Minor Truck Street (City of Portland Classification) the Sellwood Bridge plays a key role in freight access across the Willamette River. Improvements to the Sellwood Bridge were identified in the 1994 Willamette River Bridges Accessibility Project (WRBAP) that recommended about 40 projects to improve bicycle and pedestrian access to the WRBs. Bicycle and pedestrian access across the Sellwood Bridge is totally inadequate and needs to be upgraded. Due to the structural instability of the Sellwood Bridge vehicles over 10,000 lbs. have been restricted from using the bridge. All transit and almost all trucks are thereby excluded.
Goal 3, Goal 8	C. Provide access to transportation options for underserved populations (low income and minority populations and elderly and people with disabilities).	Reliable operation of the Sellwood Bridge will facilitate needed alternate access options to underserved populations, providing better transit, bicycle and pedestrian options.
Goal 4	D. Invest in Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) in regional mobility corridors.	
Goal 5	E. Address recurring safety issues, including gaps in the bike and pedestrian system.	The need to improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities on the Sellwood Bridge is identified in the 1994 WRBAP study.
Goal 6	F. Minimize transportation-related storm-water run-off.	Improvements to the Sellwood Bridge will include the installation of storm-water facilities that reduce run-off into the rivers as well as providing primary storm-water treatment.

Goal 6, Goal 7	G. Reduce or minimize energy consumption, carbon emissions and other pollution impacts.	Providing better bicycle and pedestrian facilities along with better accommodation to transit will reduce VMT, reducing energy consumption, carbon emissions and other pollution impacts.
	H. the project mode of program service type has no other or limited sources of transportation-related funding available.	Funds are available from other sources such as HBR, but are limited and unable to meet the needs of the Sellwood Bridge.
Goal 9	I. efficiently and cost effectively use federal funds.	The ability to leverage federal funds is paramount to meeting the capital needs of the WRBs to allow the bridges to operate safely and efficiently.

3. Summarize the program funding request

The funding request is for program funding authority from federal fiscal years 2012 to 2031. The request of $4 million per year will enable Multnomah County to bond $50 million for rehabilitation/replacement of the Sellwood Bridge.

Program Element Title	Base Funding Request	Additional Funding Request
Sellwood Bridge		$8,000,000
Total Program		**$8,000,000**

	Proposed FFY 2012-13	(FFY 10-11)	(FFY 08-09)	(FFY 06-07)	(FFY 04-05)	(FFY 02-03)
Sellwood PE/EIS			$2,000,000			
Morrison Bridge Bike/Ped improvements*					$1,345,000	
Burnside Electrical						$500,000
Morrison Electrical						$800,000
Program Allocation	$8,000,000					
Total: Willamette River Bridges	**$8,000,000**	**$0**	**$2,000,000**	**$0**	**$1,345,000**	**$1,300,000**
* Project also listed in Bike/Ped list of projects.						

ANNUAL

REPORT

2007

Transit-Oriented DEVELOPMENT AND Centers PROGRAM

CLICK HERE FOR REPORT

METRO

www.**metro-region.org**












Draft

March 2008

2008–2013 Strategic Plan

REGIONAL TRAVEL OPTIONS

CLICK HERE FOR REPORT

Metro | *People places. Open spaces.*

Materials following this page were distributed at the meeting.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF THE
METRO COUNCIL
AND
OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

FOR THE PURPOSE OF CERTIFYING THAT THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING REQUIREMENTS	)))))	RESOLUTION NO. 08-3928 Introduced by Michael Jordan, Chief Operating Officer with the Concurrence of Council President Bragdon

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, by the Metro Council that the Council adopts the findings contained in Exhibit A and certifies 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, Parts 450 and 500, and Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 613.

BE IT RESOLVED, by the Oregon Department of Transportation 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, Parts 450 and 500, and Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 613.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this _____ day of April 2008.

_____
David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to form:

_____
Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

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

2008.

_____
Jerri L. Bohard
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, and operates in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 134 and 49 U.S.C. 5303.

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). 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 Memorandum of Agreement between Metro and the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC) delineates areas of responsibility and coordination. Executed in April 2006, to be updated in April 2009.

b. In accordance with 23 CFR 450.314, an intergovernmental agreement (IGA) between TriMet, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), and Metro is under review.

c. Yearly agreements are executed between Metro and ODOT defining the terms and use of FHWA planning funds.

d. 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.

e. A Memorandum of Understanding between Metro and the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) describing each agency's responsibilities and roles for air quality planning. Executed in July 2007, to be updated in July 2010.

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

4. Responsibilities, Cooperation and Coordination

Metro uses a decision-making structure that 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.

In FY 2007-08, JPACT completed the bylaw review 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 updated December 28, 2005 and addresses the following topics:

- Transportation
- Land use (including the Metro Urban Growth Boundary (UGB)
- Nature in Neighborhoods
- 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 the Environmental Justice and Title VI narrative and individual program narratives; elderly and disabled planning tasks have been identified in the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Planning program narrative.

b. Regional Transportation Plan

JPACT and the Metro Council approved the 2035 Federal RTP in December 2007. This update was limited in scope and does not attempt to revisit the requirements of the Oregon Transportation Planning Rule. However, the 2035 Federal RTP includes a new policy for the purpose of transportation planning and project funding to address SAFETEA-LU provisions and key issues facing the region.

As required by Metro's 2004 Federal Review the 2035 update addressed operating and maintenance costs paid by member jurisdictions. The 2035 RTP revenue forecast and financial analysis for operations and maintenance costs was based on a thorough evaluation of city and county, ODOT, TriMet and SMART cost projections (2035 RTP Sections 5.1 through 5.3). The financially constrained system described in Chapter 6 of the 2035 RTP was specifically developed to comply with SAFETEA-LU planning requirements. The system was developed based on a forecast of expected revenues that was formulated in partnership with ODOT, cities and counties in the Metro region, TriMet and the South Metro Area Rapid Transit (SMART) district. A background research report was also developed during Phase 2 of the update to document current funding trends and sources. The subsequent financial analysis and the background report are included in Appendix 4.3 and Appendix 6.0, respectively.

The projects and programs recommended in the financially constrained system were developed cooperatively with local jurisdictions, ODOT, and port and transit districts, and through workshops sponsored by TPAC. The financially constrained system is intended as the "federal" system for purposes of demonstrating air quality conformity and allocating federal funds through the MTIP process (2035 RTP Sections 7.1 and 7.5). The RTP financial plan and revenue forecast assumptions are described in Chapter 5 of the 2035 RTP. The total reasonably expected revenue base assumed in the 2035 RTP for the road system is approximately $ 9.07 billion.

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 and is being refined as part of the "State" component of the RTP update.

A new map has been added to Chapter 1 of the RTP that identifies the MPO Planning Boundary and the Air Quality Maintenance Area 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 2008 UGB and the 2000 census defined urbanized area boundary for the Portland metropolitan region. FHWA and FTA approved the 2035 RTP and the associated air quality conformity determination on February 29, 2008. Documentation of compliance with specific federal planning requirements is summarized in subsequent sections of this document.

Work is continuing on the State component of the RTP update in 2008. Tasks related to the update are outlined in the FY 2007-08 and FY 2008-09 UPWP.

c. Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program

The MTIP was updated in Summer 2007 and incorporated into the 2008-11 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The 2007 update included the allocation of $63 million of Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality Program (CMAQ) funding, programming of projects for the ODOT Modernization, Bridge, Safety, Preservation, Operations, OTIA III, Enhancements, and Immediate Opportunity Fund projects and programming of transit funding. The first year of programming is considered the priority project funding for the region. Should any of these projects be delayed, projects of equivalent dollar value may be advanced

from the second, third or fourth years of the program without processing formal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) amendments. As recommended in Metro's 2004 Federal Review, the MTIP webpage was linked to ODOT's STIP page.

Metro is in the process of updating the 2010-13 MTIP in the current fiscal year, with adoption of an updated program scheduled for late FY 2008-09.

6. Planning Factors

Currently, Metro's planning process addresses the SAFETEA-LU planning factors in all projects and policies. Table 1 below describes the relationship of the planning factors to Metro's activities and Table 2 outlines Metro's response to how the factors have been incorporated into the planning process. The SAFETEA-LU planning factors are:

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

As noted in Tables 1 and 2, Metro has reviewed and updated both the RTP and MTIP, and revised both documents to be compliant with SAFETEA-LU planning requirements.

Table 1: SAFETEA-LU Planning Factors

Factor	System Planning (RTP)	Funding Strategy (MTIP)	High Capacity Transit (HCT)
1. Support Economic Vitality	• 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 the 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.	• 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."	• 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.

Table 1: SAFETEA-LU Planning Factors

Factor	System Planning (RTP)	Funding Strategy (MTIP)	High Capacity Transit (HCT)
2. Increase Safety	• 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). • The RTP includes a number of investments and actions aimed at further improving safety in the region, including: ◦ Investments targeted to address known safety deficiencies and high-crash locations. ◦ Completing gaps in regional bicycle and pedestrian systems. ◦ Retrofits of existing streets in downtowns and along main streets to include on-street parking, street trees marked street crossings and other designs to slow traffic speeds to follow posted speed limits. ◦ Intersection changes and ITS strategies, including signal timing and real-time traveler information on road conditions and hazards. ◦ Expanding safety education, awareness and multi-modal data collection efforts at all levels of government. ◦ Expand safety data collection efforts and create a better system for centralized crash data for all modes of travel.	• 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.	• Station area planning for proposed HCT improvements is primarily driven by pedestrian access and safety considerations.

Table 1: SAFETEA-LU Planning Factors

Factor	System Planning (RTP)	Funding Strategy (MTIP)	High Capacity Transit (HCT)
3. Increase Security	• System security was incorporated into the 2035 Federal RTP. • Security and emergency management activities are summarized in Section 2.4.7.4 of the 2035 RTP. • Policy framework in Section 3.3 of the 2035 RTP includes, "Goal 5: Enhance Safety and Security," and specific security objectives and potential actions to increase security of the transportation system for all users. • Includes investments that increase system monitoring for operations, management and security of the regional mobility corridor system. • Actions direct Metro to work with local, state and regional agencies to identify critical infrastructure in the region, assess security vulnerabilities and develop coordinated emergency response and evacuation plans. • Actions direct transportation providers to monitor the regional transportation and minimize security risks at airports, transit facilities, marine terminals and other critical infrastructure	• Transportation security will be factored into the next MTIP update, following completion of the new RTP.	• System security has been a routine element of the HCT program, and does not represent a substantial change to current practice.

Table 1: SAFETEA-LU Planning Factors

Factor	System Planning (RTP)	Funding Strategy (MTIP)	High Capacity Transit (HCT)
4. Increase Accessibility	• 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. • The plan emphasizes accessibility and reliability of the system, particularly for commuting and freight, and includes a new, more customized approach to managing and evaluating performance of mobility corridors. This new approach builds on using new, cost-effective technologies to improve safety, optimize the existing system, and ensure that freight transporters and commuters have a broad range of travel options in each corridor.	• 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.	• 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.

Table 1: SAFETEA-LU Planning Factors (continued)

Factor	System Planning (RTP)	Funding Strategy (MTIP)	High Capacity Transit (HCT)
5. Protect Environment and Quality of Life	• 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. • Many new transit, bicycle, pedestrian and TDM projects have been added to the plan to provide a more balanced multi-modal system that maintains livability. • RTP transit, bicycle, pedestrian and TDM projects 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. • The region's parking policies (Title 2 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan) are also designed to encourage the use of alternative modes, and reduce reliance on the automobile, thus promoting energy conservation and reducing air quality impacts.	• The MTIP conforms to the Clean Air Act and continues to comply with the air quality maintenance plan in accordance with sections 174 and 176 (c) and (d) of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7504, 7605 (c) and (d)) and 40 CFR part 93. • 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.	• 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: SAFETEA-LU Planning Factors (continued)

Factor	System Planning (RTP)	Funding Strategy (MTIP)	High Capacity Transit (HCT)
6. System Integration/ Connectivity	• 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 links in the region.	• Projects funded through the MTIP must be consistent with regional street design guidelines. • Freight improvements are evaluated according to potential conflicts with other modes.	• 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.
7. Efficient Management & Operations	• The policy component of the 2035 RTP includes specific provisions for efficient system management and operation (2035 RTP Goal 4), with an emphasis on TSM, ATMS and the use of non-auto modal targets (Table 3.17) to optimize the existing and planned transportation system. • Proposed RTP projects include many system management improvements along regional corridors. • The plan also calls for consideration of value pricing in the region to better manage capacity and peak use of the throughway system. However, more work is needed to gain public acceptance of this tool.	• 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.	• Proposed HCT improvements include redesigned feeder bus systems that take advantage of new HCT capacity and reduce the number of redundant transit lines.

* *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. Metro consults with the Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement (MCCI) in the development of individual PIPs. 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 work program and PPP for the 2035 RTP update was developed with input from Metro's Advisory Committees, including Metro's Committee for Citizen Involvement. The 2035 RTP update included workshops, informal and formal input opportunities as well as a 30-day+ comment period for the community, affected public agencies, representatives of transportation agency employees, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation, representatives of users of public transit, and other interested persons. Public involvement opportunities and key decision points were published in the Oregonian and other community newspapers, posted on Metro's web site, e-mailed via the Planning Department E-News to more than 4,500 individuals, and advertised through Metro's transportation hotline. All plan documents were simultaneously published (and regularly updated) on the Metro web site, including draft plan amendments, the update schedule, other explanatory materials and summaries of public comments received. Section 1.5 in the 2035 RTP and Appendix 4.5 describe the public process in more detail.

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 30-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 July 2006, 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 the needs of minority and disadvantaged populations are considered and 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 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).

Metro's DBE program was reviewed and submitted to FTA in August 1999. 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. Affirmative Action

In accordance with 49 U.S.C. 5331, 42 U.S.C. 6101, Section 324 of title 23 U.S.C. and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794) and 49 CFR part 27, Metro states as its policy a commitment to provide equal employment opportunities without regard to race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, disability, sexual orientation, or marital or familial status, except where a bona fide occupational qualification exists. Compliance with this policy is administered by Metro's Human Resources Department.

11. Construction Contracts

Provisions of 23 CFR part 230 do not apply to Metro as Metro does not administer Federal and Federal-aid highway construction contracts.

12. Lobbying

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

Table 2: Metro's Response to SAFTETEA-LU Provisions

SAFTETEA-LU Provision for all MPOs	**Metro Response**
Consult/Coordinate with planning officials responsible for planned growth, economic development, environmental protection, airport operations, and freight movement.	Metro's transportation planning and land-use planning functions are within the same department and coordinate internally. • Metro facilitates this consultation, coordination and decision-making through four advisory committee bodies –the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC), the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) and the Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC). 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 also coordinates with freight, rail, airport operations and business interests through the Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force and Regional Freight and Goods Movement Technical Advisory Committee.
Promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development.	Metro transportation and land-use planning is subject to approval by the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development.
Give safety and security due emphasis as separate planning factors.	Metro addressed security and safety as individual factors in the update to the RTP in 2007. • Separate background research papers were developed during Phase 2 of the update to document current safety issues and planning efforts, and current security planning efforts in the region. This research is included Appendix 6.0 was considered during the formulation of the 2035 RTP goals, objectives, projects and potential actions included in Chapter 3 and investment priorities in Chapter 6 of the 2035 RTP. Additionally, Metro staffs the Regional Emergency Management Group (REMG), which has expanded its scope to include anti-terrorism preparedness, TriMet's responsibility for transit security plans, ODOT's responsibility for coordination of state security plans, Port of Portland's responsibility for air, marine and other Port facilities security plans and implementation of system management strategies to improve security of the transportation system (e.g., security cameras on MAX and at transit stations). The group brings together local emergency managers to plan responses to security concerns and natural hazards.

Table 2: Metro's Response to SAFTETEA-LU Provisions (continued)

SAFTETEA-LU Provision for all MPOs	**Metro Response**
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.	SAFETEA-LU provisions for additional consultation with state and federal resource agencies, and tribal groups that were not already part of Metro's existing committee structure were met through a consultation meeting held on October 16, 2007 with the Collaborative Environmental Transportation Agreement for Streamlining (CETAS) work group, consisting of the Oregon Department of Transportation and ten state and federal transportation, natural resource, cultural resource and land-use planning agencies. A background research paper was also developed during Phase 2 of the update to document current environmental trends, issues and current mitigation strategies in the region. This research was considered during the formulation of the 2035 RTP goals, objectives, projects and potential actions included in Chapter 3 and investment priorities in Chapter 6 of the 2035 RTP. In addition, staff conducted an analysis of the potential environmental effects of transportation investments. The background research report and environmental considerations analysis is included in Appendix 6.0.
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.	SAFETEA-LU provisions for additional consultation with state and federal resource agencies, and tribal groups that were not already part of Metro's existing committee structure were met through a consultation meeting held on October 16, 2007 with the Collaborative Environmental Transportation Agreement for Streamlining (CETAS) work group, consisting of the Oregon Department of Transportation and ten state and federal transportation, natural resource, historic, cultural resource and land-use planning agencies. A background research paper was also developed during Phase 2 of the update to document current environmental trends, issues and mitigation strategies in the region. This research was considered during the formulation of the 2035 RTP goals, objectives, projects and potential actions included in Chapter 3 and investment priorities in Chapter 6 of the 2035 RTP. In addition, staff conducted an analysis of the potential environmental effects of transportation investments – this analysis included a comparison of the RTP investments with available State Conservation maps and inventories of historic resources. The background research report and environmental considerations analysis is included in Appendix 6.0.

Table 2: Metro's Response to SAFTETEA-LU Provisions (continued)

SAFTETEA-LU Provision for all MPOs	**Metro Response**
Include operation and management strategies to address congestion, safety, and mobility in the transportation plan.	• System management policies in the RTP (2035 RTP Section 3.4.4) and resulting projects and programs are intended to maximize the use of existing facilities to address congestion, safety and mobility. • The regional congestion management process (CMP) also requires local jurisdictions to explore system management solutions before adding roadway capacity to the regional system (2035 RTP Section 7.6.3). These provisions are implemented through potential actions included in Section 3.3 (particularly Goals 4 and 5), and a number of projects and programs recommended in the updated plan, and are listed in Chapter 6 of the 2035 RTP. • The plan also calls for consideration of value pricing in the region to better manage capacity and peak use of the throughway system. • RTP projects in Chapter 6 include many system management improvements along regional mobility corridors and the supporting arterial system. Work will continue in the state component of the RTP update to further expand implementation of these strategies. • 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.

Table 2: Metro's Response to SAFTETEA-LU Provisions (continued)

SAFTETEA-LU Provision for all MPOs	**Metro Response**
Develop a participation plan in consultation with interested parties that provides reasonable opportunities for all parties to comment on transportation plan.	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. The work program and PPP for the 2035 RTP update was developed with input from Metro's Advisory Committees, including Metro's Committee for Citizen Involvement. Approval of the 2035 RTP, Resolution No. 07-3831B, followed JPACT and Metro Council consideration of nearly than 300 comments received during the public comment period. The comments were summarized into a comment log and Public Comment Summary Report. Refinements were recommended to respond to the comments received. The comment period for the Air Quality Conformity Determination provided an opportunity for public review and comment on the air quality conformity methodology and results. *Section 1.5 in the 2035 RTP and Appendix 4.5 describe the public process in more detail.*
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.	On a regular basis, Metro employs visualization techniques. Examples include: • RTP document is available on Metro's website • RTP newsletters and maps • MTIP document is available on Metro's website • GIS maps to illustrate planning activities • Participation in FHWA GIS Web Training Video simulation of light rail on the Portland Mall and I-205 Corridor.
Update the plan at least every 4 years in non-attainment and maintenance areas, 5 years in attainment areas.	2035 Federal RTP update was completed by March 5, 2008.
Update the TIP at least every 4 years, include 4 years of projects and strategies in the TIP.	Initiated MTIP and STIP update for August 2009.
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.	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 has been integrated into the 2008 RTP update. Additional work will be completed during the state component of the RTP update in 2008.

STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 08-3928 FOR THE PURPOSE OF CERTIFYING THAT THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING REQUIREMENTS

Date: April 17, 2008 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. 08-3928.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. **Known 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, Parts 450 and 500 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, 2008, 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. 08-3928; certifying that the Portland metropolitan area is in compliance with federal transportation planning requirements.

JPACT Reauthorization Earmark Proposal

To achieve consistency with the OTC's draft earmark policy while working within JPACT's existing process for advancing earmarks to the congressional delegation, ODOT will ask jurisdictions who plan to seek earmarks for projects on the state highway system to submit proposals to ODOT this spring/early summer. Unlike other parts of the state, ODOT will not ask local agencies to submit local projects, as JPACT already has a process for reviewing these projects.

ODOT will review these projects for consistency with the earmark guidelines set forth in the OTC's draft earmark policy and make a proposal to JPACT on which projects JPACT should recommend to the OTC as regional priorities. JPACT will consider this proposal and send a list of regional state highway system priorities to the OTC.

The OTC will select appropriate projects for inclusion on its request list, and these projects will be placed on the JPACT list as ODOT's official requests. The other projects not chosen may still be put on the JPACT list by other jurisdictions, but ODOT will not officially endorse them and will not commit in advance to provide matching funds and cover funding shortfalls.

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: March 26, 2008

TO: TPAC and MTAC and Interested Parties

FROM: Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner

SUBJECT: 2035 Regional Transportation Plan – "Cause and Effect" Transportation Investment Scenarios Proposal

****

This memorandum outlines a recommended approach for analyzing the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) "cause and effect" transportation investment scenarios. The analysis is intended to evaluate the effects of distinct transportation policy choices on the future of the Portland metropolitan region. The analysis will be conducted simultaneously with other *Making the Greatest Place* "Cause and Effect" land use scenarios described in a separate document.

The results of the analysis will be reported using the RTP Outcomes-Based Evaluation Framework being developed by Metro staff and the RTP performance measures work group. The Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC), the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council will provide direction on the policy variables to be tested in each of the scenarios.

Recommendations for the *Making the Greatest Place* effort and RTP policy refinements will be developed based on what is learned through this analysis. The RTP investment scenarios analysis is also intended to be a starting point for the System Development Phase of the RTP process, which includes analysis of 2 to 3 "hybrid" alternatives in 2009. The "hybrid analysis" in 2009 will consider "blended" packages of transportation investments together with different levels of funding and, to the extent possible, land use variations identified through the Urban/Rural reserve track of the *Making the Greatest Place* effort. The "hybrid analysis" will draw from the current RTP investment pool and new ideas/strategies explored in the "Cause and Effect" scenarios to develop more realistic, yet ambitious combinations of transportation investments to implement the 2040 Growth Concept vision and meet state planning requirements. The analysis will inform development of a recommended "state" system of transportation investments and identification of the tools and actions needed to best support the 2040 Growth Concept vision for land use, transportation, the economy and the environment.

Purpose

The RTP investment scenarios analysis is intended to provide policy makers with better information about new 2035 RTP policies and the implications of different transportation policy choices. Major objectives of the analysis are to:

- Evaluate distinct transportation investment policy choices that frame the boundaries of the political landscape and public opinion.
- Test RTP policies to better understand the effect of different transportation investments packages on travel behavior and development patterns.
- Test proposed performance measures to determine which measures can best evaluate whether the transportation system is successful in meeting regional goals and policies.
- Evaluate the relative effect and cost of different transportation investments packages in order to recommend what combinations of investments, tools and strategies are needed to best support the 2040 Growth Concept and other regional goals and policies.
- Provide recommendations to guide RTP System Development ("RTP hybrid analysis" and development of recommended alternative).

Questions to Answer with RTP "Cause and Effect" Investment Scenarios

The RTP scenarios will help answer policy questions that forecasted growth and fiscal constraints in the region raise about our ability to protect the region's quality of life and economy for current residents and future generations, including:

- What strategic transportation investments, in which key locations, best support the 2040 Growth Concept vision for vibrant communities, a healthy economy, transportation choices, and a healthy environment in an equitable and fiscally sustainable manner?
- How will future growth affect the reliability of our transportation system in providing for goods movement and access to work, school and other daily destinations?
- How do investments in major highways and transit affect travel behavior and development patterns in the region? What effect do these investments have on neighboring communities?
- What is the maximum potential for reducing drive-alone travel and optimizing performance of the existing transportation system?
- What indicators can best monitor whether the transportation system is successful in meeting regional goals and policies?

General Construct and Scope

This analysis will examine a series of four conceptual motor vehicle and transit systems for their ability to serve forecast 2035 population and employment growth and support the 2040 Growth Concept. Each of the four scenarios is based on a "What if" policy-theme focus from the 2035 RTP, resulting in a distinct mix and level of transit service, motor vehicle system investments and system management strategies in each scenario. *All scenarios will have significantly more service and system investments than the "No Build" system of investments.* **Figure 1** shows the general construct and timeline for this analysis.

Figure 1. RTP Investment Scenarios Construct and Timeline



Each scenario is initiated by a "what if" question:

- *Concept A* - What if we focused our investments on increasing connectivity for all modes of travel?
- *Concept B* - What if we focused our investments to build out the high capacity transit connections identified in the 2040 Growth Concept and to expand regional transit service to complement the new HCT connections?

- *Concept C* - What if we focused our investments on adding new capacity and connections to the region's throughway system?
- *Concept D* - What if we focused our investments on optimizing the existing system and managing demand?

The four scenarios complement one another, and will be compared to the results of a 2035 No Build scenario and a 2035 Base Case scenario that were developed during the federal component of the 2035 RTP update.[1] The 2035 No-Build assumes no new revenue or investments beyond what has already been committed to transportation projects and programs in the region. The 2035 Base Case scenario assumes the 2035 RTP Financially Constrained System of projects and programs adopted by JPACT and the Metro Council in December 2007. **The scenarios do not represent future Metro Council, Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) or TriMet policy intentions.**

Methodology

MPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council will provide direction on the policy variables to be tested in each of the scenarios. The RTP scenarios will be developed with the regional travel demand model for the purpose of modeling and analysis. The Metroscope model will be used to evaluate the land use effects of each of the transportation networks. This approach will allow a comprehensive analysis of the relative strengths and weaknesses of each scenario in achieving the RTP goals approved by MPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council in December 2007.

Summary of Regional Travel Demand Model

The Metro regional travel demand model forecasts travel volumes, with assignments executed in EMME/3. For travel forecasting purposes, land use assumptions are broken down into geographical areas called transportation analysis zones (TAZs). The EMME/3 model is not sensitive enough to test which policy/pricing/regulatory change is the best, but it can help demonstrate the overall effect of packages of investments. The 2035 land use assumptions will be held constant in the travel demand model for each scenario. In addition, the cost of various forms of transportation, including parking and transit fare costs, and levels of street connectivity are also assigned to each TAZ based on regional transportation and land use policies.

Figure 2. Regional Travel Demand Model Inputs



Summary of Metroscope Model

Metroscope is a simulation model developed for testing planning policies in the urban land and real estate market. It utilizes extensive data describing attributes of the region's land and economic growth potential in order to mimic the responses of homeowners, renters, commuters, developers and business entrepreneurs to changes in the different

[1] Modeling for the 2035 No Build and 2035 Base Case scenarios was conducted during December 2006-January 2007. The 2035 No-Build assumes no new revenue or investments beyond what has already been committed to transportation projects and programs in the region. The 2035 Base Case scenario uses the 2035 RTP Financially Constrained System of projects and programs.

attributes – where will people choose to live, work, travel, build new communities and engage in commerce. Data attributes include: land and real estate value, vacant buildable land, redevelopment and infill land, environmental conditions, transportation network features, development trends and population and employment growth projections.

Metroscope includes a built-in transportation model that simulates levels of travel demand and congestion for the region's road and transit system. The transportation model outputs from Metroscope are not as extensive as the outputs that can be drawn from the regional travel demand model, thereby limiting Metroscope's ability to provide detailed information about travel behavior in the region. Metroscope is capable of providing extensive information about the effects of transportation investments on development patterns throughout the region.

While the technical evaluation of the RTP scenarios will generate an extensive array of data, the analysis will focus on more generalized questions of how each scenario responds to basic concerns about growth in the region as expressed in the proposed RTP Outcomes-Based Evaluation Framework. Performance of each scenario will be compared using a set of key indicators and related performance measures being developed by the RTP Performance Measures Work Group. Planning-level cost estimates for each scenario will be developed by Metro, in partnership with ODOT and TriMet.

Process and Products

The RTP Investment Scenarios Analysis will inform the *Making the Greatest Place* effort and state component of the RTP update. Recommendations for the *Making the Greatest Place* effort and RTP policy refinements will be developed based on what is learned through the analysis. The analysis is also intended to be a starting point for developing a recommended "state" system of transportation improvements and programs. The "cause and effect" understanding gained through this analysis will guide the design and analysis of subsequent "RTP hybrid alternatives" that will bear greater resemblance to realistic policy alternatives in Winter/Spring 2009.

The findings from the analysis will be discussed at a joint JPACT, MPAC and Metro Council workshop in October 2008. Policy conclusions reached at this joint meeting will provide direction to Metro, ODOT, TriMet and local agency staff on the "hybrid alternatives" to be analyzed during the System Development Phase in 2009.

The policy conclusions from the scenarios analysis will be summarized in an RTP Investment Scenarios Analysis report. The report will serve as a tool in RTP public involvement activities beginning in Winter 2008. The first major public outreach for the state component of the RTP update will be a series of workshops – called "structured conversations" – to be held with freight and business interests and community-based organizations. The workshops will be designed to gather input on funding strategies and investment priorities to be included in the "state" system of investments in 2009. The RTP investment scenarios analysis report will serve as an important background document for these workshops.

Timeline

The timeline for completing the scenarios is aggressive to meet the RTP schedule:

January – June 2008	*Develop proposed RTP outcomes-based evaluation framework & performance measures*
April-May 2008	*MPAC, JPACT and Metro Council confirm RTP scenarios construct and policy questions to be addressed in scenarios analysis*
June-August 2008	*Prepare and analyze investment scenarios using regional travel demand model and Metroscope*[2]
August-September 2008	*Compile transportation analysis and summaries in RTP investment scenarios report and identify Making the Greatest Place and RTP recommendations*
October-November 2008	*RTP Scenarios Analysis Report and recommendations released for discussion*
December 2008	*RTP System Development Phase begins*
January-March 2009	*Prepare and analyze 2 to 3 RTP "hybrid" investment alternatives using regional travel demand model*
April-May 2009	*Compile transportation analysis and summaries in RTP Hybrid Analysis report and identify Making the Greatest Place and RTP recommendations*

[2] Staff is working to determine whether sufficient resources exist to conduct Metroscope analysis of transportation scenarios within this timeframe.

Transportation Policy Variables to Test

Concept A — Focus on Multi-Modal System Connectivity

Focus on multi-modal connections throughout the region to test the RTP arterial, bicycle, pedestrian and regional transit service connectivity concepts.

Construct variables to be tested in this concept:

1. 4-lane major arterials spaced approximately1-mile apart and 2-lane minor arterials and collectors spaced approximately ½-mile apart, where reasonable.
2. Throughway overcrossings spaced approximately two miles apart, where reasonable, to improve access to centers and address congestion at interchanges.
3. Grade separation of railroad and arterial street network.
4. Implementation of the 2008 Transit Investment Plan, South Metropolitan Area Rapid Transit (SMART) Transit Plan and C-TRAN transit plan.
5. Local transit circulators in regional centers.
6. Build out of the regional bicycle and pedestrian systems, including regional trails with a transportation function.

Concept B — Focus on High Capacity Transit (HCT) and Regional Transit Service[3]

Focus on build out of high capacity transit connections identified in the 2040 Growth Concept (e.g., Milwaukie LRT, Washington Square LRT, Oregon City LRT, Clark County LRT) and service expansions to complement new HCT connections to test RTP regional transit network concept.

Construct variables to be tested in this concept:

1. Transit system designs to improve coverage, speed and frequencies, and address bottlenecks in the system.
2. HCT connections as defined in the HCT Study, including connections to all regional centers, inter-urban commuter rail to points outside the region and local aspirations.
3. HCT and streetcar network assumptions to be informed by current status of corridor studies.
4. Park-and-ride facilities and transit stations tied to new HCT service.
5. New and expanded frequent bus service on major arterials and 2040 corridors to support new HCT service, including new suburban-to-suburban connections and connections to employment areas (minimum 15-minute service most hours of the day).
6. Expanded streetcar system to complement HCT in the central city and regional centers.
7. Build out of new regional bicycle and pedestrian system connections to transit.

[3] Additional transit investment scenarios analysis will be conducted through the High Capacity Transit System Plan Alternatives Analysis to test different levels of high capacity transit and bus service coverage and frequency.

Transportation Policy Variables to Test

Concept C Focus on Throughways

Focus on expanded and new throughway connections identified in the 2040 Growth Concept (e.g., I-5/99W Connector, Sunrise Corridor, I-84/US 26 connector) to test the RTP Throughway System Concept.

Construct variables to be tested in this concept:

1. Throughways widened **up to 10 lanes** as needed to address congestion and freight bottlenecks.
2. Interchange designs restructured as needed to accommodate additional throughway lanes.
3. New throughways connections **up to 6 lanes** as needed (e.g., I-5/99W Connector, Sunrise Corridor, I-84/US 26 connector).
4. Throughway network assumptions to be informed by current status of corridor studies.
5. A "B" version of this concept includes value pricing of new capacity on selected heavily traveled throughway corridors.

Concept D Focus on System Management

Focus on aggressively optimizing and managing the demand of the existing transportation facilities and services in the region to test the RTP Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) Concept.

Construct variables to be tested in this concept:

1. Value pricing and/or high occupancy vehicle (HOV)/freight-only lanes on selected heavily traveled throughway corridors to address congestion and freight bottlenecks.
2. Expanded ramp metering on throughways.
3. Signal timing on major arterials.
4. Access management of major arterials and removal of throughway interchange access to meet Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) interchange spacing standards.
5. Expanded transit pass programs, including "reduced fare zones" in the central city and regional centers.
6. Expanded parking management programs in the central city, regional centers, town centers and employment areas.

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 1930

METRO

DATE: March 26, 2008

TO: TPAC and Interested Parties

FROM: Ted Leybold: MTIP Manager

SUBJECT: Regional Program applications for Regional Flexible Funds

* * * * * * *

The policy update to the 2010-13 MTIP has directed technical staff to develop a two-step process for the allocation of regional flexible funds. The first step would be to consider the allocation of funding to regional programs prior to solicitation of applications for locally administered projects.

To maintain a schedule that remains coordinated with the consideration of ODOT administered funding programs, a recommendation on the funding of regional programs is needed at the April TPAC and May JPACT meetings.

The policy report defines that consideration will be given in the first step to:

- High Capacity Transit implementation
- Metro Planning
- Regional Travel Options (RTO)
- Transit Oriented Development (TOD)/Centers Program
- Transportation System Management and Operations Program (TSMO)
- Willamette River Bridges
- Pedestrian and Bicycle Program

Attached are the regional program applications for regional flexible funds and a summary table of the available funding and requested program costs. A summary presentation of these materials will be provided at the meeting in preparation for a TPAC recommendation on funding of the regional programs at your April 25th meeting. Also, included in the TPAC packet are copies of the newly adopted RTO Strategic Plan and the 2007 TOD/Centers Program Annual Report.

Allocation of Transportation Capital Project Funds
Metro Area

	Proposed FFY 2012-13	FFY 2010-11	FFY 2008-09	FFY 2006-07	FFY 2004-05
Capital Funding Programs (Metro area only):					
New Starts Funding					
ODOT Modernization					
OTIA State Projects					
OTIA Local Projects					
OTIA State Bridge					
OTIA Local Bridge					
HBR: State					
HBR: Local					
Regional Flexible Fund Allocation Amount	**$67,800,000**	**$64,000,000**	**$63,116,000**	**$54,168,000**	**$50,540,000**
High Capacity Transit - Base Allocation (1)	$18,600,000	$18,600,000	$18,600,000	$16,000,000	$12,000,000
Milwaukie LRT/Commuter Rail Supplemental	$7,400,000				
DEIS/FEIS supplemental (2)	$4,000,000	$2,000,000	$3,688,000		$4,000,000
High Capacity Transit Subtotal	$30,000,000	$20,600,000	$22,288,000	$16,000,000	$16,000,000
Existing Regional Programs:					
Planning - Base Allocation	$2,115,500	$1,992,630	$1,881,000	$1,778,000	$1,665,000
Planning - Supplemental (3)	$850,500	$675,000	$500,000	$700,000	$300,000
RTO - Base Allocation	$4,406,000	$4,279,000	$4,100,000	$3,047,000	$2,139,000
RTO - Supplemental	$2,300,000				
TOD - Base Allocation (4)	$5,000,000	$5,000,000	$4,000,000	$4,000,000	$1,500,000
TOD - Supplemental	$1,000,000		$2,000,000	$2,000,000	$800,000
TSMO - Base Allocation (5)	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	$520,000	$0	$1,625,000
Subtotal - Base Allocation	$14,521,500	$14,271,630	$10,501,000	$8,825,000	$6,929,000
Subtotal - Supplemental	$4,150,500	$675,000	$2,500,000	$2,700,000	$1,100,000
Potential New Regional Programs:					
Willamette River (and Other?) Bridges	$8,000,000	$0	$2,000,000	$0	$1,345,000
Bike & Pedestrian - Base Allocation	$6,800,000	$6,767,000	$6,790,000	$6,551,000	$8,429,000
Bike & Pedestrian - Supplemental	$4,100,000				
Remaining Allocation	$228,000	$21,686,370	$19,037,000	$20,092,000	$16,737,000
Percent of Total Allocation Amount					
High Capacity Transit - Base Allocation	27.43%	29.06%	29.47%	29.54%	23.74%
High Capacity Transit - Supplemental	16.81%	3.13%	5.84%	0.00%	7.91%
Existing Regional Programs - Base	21.42%	22.30%	16.64%	16.29%	13.71%
Existing Regional Programs - Supplemental	6.12%	1.05%	3.96%	4.98%	2.18%
Potential New Regional Programs:					
Willmette River (and Other?) Bridges	11.80%	0.00%	3.17%	0.00%	2.66%
Bike & Pedestrian -Base Allocation	10.03%	10.57%	10.76%	12.09%	16.68%
Bike & Pedestrian -Supplemental	6.05%				
Remaining Allocation (6)	0.34%	33.88%	30.16%	37.09%	33.12%

Notes:

(1) The HCT base program is a prior commitment through 2015 for bond payments for regional contribution toward Interstate LRT, I-205/Mall LRT, Commuter Rail, South Waterfront Streetcar and prior contributions to Interstate and Westside light rail projects.

(2) The FEIS/DEIS supplemental work in this proposal is for the Portland to Lake Oswego corridor.

(3) Metro Planning Base includes MPO Required Planning, Freight Planning. Metro Planning Supplemental includes Corridor Planning, and Household Survey funding.

(4) TOD projects (eligible adjacent to LRT, Streetcar, Commuter Rail and Frequent Bus stations) and Centers projects have been committed to date in Gresham, Portland, Beaverton, Hillsboro, unicorporated Washington County and Milwaukie.

(5)TSMO became a regional program in the 2007 allocation. Previous allocations were to local agency applications.

(6) The remaining allocations have funded locally led arterial capacity, reconstruction, boulevard (Main Street) and Green Street demonstration projects, diesel retrofits, culvert retrofits, on-street transit improvements,

Regional Flexible Fund Allocation to Regionally Administered Programs

High Capacity Transit Program

1. Program Description

This region's celebrated quality of life is in no small part as result of careful transportation and land use planning. Transit is an integral part of the region's culture and identity. For 30 years the region has made light rail transit, now supplemented with commuter rail, the basis for the regional high capacity transit (HCT) system. Each addition has had exponential benefits and the system must be completed if it is to respond to the region's continued growth.

The region has been successful in bringing an average $65 million of Federal New Starts funding per year (1992 to 2011), leveraged by a mix of local sources of funding. A decline in Federal contributions (from 88% for the Banfield project to 60% for the Green Line) and increasing construction costs have made it necessary to look to a contribution from the region's MTIP to help close the funding gap for these HCT projects. The program will implement the Regional Transportation Plan and the Regional High Capacity Transit Plan supporting the highest priority regional High Capacity Transit Projects. This request addresses the needs of two key components of the Regional High Capacity Transit Program:

1. The Portland-to-Milwaukie light rail project will construct a 6.5-mile MAX extension from Portland State University to downtown Milwaukie with a multi-modal river crossing and serving the South Waterfront, OMSI, SE Portland, Brooklyn, West Mooreland and Sellwood neighborhoods. While several alignment and design options are still under consideration, the estimated cost of a baseline project (as of 3/08) is $1.25 billion. The project will complete a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement this spring. In total, $1 Billion in transportation funding is expected to be leveraged by this project through (1) a proposed $750 million Section 5309 New Starts share; and (2) $250 million in lottery bonds approved by the Oregon legislature in 2007. The requested multi-year commitment of MTIP funds would provide net proceeds of $75.0 million toward the local match requirement for Milwaukie LRT in 2011 and $1.2 million toward Preliminary Engineering/Final Environmental Impact Statement in 2008. The remaining local match requirement will come from TriMet, benefited local governments, benefited land owners, and land donation sources.

2. As proposed, MTIP funds would provide net proceeds of $13.3 million (2008 dollars) to offset certain essential and necessary costs associated with the 14.7-mile WES Commuter Rail line that is scheduled to open in October 2008.

The most efficient method of providing these funds will probably require using the MTIP funds to acquire buses, freeing up TriMet general funds to be used to provide additional funding for these High Capacity Transit projects.

2. Policy objectives for the RFF Allocation Process addressed by High Capacity Transit Program

RTP Goals	RTP policy objectives	How Program Addresses Policy Objectives
Goal 1, Goal 2	A. Retain and attract housing and jobs by addressing system gaps or deficiencies to improve multi-modal access in primary 2040 target areas (central city, regional centers, industrial areas and passenger and freight inter-modal facilities) as the highest priority, secondary areas (town centers, main streets, station communities and corridors) as next highest priority, and other areas (employment areas, inner and outer neighborhoods) as the lowest priority.	The Portland region has demonstrated how high capacity transit can define and reinforce regional and town centers that are characterized by more dense, mixed-use development with strong pedestrian orientation. The region continues to leverage light rail to take advantage of land development opportunities around light rail. Transit-supported centers and station areas can absorb more housing and more employment than other land use types with less dependence on the road infrastructure. Regional and town centers interconnected with high capacity transit reduce the burden on the regional and interstate road system. Station communities that are not otherwise "centers" have a secondary but nonetheless important priority. The Milwaukie line serves the central eastside industrial area, industrial areas in SE Portland, and Milwaukie's north Industrial area. The commuter rail provides key employment connections in the Wilsonville, Tualatin, Tigard, Beaverton corridor. .
Goal 1, Goal 2	B. Address gaps and deficiencies in the reliable movement of freight and goods on the RTP regional freight system, and transit, pedestrian and bicycle access and inter-modal connections to labor markets and trade areas within or between 2040 target areas (Primary areas are highest priority, Secondary areas are next highest priority, other areas are lowest priority).	The high capacity transit system compliments the road system by carrying regional trips at peak travel times of the day. This takes pressure off of the road systems, thus facilitating the free flow of freight and commerce. An interconnected high capacity transit system backed up by more localized bus services also provides multi-directional access to jobs. That HCT system today is incomplete and its development will multiply options for live-work combinations, regardless of location and type of work. A multi-directional high capacity transit system will also be less downtown centric but focused on regional centers and will increase live/work options while reducing travel time for a greater share of the population.
Goal 3, Goal 8	C. Provide access to transportation options	Jurisdictions are increasingly zoning for affordable and senior housing within in high capacity transit

	for underserved populations (low income populations,the elderly and people with disabilities).	station communities. HCT expands live/work/travel options for these populations whether they live in the city or suburban station-area communities at a lower cost than car ownership. Access to high capacity transit for these populations is further extended with feeder bus services.
Goal 4	D. Invest in Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) in regional mobility corridors.	Light/commuter rail serves regional mobility corridors generally alongside the major road system. Bus rapid transit, while not yet used in this region, is another HCT mode that is typically integrated with road management systems to increase the through-put of existing travel corridors. Light/commuter rail transit serves these major corridors providing a highly reliable option to the road facilities and a backup for when those facilities are blocked or congested. Light/commuter rail transit is also efficient use of the right of way, with each track providing the equivalent of 1.5 freeway lanes.
Goal 5	E. Address recurring safety issues, including gaps in the bike and pedestrian system.	All transit vehicles carry bikes and additionally many light rail stations provide lockable bike lockers. Transit thus is an extension of both the bike and pedestrian systems, but is also highly dependent on those systems for safe access and egress. Sections of high capacity transit rights of way also serve as direct bike routes – without the noise and exhaust associated with roadway bike lanes. TriMet works with all road jurisdictions to assure safe access to HCT facilities and has increasingly aggressive standards for safe use of the transit system – on and off the transit vehicles.
Goal 6	F. Minimize transportation-related storm-water run-off.	With its high person-carrying capacity, transit can reduce the footprint of transportation infrastructure. Each light rail tack carries the equivalent of 1.5 freeway lanes with a smaller cross section and, in many places, over permeable, ballasted track. TriMet also employees green design features into its park & ride lots and stations (e.g. using dry set pavers and bioswales).
Goal 6, Goal 7	G. Reduce or minimize energy consumption, carbon emissions and other pollution impacts.	The high person-carrying capacity of high capacity transit is inherently more energy efficient than most alternatives. Light rail uses clean electric energy. Bus Rapid Transit vehicles increasingly use hybrid technology and biodiesel fuel.
	H. the project mode of program service type has no other or limited sources of transportation-related funding available.	This region has historically competed well for Federal New Starts funds, but the Federal share has been receding from 88% to now 60%. Covering the full program costs has been difficult without the supplemental use of MTIP funds. MTIP funds are thus to be used to “top off” Federal and

		other state and local funding.
Goal 9	I. efficient and cost effective use of federal funds.	The region has acquired project development expertise, a favorable project delivery track record and has secured an average on $65 million in Federal New Starts funds annually over the past 15 years. While the local match ratio, by Federal policy is generally now at 40%, each $1.00 0f local funds (including formula federal funds) leverage about $1.68 of discretionary federal funds.

3. Summarize the program's funding request

The Regional High Capacity Transit Program will apply the following principles as it utilizes Regional Flexible MTIP Funds:

1. The region will make every effort to maximize the Federal Section 5309 contribution to the program, at this time 60% or more.
2. At least 50% of the remaining State and local share (matching funds) for the program will come directly from the collective project sponsors.

The requested MTIP funds will support a financing plan providing about $76.45 million in net bond proceeds (2011 dollars) to the Milwaukie LRT Project and $13.3 million (2008 dollars) to the WES Commuter Rail Project. The financing program may include bonding, other types of borrowing, and/or eligible funding offsets for other regional transit needs (e.g. purchase of replacement buses) that allows for the efficient financing of the Regional High Capacity Transit Program. These funds would be managed through an Intergovernmental Agreement between TriMet and Metro, consistent with an existing agreement managing the MTIP contributions to the South Corridor Green Line, Commuter Rail and North Macadam projects.

Program Funding Request: $3.7 million per year in FY '12 and '13 and a long-term funding commitment through 2025.

	Regional High Capacity Transit Funding (millions)		
Federal Fiscal Year	**Existing Commitment**	**New Request**	**Total Existing and New**
2006	$ 4.0	$ 0.0	$ 4.0
2007	$ 8.0	$ 0.0	$ 8.0
2008	$ 9.3	$ 0.0	$ 9.3
2010	$ 9.3	$ 0.0	$ 9.3
2011	$ 9.3	$ 0.0	$ 9.3
2012	**$ 9.3**	**$ 3.7**	**$ 13.0**
2013	**$ 9.3**	**$ 3.7**	**$ 13.0**
2014	$ 9.3	$ 3.7	$ 13.0
2015	$ 9.3	$ 3.7	$ 13.0
2016	$ 0.0	$ 13.0	$ 13.0
2017	$ 0.0	$ 13.0	$ 13.0
2018	$ 0.0	$ 13.0	$ 13.0
2019	$ 0.0	$ 13.0	$ 13.0
2020	$ 0.0	$ 13.0	$ 13.0
2021	$ 0.0	$ 13.0	$ 13.0
2022	$ 0.0	$ 13.0	$ 13.0
2023	$ 0.0	$ 13.0	$ 13.0
2024	$ 0.0	$ 13.0	$ 13.0
2025	$ 0.0	$ 13.0	$ 13.0
Total in Millions	$ 86.4	$ 144.8	$ 231.2

.

High Capacity Transit Program
Lake Oswego to Portland Streetcar Project

1. Program Description

This $4 million request is for the Lake Oswego to Portland Streetcar Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It is anticipated that this funding will be matched by $1.5 million in local funding from project partner jurisdictions.

A federal appropriations request has been made for federal fiscal year 2009 for $4.0 million in Federal Transit Administration Section 5339 funding for this DEIS. The funding requested in this FY 12 – 13 MTIP request would be used to complete the funding plan for the DEIS in the event that the entire $4.0 million is not received in FY 09 and FY 10. These FY 12 – 13 funds would need to be moved forward to FY 09 or FY 10.

If the entire $4.0 million in FTA Section 5339 funds is received in FY 09, the $4.0 million in this request would be used to complete the project's Final Environmental Impact Statement in FY 10.

Metro provides services to the region by leading the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Environmental Impact Statements and the Federal Transit Administration New Starts processes in order to gain approval and funding for new high capacity transit projects.

2. Policy objectives of the RFF Allocation Process addressed by the High Capacity Transit Program

RTP Goals	RFF policy objectives	How Program Addresses Policy Objectives
Goal 1, Goal 2	A. Retain and attract housing and jobs by addressing system gaps or deficiencies to improve multi-modal access in primary 2040 target areas (central city, regional centers, industrial areas and passenger and freight inter-modal facilities) as the highest priority, secondary areas (town centers, main streets, station communities and corridors) as next highest priority, and other areas	The Portland region has demonstrated how high capacity transit can define and reinforce regional and town centers that are characterized by more dense, mixed-use development with strong pedestrian orientation. The region continues to leverage light rail to take advantage of land development opportunities around light rail. Transit-supported centers and station areas can absorb more housing and more employment than other land use types with less dependence on the road infrastructure. Regional and town centers interconnected with high capacity transit reduce the burden on the regional and interstate road system. Station communities that are not otherwise "centers" have a secondary but nonetheless important priority.

	(employment areas, inner and outer neighborhoods) as the lowest priority.	
Goal 1, Goal 2	B. Address gaps and deficiencies in the reliable movement of freight and goods on the RTP regional freight system, and transit, pedestrian and bicycle access and inter-modal connections to labor markets and trade areas within or between 2040 target areas (Primary areas are highest priority, Secondary areas are next highest priority, other areas are lowest priority).	The high capacity transit system compliments the road system by carrying regional trips at peak travel times of the day. This takes pressure off of the road systems, thus facilitating the free flow of freight and commerce. An interconnected high capacity transit system backed up by more localized bus services also provides multi-directional access to jobs. That HCT system today is incomplete and its development will multiply options for live-work combinations, regardless of location and type of work. A multi-directional high capacity transit system will also be less downtown centric but focused on regional centers and will increase live/work options while reducing travel time for a greater share of the population.
Goal 3, Goal 8	C. Provide access to transportation options for underserved populations (low income populations, the elderly and people with disabilities).	Jurisdictions are increasingly zoning for affordable and senior housing within in high capacity transit station communities. HCT expands live/work/travel options for these populations whether they live in the city or suburban station-area communities at a lower cost than car ownership. Access to high capacity transit for these populations is further extended with feeder bus services.
Goal 4	D. Invest in Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) in regional mobility corridors.	Light/commuter rail serves regional mobility corridors generally alongside the major road system. Bus rapid transit, while not yet used in this region, is another HCT mode that is typically integrated with road management systems to increase the through-put of existing travel corridors. Light/commuter rail transit serves these major corridors providing a highly reliable option to the road facilities and a backup for when those facilities are blocked or congested. Light/commuter rail transit is also efficient use of the right of way, with each track providing the equivalent of 1.5 freeway lanes.
Goal 5	E. Address recurring safety issues, including gaps in the bike and pedestrian system.	All transit vehicles carry bikes and additionally many light rail stations provide lockable bike lockers. Transit thus is an extension of both the bike and pedestrian systems, but is also highly dependent on those systems for safe access and egress. Sections of high capacity transit rights of way also serve as direct bike routes – without the noise and exhaust associated with roadway bike lanes. TriMet works with all road jurisdictions to assure safe access to HCT facilities and has increasingly aggressive standards for safe use of the transit system – on and off the transit vehicles.

Goal 6	F. Minimize transportation-related storm-water run-off.	With its high person-carrying capacity, transit can reduce the footprint of transportation infrastructure. Each light rail tack carries the equivalent of 1.5 freeway lanes with a smaller cross section and, in many places, over permeable, ballasted track.
Goal 6, Goal 7	G. Reduce or minimize energy consumption, carbon emissions and other pollution impacts.	The high person-carrying capacity of high capacity transit is inherently more energy efficient than most alternatives. Light rail uses clean electric energy. Bus Rapid Transit vehicles increasingly use hybrid technology and biodiesel fuel.
	H. the project mode of program service type has no other or limited sources of transportation-related funding available.	
Goal 9	I. efficient and cost effective use of federal funds.	

3. Summarize the program funding request

Program Element Title	Base Funding Request	Additional Funding Request
Lake Oswego to Portland Streetcar DEIS/FEIS		$4,000,000
Total Program		**$4,000,000**

4. Historical Funding Levels

HCT Project Development	FFY 2012-13	FFY 10-11	FFY 08-09	FFY 06-07	FFY 04-05	FFY 02-03	10-year Total Allocation
Lake Oswego to Portland Streetcar DEIS/FEIS	$4,000,000						$4,000,000
Milwaukie to Portland LRT PE/FEIS		$2,000,000					$2,000,000
Milwaukie to Portland LRT DEIS			$2,000,000				$2,000,000
Portland Streetcar Loop (Eastside) AA			$1,000,000				$1,000,000
Lake Oswego to Portland AA			$688,000	$300,000			$988,000
South Corridor AA/DEIS/PE					$4,000,000		$4,000,000
Wash Co. Commuter Rail EA/PE						$1,000,000	$1,000,000
Total: HCT Project Development	**$4,000,000**	**$2,000,000**	**$3,688,000**	**$300,000**	**$4,000,000**	**$1,000,000**	**$14,988,000**

Metro Planning

1. Program Description

A. MPO-Required Planning - Allocation of Regional Flexible Funds to Metro provides support for meeting MPO mandates, established through federal transportation authorization bills. Examples of these requirements include:

- Development and adoption of a long-range plan (RTP);
- Development and adoption of a short-range transportation improvement program (TIP);
- Support for a decision-making structure that includes local governments and state and regional transportation providers;
- Participation in the development of local plans and projects that implement regional policy;
- Maintenance of travel demand models for planning by Metro, local governments and state and regional transportation service providers;
- Maintenance of land use, economic, demographic, GIS and aerial photo services for planning by Metro, local governments, and state and regional transportation providers;
- Compliance with federal certification requirements, including public participation, Environmental Justice, air quality, coordination with environmental resource agencies, grants and contracting requirements

This element of the allocation of Regional Flexible Funds came about in the mid-1980's when Metro abandoned the assessment of local government dues on cities and counties, TriMet and the Port of Portland. The amount allocated has been consistent over time with an inflation factor applied.

Proposed Allocation: This should be viewed as the Base allocation in the Planning category. The proposed allocation is $1.949 million for the 2-year period including a 3% per year escalator.

B. Freight Planning – In the last 5-years, there has been an increased level of concern and attention to freight planning. As a result, an increasing share of Metro's base planning funds have been dedicated to freight planning. In addition, there has been a series of Regional Flexible Funds allocations to freight planning to support improved data collection, improved forecasting of overall regional commodities, improvements to the regional travel demand models to upgrade forecasts of truck volumes on the road and highway network, facilitation of a regional freight advisory committee, participation in state freight planning and development of a freight component to the RTP. Continuation of this added allocation would enable continued support of involvement with freight interest groups and follow-through on implementation of freight plan recommendations.

Proposed Allocation: This supplemental freight allocation is proposed at $166,500 for the 2-year period including a 3% escalator.

C. Multi-Modal Corridor Plans – Following adoption of the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan, a multi-year work plan was identified to carry out a series of corridor plans to better define needed improvements in various corridors throughout the region. Priorities for addressing these corridors were established through Resolution No. 01-3089 and Resolution No. 05-3616A. To support carrying out those corridor plans, MTIP funds have been allocated through a series of MTIP cycles since 2002. To date, corridor plans have been completed for the I-5 Trade Corridor, the Hwy 217 Corridor, the Powell-Foster Corridor and is now underway for a Regional HCT System Plan. Upon completion of the next RTP update, these corridor priorities will be updated. This allocation would set aside funds in FY '12 and FY '13 to contribute toward the next priority corridor. In the past there has been a practice to define the scope of work for the corridor plans and supplement this funding set-aside with other state, regional and local contributions. Consideration will be given to the priorities established through Resolution No. 05-3616A which included the I-84/US 26 Connector, I-5 South, I-205 and the I-5/I-405 Loop. However, final priorities are subject to conclusions reached through the RTP update.

Proposed Allocation: This supplemental corridor planning allocation is proposed at $500,000 for the 2-year period. Most of the funding is used for contractual services.

D. Household Travel Behavior Survey – Metro fields a comprehensive household travel behavior survey about every decade to inform policy makers on changing travel patterns and to update travel forecasting models to accurately predict future travel. The last survey was 1994. This update was delayed from 2004 to 2010 because the significant disruption due to downtown Portland construction would skew the results. In the meantime, Metro staff has been working with ODOT staff and staffs from the other Oregon MPOs to design and test the survey instrument and begin fielding surveys in other metropolitan areas of the state. By having a common survey instrument and contractor, all of the parties receive information from the other regions to use in their own work and an economy of scale results in lower costs.

The survey is designed to cover 6,000 households throughout the 4-county region, 25% in Clark Co. and 75% in the Oregon tri-county area. In addition, ODOT and the Salem MPO are fielding the same survey in Marion and Yamhill Counties which should yield some records for travelers into the Metro region. 10% of the surveys would use GPS technology with 90% using paper surveys. The GPS surveys will be for a 5-day period and the paper surveys for a 1-2 day period. All of the surveys will be for all of the trips of the household, including children. With this base level survey, there is an opportunity for others to add to the survey to obtain a higher sample size for particular areas of interest (such as a smaller geography, a specialized land use like TODs, a particular demographic or a particular mode of travel like bikes or transit).

The overall survey cost is projected at $1,402,000 for consultant services (the Metro staff cost is already covered through the base MPO-related planning allocation). The cost is proposed to be split 25% each between Metro, ODOT, TriMet and SW Washington RTC consistent with past practice.

Proposed Allocation: This proposed supplemental allocation is for the 25% Metro share of $350,500.

2. Policy objectives for the RFF Allocation Process addressed by Metro Planning

RTP Goals	RFF policy objectives	How Program Addresses Policy Objectives
Goal 1, Goal 2	A. Retain and attract housing and jobs by addressing system gaps or deficiencies to improve multi-modal access in primary 2040 target areas (central city, regional centers, industrial areas and passenger and freight inter-modal facilities) as the highest priority, secondary areas (town centers, main streets, station communities and corridors) as next highest priority, and other areas (employment areas, inner and outer neighborhoods) as the lowest priority.	The MPO Planning activities and Multi-Modal Corridor Plans will include elements that improve access to Primary and Secondary 2040 target areas. The freight planning will address access to industrial areas.

Goal 1, Goal 2	B. Address gaps and deficiencies in the reliable movement of freight and goods on the RTP regional freight system, and transit, pedestrian and bicycle access and inter-modal connections to labor markets and trade areas within or between 2040 target areas (Primary areas are highest priority, Secondary areas are next highest priority, other areas are lowest priority).	The freight planning will directly address access to industrial areas. The MPO planning and Multi-Modal Corridor Planning will address access to Primary 2040 Target areas.
Goal 3, Goal 8	C. Provide access to transportation options for underserved populations (low income populations, the elderly and people with disabilities).	The MPO Planning will address transportation options for underserved populations and support addressing Environmental Justice requirements.
Goal 4	D. Invest in Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) in regional mobility corridors.	The MPO Planning funds provides Metro the ability to address TSMO needs and provide staff support to the TransPort Committee. The Multi-Modal Corridor planning will include addressing TSMO options as part of the corridor plan.
Goal 5	E. Address recurring safety issues, including gaps in the bike and pedestrian system.	The MPO Planning funds include addressing safety issues and bike/ped. Issues.
Goal 6	F. Minimize transportation-related storm-water run-off.	The MPO Planning funds includes staff support for the Liveable Streets/Green Streets manuals and staff support to assist in incorporating green features into project scopes funded through the MTIP.
Goal 6, Goal 7	G. Reduce or minimize energy consumption, carbon emissions and other pollution impacts.	The MPO Planning includes addressing air quality requirements and multi-modal planning aimed at reducing VMT and therefore energy and carbon emissions.
	H. the project mode of program service type has no other or limited sources of transportation-related funding available.	Metro's Planning program receives federal highway and transit planning funds through a formula distribution and local matching funds through Metro's budget process. In addition, TriMet and ODOT contribute local funds to support these planning functions. However, Metro does not have access to state and local sources of transportation funding.

Goal 9	I. efficient and cost effective use of federal funds.	These Planning funds provide the support for meeting federal and state planning requirements, thereby allowing construction funds to be accessed for implementing projects. Without these funds, the region would be in jeopardy of losing federal certification which would disrupt the flow of federal construction funding.

3. Summarize the program funding request

The funding request is for program funding authority from federal fiscal years 2012 and 2013. Actual funding authority awarded may be programmed over any of the federal fiscal years 2010 through 2013.

Program Element Title	Base Funding Request	Additional Funding Request
MPO Required Planning	$1,949,000	
Freight Planning	$ 166,500	
Multi-Modal Corridor Plans		$500,000
Household Travel Behavior Survey		$350,500
Total Program	**$2,115,500**	**$850,500**
GRAND TOTAL	**$2,966,000**	

Historical MTIP allocation to Planning related programs:

	MPO-Required Planning	Freight Planning	Multimodal Corridor Plans	Best Practices Manuals	Household Travel Survey	Total
FY '02	$ 705,000	$ 50,000				$ 755,000
FY '03	$ 705,000	$ 50,000	$ 250,000			$ 1,005,000
FY '04	$ 738,000	$ 75,000				$ 813,000
FY '05	$ 777,000	$ 75,000	$ 300,000			$ 1,152,000
FY '06	$ 801,000	$ 75,000				$ 876,000
FY '07	$ 827,000	$ 75,000	$ 700,000			$ 1,602,000
FY '08	$ 853,000	$ 75,000				$ 928,000
FY '09	$ 878,000	$ 75,000	$ 500,000			$ 1,453,000
FY '10	$ 904,340	$ 77,250				$ 981,590
FY '11	$ 931,470	$ 79,570	$ 300,000	$ 375,000		$ 1,686,040
Proposed FY '12	$ 960,000	$ 82,000				$ 1,042,000
Proposed FY '13	$ 989,000	$ 84,500	$ 500,000		$ 350,500	$ 1,924,000
FY '12/'13 Total	$ 1,949,000	$ 166,500	$ 500,000	$ -	$ 350,500	$ 2,966,000

Proposed Budget for Household Survey:

	FY2008-2009	FY2009-2010	FY2010-2011	FY2011-2012	Totals
Survey Design					
RTC (1500 hh - 10% w/ GPS)	$31,500				
Oregon (4500 hh - 10% w/ GPS)	$94,500				
Survey Data Collection					
RTC (1500 hh - 10% w/ GPS)		$319,000			
Oregon					
Phase 1 (2250 hh - 10% w/ GPS)			$478,500		
Phase 2 (2250 hh - 10% w/ GPS)				$478,500	
	$126,000	$319,000	$478,500	$478,500	**$1,402,000**
RTC	$31,500	$319,000			$350,500
ODOT	$94,500		$128,000	$128,000	$350,500
TriMet			$350,500		$350,500
MTIP				$350,500	$350,500
	$126,000	$319,000	$478,500	$478,500	$1,402,000

Assumptions

Survey design per hh w/ 10% GPS => $21

Data capture per hh w/ 10% GPS => $196

$217

Region Travel Options (RTO)

1. Program Description

The Regional Travel Options (RTO) Program carries out regional strategies to increase use of travel options, reduce pollution and improve mobility. Regional travel options include all of the alternatives to driving alone – carpooling, vanpooling, riding transit, bicycling, walking and telecommuting. The program maximizes investments in the transportation system and relieves traffic congestion by managing travel demand, particularly during peak commute hours.
RTO is a key implementation strategy to meet required 2040 non-drive alone modal targets. These modal targets are the regionally selected measurement to demonstrate compliance with per capita travel reductions required by the State Transportation Planning Rule. Implementing the 2008-2013 RTO Strategic Plan is expected to reduce 86,600,000 vehicle miles of travel (VMT) per year. Expected VMT reductions are based upon past program performance and carrying out cost-effective strategies that leverage investments in transit, trails and other infrastructure by marketing new options to potential users.

The RTO program supports federal, state and regional air quality regulations, reduces the consumption of gasoline and increases the share of trips made with less polluting modes of travel. RTO supports employers affected by Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Employer Commute Options Rules to reduce employee auto trips. The program results in significant reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. The Governor's Climate Change Integration Group, January 2008 report, "A Framework for Addressing Rapid Climate Change," recommends continued implementation of "transportation choices" programs and notes that Oregon must reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 42% to meet the State's 2020 goals.

Proposed Allocation
$4.407 million base program supports the following programs and projects:

- Collaborative marketing programs increase public awareness of the personal and community benefits of travel options; and, motivate people to choose more efficient transportation. RTO manages regional, collaborative marketing; currently Drive Less/Save More. Additional funds from ODOT (separate from MTIP) purchase television and radio ads for the campaign.
- Individualized marketing projects (TravelSmart™ or Smart Trips) identify individuals who want to change their travel behavior and provides them customized information. One large scale or two smaller scale projects are included in the base program.
- Employer outreach to employers to reduce auto trips by increasing employer-offered transportation benefits. The non-drive alone rate has risen from 26% in 1996 to 35% in 2006, representing 150,000 employees. RTO efforts are expected to pass 40% non-drive alone commute trips by 2013. DEQ, Metro, TriMet, Wilsonville SMART, area TMAs and other partners carry out employer outreach programs.
- Transportation Management Association (TMA) and RTO grant programs support local travel options projects and programs.

2. Policy objectives of the RFF Allocation Process addressed by RTO

RTP Goals	RFF policy objectives	How Program Addresses Policy Objectives
Goal 1, Goal 2	A. Retain and attract housing and jobs by addressing system gaps or deficiencies to improve multi-modal access in primary 2040 target areas (central city, regional centers, industrial areas and passenger and freight inter-modal facilities) as the highest priority, secondary areas (town centers, main streets, station communities and corridors) as next highest priority, and other areas (employment areas, inner and outer neighborhoods) as the lowest priority.	RTO preserves multi-modal access in primary 2040 target areas by reducing drive-alone auto trips. RTO centers analysis in 2003 showed the following number of employment sites meeting or making progress to a 10% reduction in auto trips: • 171 employment sites in the Central City • 55 employment sites in Regional Centers The 2006 RTO evaluation showed the program reducing over 40 million vehicle miles traveled each year; taking over 10,000 vehicles out of the peak commute each weekday.
Goal 1, Goal 2	B. Address gaps and deficiencies in the reliable movement of freight and goods on the RTP regional freight system, and transit, pedestrian and bicycle access and inter-modal connections to labor markets and trade areas within or between 2040 target areas (Primary areas are highest priority, Secondary areas are next highest priority, other areas are lowest priority).	RTO preserves multi-modal access in primary and secondary 2040 target areas by reducing drive-alone auto trips. RTO also supports connections to labor markets. These two areas are addressed through RTO employer outreach which has reached one-quarter of the region's employees and has measured results for one-fifth of all employees. Non-drive alone trip rates have steadily climbed from 26% in 1996 to 34% in 2006.
Goal 3, Goal 8	C. Provide access to transportation options for underserved populations (low income populations, the elderly and people with disabilities).	Grant proposals that connect programs to underserved populations score more points. RTO outreach features materials written in Spanish.

Goal 4	D. Invest in Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) in regional mobility corridors.	RTO implements transportation demand management that is a component, like TSMO, of managing the system. RTO staff are actively partnering with TSMO staff. RTO traveler information is just one strategy RTO shares with TSMO.
Goal 5	E. Address recurring safety issues, including gaps in the bike and pedestrian system.	RTO provides outreach and materials to address safety issues. Bike maps show safer routes and include practical information for navigating the bike system safely. Walking maps serve a similar function. RTO individualized marketing projects address safety barriers one-on-one with novice users of the bike and pedestrian system.
Goal 6	F. Minimize transportation-related storm-water run-off.	RTO reduces auto trips which reduces all auto-related run-off including toxics. RTO influences the demand for parking which will reduce impervious surfaces in the long-term.
Goal 6, Goal 7	G. Reduce or minimize energy consumption, carbon emissions and other pollution impacts.	RTO measurement shows that the program is on track to reduce gasoline consumption by 4.5 million gallons in the year 2012, save 45,000 tons of carbon-dioxide from being released into the atmosphere and tons of carcinogenic particulate matter and air toxics (expected results are based on past program evaluation).
	H. The project mode of program service type has no other or limited sources of transportation-related funding available.	Past MTIP Technical Evaluation has rated RTO as "low" for availability of other funding sources. In the most optimistic scenario, MTIP would make up 63% of RTO revenue, not including local match.
Goal 9	I. Efficient and cost effective use of federal funds.	RTO staff estimate most programs reduce one vehicle mile traveled for five cents ($.05) or less. RTO is in line with the second most cost-effective regional approaches to transportation demand management in the nation (comparing RTO among the eight national programs included in the 2002 Transportation Research Board assessment of CMAQ (Special Report 264)).

3. RTO Program funding request

Program Element Title	Base Funding Request	Additional Funding Request
Regional Travel Options implementing transportation demand management	$4,407,000	0
Employer Outreach Evolution		$700,000
New Phase of Life		$600,000
Safety		$1,000,000
Total Program	$4,407,000	$2,300,000

Historical MTIP allocation to RTO Programs and Base Funding Request

		Base		TMAs and Grants		Total
FY '01	$	700,000	$	767,000	$	1,467,000
FY '02	$	700,000			$	700,000
FY '03	$	999,000	$	500,000	$	1,499,000
FY '04*	$	700,000	$	425,757	$	1,125,757
FY '05	$	700,000	$	320,000	$	1,020,000
FY '06	$	700,000	$	757,000	$	1,457,000
FY '07	$	883,000	$	295,000	$	1,178,000
FY '08	$	883,000	$	337,544	$	1,220,544
Base and TMA/Grants to be determined by RTO Subcommitee						
		MTIP Allocation				
FY '09	$	1,800,000	→	tbd	$	1,800,000
FY '10	$	1,897,000	$500,000** +	tbd	$	2,397,000
FY '11	$	1,882,000	→	tbd	$	1,882,000
Proposed FY '12	$	2,203,685	→	tbd	$	2,203,685
Proposed FY '13	$	2,203,685	→	tbd	$	2,203,685
FY '12 & FY'13 Total (rounded)	$	4,407,000	→	tbd	$	4,407,000

*MTIP funding cut this year

**$500,000 is dedicated to individualized marketing

The following pie charts illustrate:

1. the likely split between local and regional expenditures of the $4.4 million MTIP application for the RTO funding base.
2. the projected amount of MTIP, match and leveraged funding, totaling $7.1 million.





Additional Funding Requests

On March 12, 2008, the RTO Subcommittee of TPAC recommended three requests for additional funding.

1. Employer Outreach Evolution

Currently, the employer outreach program reaches one-quarter of the region's employees. This program would continue leveraging transportation and sustainability coordinators at employers throughout the region, conduct outreach, trip planning and/or individualized marketing to employees at businesses of all sizes. TriMet has a solid track record working with employer coordinators since 1996, helping to bring RTO commute mode splits from 26% non-drive alone trips in 1996 to 35% in 2006, representing 150,000 employees. The City of Portland has had success with individualized marketing to employees. Portland's early results show that contact with 90 downtown employers generated 6,000 interested commuters who now reduce their drive-alone commuting by 18%.

$700,000 is requested to reach 100,000 additional employees. Program elements include:

- Development of local and personalized transportation options toolkits and online resources.
- Partnerships with transit agencies, local jurisdictions and Transportation Management Associations (TMAs) would build local capacity to provide transportation sustainability expertise to businesses, especially those that are new, relocating, applying for LEED ratings or have physical exercise goals for their workforce.
- Outreach to office parks, building managers in centers and industrial/employment areas to reach employees. Examples include the Kruse Way employment area and the Clackamas industrial area.

2. Individualized Marketing for a New Stage of Life

People make many changes in at least three distinct phases in life: becoming an independent adult, forming a family and post-retirement. Often, their transportation decisions come after a move to the region or within the region. This program would be based on individualized marketing and community-based marketing to reach targeted demographic groups. $600,000 is requested to reach 60,000 residents over two years with a cost-efficient version of individualized marketing, estimated at $10/person. Funding would support:

- Contacting residents and fulfilling their request for personalized transportation information.
- Partnering with residential developers seeking LEED ratings.
- Partnering with developing centers to promote location-efficient choices within short distance of new residents.
- Outreach to targeted populations: students entering post-secondary education; new families; and retirees and seniors.

3. Safety Partnership and Safer Crossings

The region lacks a coordinated effort for safety. Safety is both a real and perceived barrier for much of the public who are not using transportation options. Forty percent of residents who do not already use alternative modes, said improved safety would motivate them to use transit, walk or bike (2004 Travel Behavior Barriers and Benefits Research). More in-depth research and careful development would guide this initiative. Through advocacy and legislation, laws are updated; however, the public is often unaware. Engineering advancements are making some road intersections safer for all modes, but these advancements could be implemented on a greater scale.

$1,000,000 is requested to develop and carry out a regionally coordinated safety initiative that includes an education campaign, enforcement actions and engineering solutions. A Safety Partnership between RTO and Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) would convene state agencies (ODOT, DEQ), local law enforcement, auto clubs like AAA, insurance providers (motor vehicle and health), advocacy groups like BTA and community members. The partnership would implement this safety initiative and develop a funding strategy to continue work past 2013.

Based on research and development, funding could support:

- An education campaign that brings efforts such as Portland's "I Share the Road" and "I Brake for People" to the rest of the region. Education informs road and transit users of new laws, provides guidance for staying safe and disseminates research-based information to distinguish real safety issues from perceived safety barriers. The partnership would develop communication strategies, deciding between large- and small-scale efforts, choosing which forms of media to pursue, and ways to generate earned media. Messaging would be directed to novice transit riders, cyclists and walkers, as well as motorists.
- Enforcement actions would be carried out by local police departments. A partnership with law enforcement would bring red traffic light cameras and other techniques to problem intersections and pedestrian crossings. One option is to follow Portland's model, to use a portion of ticket revenue to fund ongoing local enforcement, regional safety coordination and

safer intersections. Traffic safety officers around the region would select an enforcement action to highlight a specific danger to raise awareness.

- Engineering solutions would likely focus on making safer crossings at key intersections. Intersection improvements would be based on criteria for areas where pedestrian, cycling and motorist activity is high or likely to grow; for example, near major transit stops, near schools, near senior centers and in developing centers. New data show that signals can be optimized for motorists or pedestrians based on usage by time of day. Safer crossings would also focus on locations where low auto-traffic, through streets cross arterials. Signals could be upgraded, such as the one on N Columbia Boulevard at Macrum, where a busy freight corridor borders a residential neighborhood. In this example, a road sensor calculates the ability for a truck to safely stop before the light turns red and extends green time, which has significantly reduced red-light running at this intersection and increased safety for all modes. Regional coordination would highlight best practices and lessons learned while implementing solutions. New projects would be the focus of earned media efforts to raise safety awareness.

Regional Flexible Fund Allocation to Regionally Administered Programs

Program Summaries

1. Program Description

Metro's Transit-Oriented Development and Centers Implementation Programs (Programs) work directly with developers, landowners and local jurisdictions, creating partnerships to influence development projects that forge strong land use-transportation connections to increase transit ridership and help realize the 2040 Growth Concept. Since the Program's inception 10 years ago, $19 million dollars has been invested throughout the region to stimulate the development of nearly 3,000 new housing units in 30 higher-density mixed-use projects with a functional or physical connection to the transit system.

Transit-oriented development (TOD) projects contribute to compact, relatively dense, mixed-use, mixed-income developments which concentrate retail, housing and jobs in pedestrian-scaled urban environments and increase non-auto trips (transit, bicycle, walking). TODs serve to decrease regional congestion and help mitigate environmental impacts like climate change by decreasing carbon emissions and using land more efficiently. A recent study sponsored jointly by PB Placemaking, Cal Berkely, the Urban Land Institute and Reconnecting America indicates that TOD projects produce up to 50% fewer auto trips than conventional development. This research confirmed Metro's study that was conducted by Portland State University Professor Jennifer Dill, which examined the Merrick, a development that received TOD Program funding, and found that 47% of all trips from the Merrick were made either by walking or using transit. In total, all TOD/Centers Projects to date will add an estimated 3,541 new riders daily or over a million riders annually to the transit system. The Program's innovation and effectiveness were recently nationally recognized by the American Planning Association (APA) and received the 2008 Planning Excellence Award for Best Practice.

2. Program Operations

The TOD Program utilizes three main strategies to incentivize and facilitate transit-oriented development projects: 1) buying land to develop future transit oriented projects, and 2) purchasing transit-oriented development easements on projects requesting funding, 3) provision of site improvements (plaza, etc.) When the TOD Program jointly purchases land with a local jurisdiction, such as Hillsboro, Beaverton and Milwaukie, a partnership is created to undertake an RFP or RFQ process to select a developer for the site. Both methods use the increase in projected transit ridership which results in a capitalized farebox revenue figure and the anticipated cost premiums associated with higher density mixed-use projects to determine the level of Program funding for each project.

The TOD Program evaluates the cost effectiveness of a higher density transit-oriented project compared to a base case development scenario that reflects what current market conditions would support. As an example typical suburban development occurs in single- use one to three story buildings with surface parking while TOD projects tend to be four stories or higher in mixed-use buildings with structured parking. The difference in

ridership generated by each project provides a metric for evaluating the cost effectiveness of a proposed project.

"Cost per induced rider" is routinely modeled to provide a normalized basis for evaluating the cost-effectiveness of the proposed project, and comparing it to other investment alternatives. The annualized cost divided by the number of induced transit riders per year determines the "cost per induced rider." The TOD Program's costs per induced rider compares extremely well with other transportation investment strategies. For TOD Program projects that have either been completed or are currently under construction, the cost per induced rider is $0.96 which compares very favorably with other transportation investments.

The TOD Program analyzes the additional costs (cost premiums) associated with each specific proposed project, compared to the base case project. The construction methods required for mixed-use buildings are more expensive than single use buildings. TOD Program staff determine the dollar value of each cost premium in a proposed project, and the cost premium total becomes another benchmark against which project funding levels are evaluated. Recommended project funding does not exceed the total value of cost premiums.

The additional farebox revenue that results from induced ridership over the 30-year expected life of the project provides a monetary measure of TOD project benefits. Recommended project funding is derived from the net present value of future farebox revenues, which means that TOD Program funds invested are generally earned-back by the transit system in less than the first 30 years of operations.

A. Transit-Oriented Development Implementation Program

The Transit-Oriented Development Implementation Program *(TOD Program)* in existence since 1996 helps stimulate the construction of "transit villages" and other transit-oriented development projects through public/private partnerships along transit lines and frequent bus routes throughout the Portland Metropolitan region.

To date, program investments and commitments have been made throughout the metro region in 19 station areas in several jurisdictions including Portland (Central City and Gateway Regional Centers), Beaverton, Hillsboro (Regional Center and Orenco Town Center), Gresham, and in Washington County.

Proposed Base Allocation: This should be viewed as the Base allocation in the TOD category. The proposed allocation is $3 million for the 2-year period.

Supplemental Request: The request of $500,000 is to respond to increasing demand in the region for TOD funding and to continue to make strategic site acquisitions as additional light rail and commuter rail lines are planned and/or constructed (i.e. Green Line, Washington County Commuter Rail, and Milwaukie Light Rail). The increased allocation would support between 2-5 additional projects.

B. Centers Implementation Program

The Centers Implementation Program (*Centers Program*) in existence since 2004 is based on Metro's TOD Program and provides investment incentives in local jurisdictions to the private sector for constructing "urban villages" and development projects that demonstrate mixed-use concepts and reduce auto mode share by providing services, housing, jobs with access to transit within centers that are yet to be served by light or commuter rail. The Centers Program is intended to help increase development capacity while protecting existing neighborhoods and to enhance the development potential of 2040 centers to ensure that regional goals to accommodate the majority of new residents and jobs within these strategic locations can be realized. To date, Centers program investments have been made in Hillsdale and Milwaukie Town Centers.

Proposed Base Allocation: This should be viewed as the Base allocation in the Centers category. The proposed allocation is $2 million for the 2-year period.

Supplemental Request: The request of $500,000 is to respond to increasing demand in Centers throughout the region such as Forest Grove, Oregon City, Tigard, Sherwood, and Troutdale in which local partners have identified potential projects in their centers. The increased allocation would support between 2-5 additional projects.

2. Describe how this program addresses the policy objectives of the Regional Flexible Fund Allocation Process. Use quantitative data or examples where possible. Limit table to five pages.

(Programs are not expected to address every objective. MTIP Staff will provide a summary matrix of how programs and local project criteria fit into the Process Policy Objectives. Responses will focus primarily on, but are not limited to, the Project and Program Services Policy Objectives.)

RTP Goals	RFF policy objectives	How Program Addresses Policy Objectives
Goal 1, Goal 2	A. Retain and attract housing and jobs by addressing system gaps or deficiencies to improve multi-modal access in primary 2040 target areas (central city, regional centers, industrial areas and passenger and freight inter-modal facilities) as the highest priority, secondary areas (town centers, main streets, station communities and corridors) as next highest priority, and other areas (employment areas, inner and outer neighborhoods) as the lowest priority.	1. The Program invests in mixed-use projects throughout the region that provide both housing and commercial/ office space. The Program leverages private funds to directly impact housing development in strategic 2040 growth areas including the Central City, in station communities, and in regional and town centers: a. Project commitments to date will help realize the development of 2,950 housing units and 68 live/work units in centers and station areas. Of these commitments, 1,818 housing units have been completed or under construction. b. TOD/Centers Program has approved over a million square feet of office and retail space all included within mixed-use projects. In terms of retail space, TOD/Centers project investments have leveraged 378,000 square feet of retail space, 219,000 of which is constructed or currently under construction and 667,000 square feet of office space, 650,000 of which is constructed or under construction (the majority of office space is located in The Round and Pacific University). 2. TOD/Centers Projects increase efficiency of and access to the transit system by encouraging the development of housing and services with a functional or physical connection to high quality transit. It is estimated that program investments for both approved and constructed projects will result in 3,541 new transit riders each day. 3. The TOD/Centers Program investments can help retain existing jobs and housing by increasing the viability of center through direct investment and increasing potential for future private investment over time.

	B. Address gaps and deficiencies in the reliable movement of freight and goods on the RTP regional freight system, and transit, pedestrian and bicycle access and inter-modal connections to labor markets and trade areas within or between 2040 target areas (Primary areas are highest priority, Secondary areas are next highest priority, other areas are lowest priority).	The TOD/Centers Program supports development projects that have a particular urban form that enhances the pedestrian environment to increase walking and biking for non-work trips and decrease the use of autos by providing improved access to alternate modes, in particular high-quality transit, including light rail, streetcar, commuter rail, and frequent bus. Program investments and commitments have been made to projects in 5 regional centers, 3 town centers and 19 station areas all of which have a functional or physical connection to the transit system and will add potentially 3,541 new transit riders each day thus increasing access to jobs and housing by providing direct access to the regional transit system.
Goal 3, Goal 8	C. Provide access to transportation options for underserved populations (low income populations, the elderly and people with disabilities).	Program investments and commitments will provide an estimated 2,950 new housing units. Of these, 34%, or 989 housing units, are for households earning less than 80% of the area median household income (AMI). Additionally, 344 units of senior housing have been built with direct access to the transit system.
Goal 4	D. Invest in Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) in regional mobility corridors.	N/A
Goal 5	E. Address recurring safety issues, including gaps in the bike and pedestrian system.	1. The TOD/Centers Program invests in mixed-use development projects that include building massing, orientation and pedestrian improvements that reinforce pedestrian relationships and scale and create a walkable community. TOD/Centers Projects also have a functional or physical connection to the transit system and provide pedestrians and cyclists direct access to the system. TOD projects often replace and upgrade existing sidewalks as part of the development. 2. TOD/Centers projects fundamentally increase the safety of an area by adding more housing and more services closer to the transit system and creating nodes of activity thus increasing “eyes on the street.”

Goal 6	F. Minimize transportation-related storm-water run-off.	1. TOD/Centers Program investments are premised on bringing more transit riders to they system, and reducing vehicle miles traveled. TOD style development produces 50% fewer auto trips, and areas with good transit and mixed uses have a 42% non-auto mode share split and a reduction of VMT per capita of 55%. Thus TOD development reduces the need for additional roadways to accommodate future growth by changing travel behavior and getting more riders to the system. 2. TOD development is by nature more compact and utilizes land more efficiently. Projects that have completed or approved have consumed 80 acres of land as compared to 504 if the same residential and commercial uses had been built conventionally. 3. The Program encourages developers and local jurisdictions to allow for the lowest parking ratio possible. Parking in TODs is generally structured or underground reducing the amount of impervious surface for parking lots. 4. TOD Program funded projects are encouraged to include sustainable development practices where feasible. Program funds have been leveraged to include stormwater management methods including green roofs, rain gardens and bio swales.
Goal 6, Goal 7	G. Reduce or minimize energy consumption, carbon emissions and other pollution impacts.	1. Because TODs provide access and are oriented to the transit system they reduce regional congestion as non-auto trips increase and VMT decreases by up to 50%, thereby contributing to greenhouse gas reductions. An additional positive byproduct is enhanced public health because walk trips increase significantly in TODs. 2. Mixed-use projects supported by the TOD/Centers Program include smaller units which consume fewer resources than conventional single family development. Additionally, TODs are higher density buildings which are more energy efficient than typical developments.
	H. the project mode of program service type has no other or limited sources of transportation-related funding available.	There are no other funding sources available for this Program. The Program leverages other local, state, and federal funds such as SDC's, urban renewal resources, and affordable housing tax credits.

Goal 9	I. efficient and cost effective use of federal funds.	1. The TOD/Centers Program have used minimal funds to leverage maximum benefit. For projects either completed or under construction, the TOD/Centers Program has invested $19 million dollars, leveraging $405 million dollars in private investment, a return of over $20 on the dollar. 2. The TOD/Centers Program also helps generate additional revenue on the transit system. On an annual basis TOD/Centers projects are projected to generate between $1 million and $1.2 million dollars in revenue each year. 3. Focusing development around light rail furthers the benefits realized by major public investments by stimulating private investment along the rail line. Such investment enhances and revitalizes downtowns, town centers and main streets. 4. TOD makes efficient use of existing infrastructure, which can reduce the public costs of new development.

3. Summarize the program funding request.

The funding request is for program funding authority from federal fiscal years 2012 and 2013. Actual funding authority awarded may be programmed over any of the federal fiscal years 2010 through 2013.

Program Element Title	Base Funding Request	Additional Funding Request
TOD Station Areas Program	$3,000,000	$500,000
TOD Centers Program	$2,000,000	$500,000
Total Program	**$5,000,000**	**$1,000,000**

4. Program funding history.

	Program: TOD Station Areas	Program: TOD Centers	Site: Westgate	Site: Gresham Civic Station	Site: Gateway	TOTAL
Proposed (FFY 12-13)	$3,500,000	$2,500,000				$6,000,000
(FFY 10-11)	$3,000,000	$2,000,000				$5,000,000
(FFY 08-09)	$3,000,000	$1,000,000	$2,000,000			$6,000,000
(FFY 06-07)	$3,000,000	$1,000,000		$2,000,000		$6,000,000
(FFY 04-05)	$1,500,000				$800,000	$2,300,000
(FFY 02-03)	$2,000,000					$2,000,000
(FFY 99-01)	$2,000,000					$2,000,000
(FFY 96-98)	$3,000,000					$3,000,000

Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) Program

1. Program Description

The Transportation System Management and Operations program includes application of advanced technologies and management strategies to enhance the productivity of the existing transportation infrastructure. The program supports implementation of current federal, state, and regional policies promoting "*operation and management strategies to improve the performance of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the safety and mobility of people and goods.*" – SAFETEA-LU. The TSMO strategy benefits include improvements to congestion hotspots, better travel time reliability, increased safety, and reductions in fuel consumption and air pollutants.

The Portland metropolitan region has a well-established track record for regional coordination on the application of the latest traffic management technologies to improve mobility on the transportation system. TransPort, the TPAC subcommittee on TSMO, has been an active coordinating committee for operations since 1993. Representatives from ODOT, City of Portland, TriMet, Metro, the counties and cities of Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington, FHWA, Portland State University, Port of Portland, WSDOT, C-Tran, and SW Washington RTC work cooperatively to fund and implement creative system management solutions. In addition, TransPort has established a strong relationship with Portland State University's Transportation Research Center, relying on the center to provide system management data maintenance, research, and analysis.
Overall, this program promotes implementation of the TSMO strategies as a regional objective. Pursuing these strategies regionally is critical to managing congestion issues.

Since 2000, many transportation agencies in the Portland metropolitan region have completed Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Plans including ODOT, TriMet, Clackamas County, Gresham/East Multnomah County, Washington County, City of Portland, and Port of Portland. The total estimated capital cost of the operational improvements identified in these plans is over $160 million. TransPort is working toward a comprehensive regional system management plan, which will incorporate the findings from these earlier planning efforts with updated project costs. This process will result in an integrated regional action plan by summer of 2009.

The types of technologies supported by this funding program include those used to monitor or detect traffic activity, including inductive loop detectors in roadways, closed-circuit TV cameras, GPS devices, road-weather sensors and signal interconnects. Technology can also be employed to enhance the communication of information to travelers, such as variable message signs and phone or internet-based travel information services. Supporting infrastructure, such as fiber optic cable, allows control centers to communicate with and utilize devices in the field. All of these technologies are used to accomplish operational goals, such as managing incidents or improving

on-time performance of transit vehicles. Additionally, the system performance data collection and evaluation can be supported with this funding.

Program Allocation**:** The proposed base allocation for this project is $3.0 million for a two-year period.

Over the last decade, the average allocation for system management has been approximately $1.2 million per year, although the year-to-year funding has been highly variable. The MTIP allocations have funded the development of local ITS plans, signal interconnect projects, and Advance Traffic Management Systems (ATMS) including cameras, signals and traffic operation centers, and data collection infrastructure.
Beginning with the FY ’10 - ’11 MTIP, the region provided $3 million in funding for a TSMO program, recognizing both the utility of TSMO solutions to enhance system mobility and the cross-jurisdictional nature of these types of investments. The FY ’10 -’11 funding has not yet been sub-allocated. TransPort is responsible for advancing recommendations on the prioritization of these funds to TPAC. As part of the Regional TSMO Refinement Plan, TransPort will work with TPAC to develop appropriate project selection criteria and identify investments for the previous funding and apply the process to this current round of MTIP funding.

2. Policy objectives of the RFF Allocation Process addressed by TSMO Program

RTP Goals	RFF policy objectives	How Program Addresses Policy Objectives
Goal 1, Goal 2	A. Retain and attract housing and jobs by addressing system gaps or deficiencies to improve multi-modal access in primary 2040 target areas (central city, regional centers, industrial areas and passenger and freight inter-modal facilities) as the highest priority, secondary areas (town centers, main streets, station communities and corridors) as next highest priority, and other areas (employment areas, inner and outer neighborhoods) as the lowest priority.	The TSMO program enhances access to 2040 target areas by improving traffic flow for buses, trucks, and passenger vehicles through signal and communication enhancements, and traveler information.
Goal 1, Goal 2	B. Address gaps and deficiencies in the reliable movement of freight and goods on the RTP regional freight system, and transit, pedestrian and bicycle access and inter-modal connections to labor markets and trade areas within or between 2040 target areas (Primary areas are highest priority, Secondary areas are next highest priority, other areas are lowest priority).	The TSMO program directly addresses the reliable movement of freight, goods, and people by implementing strategies that manage traffic flow on freeways and arterials. Past TSMO projects in the region have shown a 20% reduction in travel times.
Goal 3, Goal 8	C. Provide access to transportation options for underserved populations (low income populations, the elderly and people with disabilities).	The TSMO program supports improvements to transit service reliability and traveler information, which benefit traditionally transit dependent users.

Goal 4	D. Invest in Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) in regional mobility corridors.	The TSMO program directly addresses this objective by investing in improvements such as ATMS in regional mobility corridors.
Goal 5	E. Address recurring safety issues, including gaps in the bike and pedestrian system.	The TSMO program directly addresses the objective by investing in improvements that increase safety including ramp meters and incident management.
Goal 6	F. Minimize transportation-related storm-water run-off.	Not applicable.
Goal 6, Goal 7	G. Reduce or minimize energy consumption, carbon emissions and other pollution impacts.	The TSMO program directly addresses this objective by reducing unnecessary engine idling due to congestion and providing real-time traveler information to improve route and mode choice.
	H. The project mode of program service type has no other or limited sources of transportation-related funding available.	Not applicable.
Goal 9	I. Efficient and cost effective use of federal funds.	The TSMO program directly addresses this objective by investing to maximize the efficiency of existing and planned transportation facilities as a lower cost solution to new capacity. Past TSMO projects funded by the MTIP program such as ATMS have shown benefit-to-cost ratios of 30 to 1,

3. TSMO Program funding request

The funding request is for program funding authority from federal fiscal years 2012 and 2013. Actual funding authority awarded may be programmed over any of the federal fiscal years 2010 through 2013.

Program Element Title	Base Funding Request	Additional Funding Request
TSMO – ITS Implementation	$3,000,000	
Total Program	**$3,000,000**	**$0**
GRAND TOTAL	**$3,000,000**	

4. Historical MTIP Allocation to TSMO-ITS-related programs/projects

Regional Allocation	Proposed FFY 2012-13	FFY 2010-11	FFY 2008-09	FFY 2006-07	FFY 2004-05	FFY 2002-03	FFY 1999-01	FFY 1996-98
Amount	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	$520,000	$0	$1,625,000	$2,420,000	$1,271,000	$0

Willamette River Bridges

1. Program Description

Multnomah County has the responsibility (ORS 382.305) for operating and maintaining six Willamette River Bridges: Sellwood, Hawthorne, Morrison, Burnside, Broadway and Sauvie Island. The current projection for the County's Willamette River Bridges shows a 20-year need of approximately $621 million which includes rehabilitating or replacing the Sellwood Bridge at an estimated cost of $300 million. The Sauvie Island Bridge is currently being replaced and no capital costs are anticipated for this bridge in 20 years.

Including the Sellwood Bridge rehabilitation or replacement, general engineering, maintenance and operations on all the (County's) Willamette River Bridges is expected to be $621 million over the next 20 years (2007 $s). Anticipated revenue over the next 20 years is expected to be $131 million, leaving a $490 million shortfall for Willamette River Bridge capital needs.

Multnomah County is requesting an annual MTIP Regionally Administered Program allocation of $4 million for 20 years. This amount would enable Multnomah County to bond the funds for $50 million. The funds would be used to provide funding for the Sellwood Bridge rehabilitation or replacement. With a cost estimate of $300 million for rehabilitation or replacement, the bonded MTIP funds would be used to leverage other federal, state and local funds.

This request to add the Willamette River Bridges to the Regionally Administered Program will address two concerns. First it would leverage funds for a Sellwood Bridge funding package. Second, it will allow Multnomah County to continue needed capital maintenance on the remaining Willamette River Bridges without diverting those funds to the Sellwood Bridge.

Program Funding Request: $4 million per year for 20 years.

3. Policy Objectives for the RFF Allocation Process addressed by Multnomah River Bridges

RTP Goals	RFF policy objectives	How Program Addresses Policy Objectives
Goal 1, Goal 2	A. Retain and attract housing and jobs by addressing system gaps or deficiencies to improve multi-modal access in primary 2040 target areas (central city, regional centers, industrial areas and passenger and freight inter-modal facilities) as the highest priority,	The Willamette River Bridges (WRB) provide key links in the transportation system in the Central City, accommodating housing to employment; freight movement (trucks and waterborne); connection to inter-modal facilities; transit (bus, streetcar and lightrail); and bicycle/pedestrian facilities. Most notably, streetcar will be added to the Broadway Bridge and a new bicycle/pedestrian facility will be added to the Morrison Bridge in 2008. Providing funds for the Sellwood Bridge will allow for continued operation of the bridge, the only link across the Willamette River for 12 miles to the south at Oregon City.

	secondary areas (town centers, main streets, station communities and corridors) as next highest priority, and other areas (employment areas, inner and outer neighborhoods) as the lowest priority.	Over 80% of the 30,000 vehicle trips per day have a destination or origin outside of Multnomah County, demonstrating its regional priority in connecting housing to jobs.
Goal 1, Goal 2	B. Address gaps and deficiencies in the reliable movement of freight and goods on the RTP regional freight system, and transit, pedestrian and bicycle access and inter-modal connections to labor markets and trade areas within or between 2040 target areas (Primary areas are highest priority, Secondary areas are next highest priority, other areas are lowest priority).	The WRBs provide necessary links between the Central City and primary industrial. Although Tacoma Street is a Minor Truck Street (City of Portland Classification) the Sellwood Bridge plays a key role in freight access across the Willamette River. Improvements to the Sellwood Bridge were identified in the 1994 Willamette River Bridges Accessibility Project (WRBAP) that recommended about 40 projects to improve bicycle and pedestrian access to the WRBs. Bicycle and pedestrian access across the Sellwood Bridge is totally inadequate and needs to be upgraded. Due to the structural instability of the Sellwood Bridge vehicles over 10,000 lbs. have been restricted from using the bridge. All transit and almost all trucks are thereby excluded.
Goal 3, Goal 8	C. Provide access to transportation options for underserved populations (low income populations, the elderly and people with disabilities).	Reliable operation of the Sellwood Bridge will facilitate needed alternate access options to underserved populations, providing better transit, bicycle and pedestrian options.
Goal 4	D. Invest in Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) in regional mobility corridors.	
Goal 5	E. Address recurring safety issues, including gaps in the bike and pedestrian system.	The need to improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities on the Sellwood Bridge is identified in the 1994 WRBAP study.
Goal 6	F. Minimize transportation-related storm-water run-off.	Improvements to the Sellwood Bridge will include the installation of storm-water facilities that reduce run-off into the rivers as well as providing primary storm-water treatment.

Goal 6, Goal 7	G. Reduce or minimize energy consumption, carbon emissions and other pollution impacts.	Providing better bicycle and pedestrian facilities along with better accommodation to transit will reduce VMT, reducing energy consumption, carbon emissions and other pollution impacts.
	H. the project mode of program service type has no other or limited sources of transportation-related funding available.	Funds are available from other sources such as HBR, but are limited and unable to meet the needs of the Sellwood Bridge.
Goal 9	I. efficiently and cost effectively use federal funds.	The ability to leverage federal funds is paramount to meeting the capital needs of the WRBs to allow the bridges to operate safely and efficiently.

3. Summarize the program funding request

The funding request is for program funding authority from federal fiscal years 2012 to 2031. The request of $4 million per year will enable Multnomah County to bond $50 million for rehabilitation/replacement of the Sellwood Bridge.

Program Element Title	Base Funding Request	Additional Funding Request
Sellwood Bridge		$8,000,000
Total Program		**$8,000,000**

	Proposed FFY 2012-13	(FFY 10-11)	(FFY 08-09)	(FFY 06-07)	(FFY 04-05)	(FFY 02-03)
Sellwood PE/EIS			$2,000,000			
Morrison Bridge Bike/Ped improvements*					$1,345,000	
Burnside Electrical						$500,000
Morrison Electrical						$800,000
Program Allocation	$8,000,000					
Total: Willamette River Bridges	**$8,000,000**	**$0**	**$2,000,000**	**$0**	**$1,345,000**	**$1,300,000**

* Project also listed in Bike/Ped list of projects.

Administration of the Federal Bridge Program

The context for deciding whether to establish a "Bridge" program through a regional MTIP allocation is the program structure for funding bridges generally. The federal highway Bridge Program is one of the four most significant federal highway funding programs established by Congress through SAFETEA-LU. The key federal highway apportionments to Oregon for FY 2008 are as follows:

- Interstate Maintenance $74.1 million
- National Highway System $94.4 million
- Surface Transportation Program $92.2 million
- Bridge Program $84.8 million
- Highway Safety Program $15.8 million
- Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality $16.0 million
- Total FY 2008 Apportionment $377.4 million

Of these apportionments, the following were sub-allocated to the Metro Region for allocation through the MTIP:

- Surface Transportation Program $19.3 million
- Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality $12.7 million
- Total MTIP Flex-fund allocation $32.0 million

The Federal Bridge Program is administered through an intergovernmental agreement with the Association of Oregon Counties and League of Oregon Cities for the portion of the program sub-allocated to local bridges. The amount apportioned to Oregon is determined on a need basis and the apportionment factors are updated annually by FHWA. A standardized approach for calculating each state's bridge needs involve maintaining a bridge inventory and calculating a standard cost for repair or replacement of each deficient bridge based upon the most recent average cost per square foot times the bridge deck size in square feet. The result is a uniform method of calculation nationwide that does not recognize unique or extraordinary costs such as those for high cost bridges like the Sellwood or lift-span bridges like the other Multnomah County bridges. Based upon this methodology, each deficient bridge essentially "earns" revenue to the sate of Oregon to be administered through the state bridge program.

The total annual apportionment for bridges is sub-apportioned to three local government bridge categories:

- Big Bridges (over 30,000 square feet in deck size)
- Small on-system local bridges (on urban Collectors or above and rural Major Collectors and above)
- Small off-system local bridges (on urban local streets below Collector and rural Minor Collectors and below)

The basis for sub-apportionment to each of these three categories is the share of the overall apportionment that that category "earned." Historically, local bridges have "earned" the state 23% of the bridge funding and this is the amount sub-allocated to local bridges. Similarly, the Big Bridge category has "earned" the state 25% of the local sub-allocation and this is the amount sub-allocated to the Big Bridge Program. The resulting amount available for Big Bridge projects is typically in the $4-5 million per year range.

Once the Bridge funds are sub-allocated to the Big Bridge category, the jurisdictions with Big Bridges collaborate to define logical construction projects to allow the funds to be programmed in the 4-year period covered by the STIP. This requires matching up the increment of funding available with project phases that can be funded within this budget (or supplemented with other sources) and that consider the severity of the bridge deficiencies that need to be addressed. Through this process, Multnomah County has been successful at implementing a series of projects to rehabilitate and repair the Willamette River Bridges.

Oregon Transportation Investment Act – Bridge Program

The Oregon Legislature funded a $1.6 billion bridge program with $1.3 million intended for ODOT bridges and $300 million for local government bridges (note: the local bridge component amounted to 19% rather than the 25% provided through the federal bridge program). This program was funded through increase license fees and weight-mile taxes and a planned $32 million per year debt payment for 25 years from the federal bridge program (an approximate 1/3rd reduction to the future federal bridge program).

The expectation was that the local government bridges would be selected through the same process as the federal bridge program with the additional consideration that the projects be limited to freight routes. Through the application of the federal bridge program methodology, the OTIA Big Bridge program included a preliminary allocation of $25 million to the Sauvie Island Bridge and $43 million toward replacement of the Sellwood Bridge. The Sellwood Bridge allocation was withdrawn on the basis of a recommendation from the Oregon Freight Advisory Committee that the long-range plan for the Sellwood Bridge was not a freight route due to planned changes to Tacoma Blvd. These funds were redistributed to other local government bridges. In recognition of this, the local bridge program increased the FY 2008 and 2009 sub-allocation to the Big Bridge category by $8 million per year (for a total of $16 million), a substantial increase above the regular $4 million per year sub-allocation.

Conclusion:

- The federal bridge program is one of the most significant federal highway programs;
- The federal bridge funds are distributed to states on the basis of needs rather than use (like vehicle miles traveled, truck miles traveled, etc.) or size (like population). This results in Oregon receiving about 1.8% of the national bridge apportionment while the other categories result in the overall

apportionment of the federal highway program to Oregon of 1.2%. Oregon is getting their fair share of the federal bridge program.

- The federal bridge funds apportioned to Oregon are sub-allocated to a Big Bridge Program thereby ensuring this category receives its fair share of funding. However, the amount, like the overall statewide apportionment, is insufficient to meet the needs.
- The STP funds are provided to states and MPOs to meet the needs for the broader system not covered by the major categories described above (Interstate Maintenance, National Highway System, etc.). The commitment of these funds toward bridges has been quite modest as a result.

Regional Pedestrian and Bicycle Program

1. Program Description

A regional pedestrian and bicycle program does not currently exist. However, a regional program would help ensure these modes are adequately included in the planning for the transportation system and could provide a reasonably consistent source of funding to implement the highest priority projects within the planned system.

There are several potential components of a program that could be created and administered at a regional level. Program component options include both the type of pedestrian and bicycle projects to be addressed and the scope of work to be performed for the projects.

Type of Projects to be Addressed by a Regional Program

This application proposes three types of pedestrian and bicycle projects be addressed by a regional program: pedestrian access to regional transit system, regional trails, and on-street bike routes.

Pedestrian access to the regional transit system is a regional objective and links the pedestrian component of the proposed program to an existing regional program. Funds have been consistently awarded to on-street transit improvements in the previous three funding cycles. The scope of the on-street transit program has been extended to include improvements to transit stops to ensure adequate pedestrian facilities as a means of meeting ADA requirements and ensuring access to low-floor buses. A pedestrian program element that ensures access to the transit stops along major routes and in mixed-use areas would build on these existing improvements.

The portion of the off-street regional trail system that serves a transportation function relies almost exclusively on regional flexible fund allocations for implementation, as constitutionally restricted state and local transportation revenues are not eligible for these projects. Many of these trails span multiple local jurisdictions and parallel transportation corridors, providing an alternative to other modes of travel.

On-street bike improvements are also a part of the regional transportation system and provide an important alternative to other travel modes. These projects could include striped bike lanes and other design improvements on arterial streets as well as bike boulevards that provide an alternative to bike facilities on arterial streets.

Scope of Work of Regional Program

An initial scope of work program element could include the administration of the program and of a master planning component of regional pedestrian and bicycle facilities. This program element would include funding one full-time equivalent project staff person to administer the program and participate and manage any consultant work on specific master plan activities. There have been several regional flexible fund allocations to master planning activities in the past, including the Tonquin Trail master plan, Lake Oswego to Milwaukie Trail master plan, Westside Trail, Mt. Scott/Scouter Mt. Trail, Sullivan's Gulch Trail master plan, and the Pedestrian to Transit study.

The supplemental administrative request would fund an additional staff person to administer the trail master planning and construction activities associated with the supplemental funding request.

A second scope of work program element could include the actual master planning and project development activities to prepare projects to enter final design, right-of-way acquisition and construction. These studies include defining the scope of the project, initiating public outreach to stakeholders, identifying environmental, right-of-way, utility and other impact issues, developing preliminary cost estimates, and recommending alignment refinements and priority project elements.

A third scope of work program element could include an allocation to construction activities. An administrative structure would be created to define a process to sub-allocate these funds to specific projects across the region. That structure could be modeled on other regional programs (such as the Regional Travel Options sub-committee of TPAC) or an alternative structure. The program would address regional flexible fund allocation goals such as ensuring the region is meeting Transportation Control Measures requirements under the state implementation plan for air quality and funding projects throughout the region.

The supplemental construction request would accelerate the pace of construction of regional trails that have a transportation function in cooperation with the Connecting Green effort to address development of the regional trail system. This level of funding would allow for an additional two trail projects per funding cycle, with the goal of funding a total of approximately three projects per cycle across the region.

2. Policy objectives for the RFF Allocation Process addressed by Regional Pedestrian and Bicycle Program

RTP Goals	RFF policy objectives	How Program Addresses Policy Objectives
Goal 1, Goal 2	A. Retain and attract housing and jobs by addressing system gaps or deficiencies to improve multi-modal access in primary 2040 target areas (central city, regional centers, industrial areas and passenger and freight inter-modal facilities) as the highest priority, secondary areas (town centers, main streets, station communities and corridors) as next highest priority, and other areas (employment areas, inner and outer neighborhoods) as the lowest priority.	• Pedestrian access to transit This portion of the program would help guide pedestrian improvements to 2040 target areas that help improve multi-modal access, specifically transit, and supports mixed-use development. • On-street bike and trails On-street bicycle and trail facilities improve multi-modal access to 2040 target areas, thereby increasing livability – an attractor for jobs and housing.
Goal 1, Goal 2	B. Address gaps and deficiencies in the reliable movement of freight and goods on the RTP regional freight system, and transit, pedestrian and bicycle access and inter-modal connections to labor markets and trade areas within or between 2040 target areas (Primary areas are highest priority, Secondary areas are next highest priority, other areas are lowest priority).	• Pedestrian access to transit Pedestrian projects are important for connecting workers to jobs within or between 2040 target areas through improved access to transit and enhancement of alternative modes. This program would help direct investments to addressing gaps and deficiencies in the pedestrian network. • On-street bike and trails On-street bike and trail improvements provide important connections to labor markets and trade areas within and between 2040 target areas.
Goal 3, Goal 8	C. Provide access to transportation options for underserved populations (low income populations, the elderly	• Pedestrian access to transit This program helps expand access to modes of travel that are typically more affordable for low-income people. These types of projects also increase access to the pedestrian and transit

	and people with disabilities).	systems for the elderly and people with disabilities through sidewalk and bus stop improvements. • On-street bike and trails On-street bike and trail improvements provide an affordable mode of transportation that increases the accessibility and mobility of those who cannot afford to own and maintain a vehicle.
Goal 4	D. Invest in Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) in regional mobility corridors.	
Goal 5	E. Address recurring safety issues, including gaps in the bike and pedestrian system.	• Pedestrian access to transit The program would address safety issues with regard to reducing gaps and barriers that endanger or inhibit pedestrian access to transit. • On-street bike On-street bike improvements improve safety by completing gaps in the bike system.
Goal 6	F. Minimize transportation-related storm-water run-off.	• Trails Trail projects will utilize porous pavement and bio-swales to manage storm water wherever feasible.
Goal 6, Goal 7	G. Reduce or minimize energy consumption, carbon emissions and other pollution impacts.	• Pedestrian access to transit This program supports modes that reduce single occupancy vehicle trips, specifically transit and walking, which both contribute to increased air quality benefits. • On-street bike and trails On-street bike and trail improvements provide for travel that produces no pollution, consumes no fossil fuels.
	H. The project mode or program service type has no other or limited sources of transportation-related funding available.	• Pedestrian access to transit While transit services typically have access to other funding sources, pedestrian projects and on-street transit improvements have very limited sources other than RFF. • On-street bike and trails On-street bike and trail improvements do not have the level of dedicated funding as other projects such as road capacity, bridge, maintenance and transit projects.
Goal 9	I. Efficient and cost effective use of federal funds.	• Pedestrian access to transit This program would use funds efficiently and cost effectively by targeting pedestrian investments to

		areas that improve transit access, therefore improving access to existing services and leveraging other transit investments. Flexible funds also help fund these investments where no other sources are available.

3. Program funding request.

The funding request is for program funding authority from federal fiscal years 2012 and 2013. Actual funding authority awarded may be programmed over any of the federal fiscal years 2010 through 2013.

Program Element Title	Base Funding Request	Additional Funding Request
Administrative element	$200,000	$100,000
Project development	$600,000	
Construction	$6,000,000	$4,000,000
Subtotal	**$6,800,000**	**$4,100,000**
Grand Total		**$10,900,000**

4. MTIP Allocations to Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects and Project Development

2012-13 (Proposed)	2010-11	2008-09	2006-07	2004-05
$6,800,000 – $10,900,000	$6,767,000	$6,790,000	$6,551,000	$8,429,000

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: March 27, 2008

TO: TPAC and Interested Parties

FROM: Andy Cotugno, Planning Director

SUBJECT: Policy issues for the Step 1 allocation of regional flexible funds

* * * * * * *

The choices this first step of the MTIP allocation process poses include the following:

1. The MTIP allocation covers a period beyond the life of the current SAFETE-LU authorization and, as such, it is unpredictable the level of funding available to the region to allocated. The assumption made to date is for a modest expansion in the funding level while historically, there has been a much more substantial increase in the first year of the new bill. Should we proceed on this basis?

2. For a sustained period, allocation of MTIP funds to Regionally administered programs has represented about one-half of the available funds, leaving the other half to distribute through a competitive grant application process. Should we continue this practice?

3. Should there be a higher allocation of MTIP funds to leverage federal new Starts/Small Starts funding to advance the region's LRT, Commuter Rail and Streetcar program? If so, another 17% of the MTIP funds would be used, reducing the amount available for competitive distribution accordingly.

4. Should there be a larger allocation toward the programs administered by Metro to fund the household travel behavior survey, initiate new programs to reduce travel demand through the RTO Program or allow for more TOD/Centers developments? Are there elements of these choices that are more important to fund than others (i.e. only select certain allocation)? If so, up to another 6% of the MTIP funds would be used, reducing the amount available for competitive distribution accordingly.

5. Should the region convert the bike/ped./trails program from a local competitive grant application process (as it is now administered) to a regionally managed program? Should the MTIP allocation be higher than historical levels to enable accelerating implementation of the off-street trail system? As a subset, should there be a more aggressive regional role in planning and project development with construction funding continuing to be allocated through the competitive grant allocation process? If so, up to another 16% of the MTIP funds would be used, reducing the amount available for competitive distribution accordingly.

6. Should there be a new regional commitment through the MTIP funds for a bridge program? If so, should it be limited to the Sellwood Bridge, be defined as all of the Willamette River bridges (which would include bridges under the jurisdiction of Multnomah County, ODOT and the railroads) or be defined as a regional bridge program beyond the Willamette River bridges? As proposed, this would use another 12% of the MTIP funds, reducing the amount available for competitive distribution accordingly.

7. Should there be an action to fund a portion of these choices, leaving the balance to be decided through the competitive step of the allocation process?

8. What level of remaining funds for Step 2 warrants a significant change to simplify the competitive allocation process (beyond what is already proposed in the policy report)? If a Step 1 allocation breaches that level, what are viable changes to the process for allocating the remaining funds?

Regional Flexible Fund MTIP Allocation
Regional High Capacity Transit Program Funding History

	Portland Regional Light Rail / Commuter Rail Project						
Project	**Banfield [1]**	**Westside**	**Airport**	**Interstate**	**Commuter [2]**	**I-205 / S. Corridor**	**Total**
Federal Funds	*83%*	*69%*	*0%*	*74%*	*50%*	*61%*	
UMTA e (4) (Mt. Hood Freeway Interstate Transfer)	$145.01						
Section 3 / 5309	$86.97	$629.850		$257.500	$58.650	$345.413	$1,378.38
Section 5309 bus	$7.10					$2.916	$10.02
Section 5307						$0.231	$0.23
Section 9		$30.000					$30.00
Federal Highway Administration	$28.44						$28.44
Subtotal Federal	$267.520	$659.850	$0.000	$257.500	$58.650	$348.560	$1,592.08
Local Funds	*17%*	*31%*	*100%*	*26%*	*50%*	*39%*	
State of Oregon							
ODOT programmed STP		$22.000				$23.000	$45.00
State of Oregon	$25.78				$3.440		$29.22
State of Oregon lottery bond proceeds		$113.600			$35.340		$148.94
State of Oregon gas tax	$11.68						$11.68
Portland Metro Regional Funds							
MTIP or MTIP backed funds		$22.000	see note [3]	$24.101			$46.10
MTIP backed GARVEE bonds [5]					$10.000	$48.500	$58.50
MTIP backed GARVEE bonds - interest [5]					$2.203	$6.293	$8.50
Urban Renewal Funding							
Portland Development Commission	$0.45		$23.000	$30.000		$22.346	$75.80
Clackamas County Development Agency						$39.310	$39.31
City / County Funds							
City of Portland	$0.35	$7.000					$7.35
City of Portland parking / enterprise						$27.700	$27.70
Multnomah County	$0.12						$0.12
Washington County		$3.000			$1.170		$4.17
Washington County bond proceeds					$6.500		$6.50
City of Beaverton		$2.000					$2.00
Other Regional Funds							
Port of Portland			$28.300				$28.30
Metro	$0.03	$2.000					$2.03
TriMet Funds							
G.O. bonds [4]		$110.000					$110.00
General funds						$4.218	$4.22
Revenue bonds [3]			$45.500			$33.653	$79.15
Other	$13.39	$21.650		$38.490			$73.53
Private Contributions							
City of Portland LID	$1.50					$19.000	$20.50
Vintage Trolley LID	$0.50						$0.50
Bechtel Corporation (Cascade Station)			$28.200				$28.20
Local property donation						$3.120	$3.12
Subtotal local	$53.80	$303.250	$125.000	$92.591	$58.653	$227.140	$860.43
Total	**$321.320**	**$963.10**	**$125.00**	**$350.09**	**$117.30**	**$575.70**	**$2,452.51**

Notes:

1 includes $107 million in highway and highway/lrt work

2 includes base project costs only

check sum $2,452.51

3 TriMet received $18 million in MTIP funds for bus purchases as part of the Airport Project funding package

4 total G.O. bond issue was $125 million, with $15 milliion assigned to South Corridor Project development

5 excludes a $10 million MTIP contribution to the Central City Streetcar extension to the N. Macadam District

Willamette River Bridges Project Funding Since 2000
Dollars x 1,000

Morrison/Burnside Electrical:

MTIP	$	1,144
County	$	139
	$	1,283

Morrison Bike/Ped:

MTIP	$	1,888
Portland (MTIP)	$	75
County	$	645
	$	2,608

Burnside Deck and Seismic:

HBRR	$	2,353
ODOT	$	294
County	$	294
	$	2,941

Burnside Main Span Rehab:

HBRR	$	6,516
County	$	4,264
	$	10,780

Broadway Phases 4-7:

HBRR	$	11,345
HPP	$	5,157
HBRR 98-03	$	543
ODOT	$	1,274
OTIA	$	7,000
OTIA II	$	2,412
County	$	485
	$	28,216

Sellwood Rehab/Replacement: (secured to date)

HBRR	$	14,357
HPP	$	6,062
ODOT	$	1,500
MTIP	$	2,000
County	$	1,066
	$	24,985

Sauvie Island Bridge Replacement:

HBRR	$	8,169
OTIA III	$	28,000
County	$	14,536
	$	50,705

Summary by Funding Source:

HBRR	$	48,440
MTIP	$	5,107
ODOT	$	3,068
OTIA	$	37,412
County	$	21,429
	$	115,456

Twenty Year WRB Program
$621M

Need

20 Yr CIP	**$481M**
Phase II Seismic	**$82M**
20 Yr General Engineering	**$12M**
20 Yr Maint & Operations	**$46M**
Total Need	$621M

Revenue

Federal & State	**$27M**
County	**$104M**
Total Revenue	$131M

SHORTFALL	$490M

2007 dollars

		FY 2010-11	FY 2012-13			
	TOTAL MTIP Funds ($ millions)	**64.00**	**67.80**	**6% increase**		
	Programs administered regionally by Metro				**Additional requests from Metro**	
1	Regional Travel Options (RTO)	4.28	4.41		RTO	2.30
2	Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	5.00	5.00		TOD	1.00
3	Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)	3.00	3.00		ITS	0.00
4	Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)	1.99	2.11		Metro Planning	0.85
					Portland-Lake Oswego Transit EIS	4.00
	Subtotal	**14.27**	**14.52**			**8.15**
	Programs administered regionally by TriMet				**Additional request from TriMet**	
5	Existing transit bond payment	**18.60**	**18.60**		Portland-Milwaukie LRT (capital)	**7.40**
					Additional request from Multnomah County	
					Bridge maintenance/replacement	**8.00**
	Local jurisdiction projects	**24.40**	**25.86**	38%		
	Balance	**6.73**	**8.82**			
					Total additional requests	**23.55**

Administration of the Federal Bridge Program

The context for deciding whether to establish a "Bridge" program through a regional MTIP allocation is the program structure for funding bridges generally. The federal highway Bridge Program is one of the four most significant federal highway funding programs established by Congress through SAFETEA-LU. The key federal highway apportionments to Oregon for FY 2008 are as follows:

• Interstate Maintenance	$74.1 million
• National Highway System	$94.4 million
• Surface Transportation Program	$92.2 million
• Bridge Program	$84.8 million
• Highway Safety Program	$15.8 million
• Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality	$16.0 million
• Total FY 2008 Apportionment	$377.4 million

Of these apportionments, the following were sub-allocated to the Metro Region for allocation through the MTIP:

• Surface Transportation Program	$19.3 million
• Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality	$12.7 million
• Total MTIP Flex-fund allocation	$32.0 million

The Federal Bridge Program is administered through an intergovernmental agreement with the Association of Oregon Counties and League of Oregon Cities for the portion of the program sub-allocated to local bridges. The amount apportioned to Oregon is determined on a need basis and the apportionment factors are updated annually by FHWA. A standardized approach for calculating each state's bridge needs involve maintaining a bridge inventory and calculating a standard cost for repair or replacement of each deficient bridge based upon the most recent average cost per square foot times the bridge deck size in square feet. The result is a uniform method of calculation nationwide that does not recognize unique or extraordinary costs such as those for high cost bridges like the Sellwood or lift-span bridges like the other Multnomah County bridges. Based upon this methodology, each deficient bridge essentially "earns" revenue to the sate of Oregon to be administered through the state bridge program.

The total annual apportionment for bridges is sub-apportioned to three local government bridge categories:

- Big Bridges (over 30,000 square feet in deck size)
- Small on-system local bridges (on urban Collectors or above and rural Major Collectors and above)
- Small off-system local bridges (on urban local streets below Collector and rural Minor Collectors and below)

The basis for sub-apportionment to each of these three categories is the share of the overall apportionment that that category "earned." Historically, local bridges have "earned" the state 23% of the bridge funding and this is the amount sub-allocated to local bridges. Similarly, the Big Bridge category has "earned" the state 25% of the local sub-allocation and this is the amount sub-allocated to the Big Bridge Program. The resulting amount available for Big Bridge projects is typically in the $4-5 million per year range.

Once the Bridge funds are sub-allocated to the Big Bridge category, the jurisdictions with Big Bridges collaborate to define logical construction projects to allow the funds to be programmed in the 4-year period covered by the STIP. This requires matching up the increment of funding available with project phases that can be funded within this budget (or supplemented with other sources) and that consider the severity of the bridge deficiencies that need to be addressed. Through this process, Multnomah County has been successful at implementing a series of projects to rehabilitate and repair the Willamette River Bridges.

Oregon Transportation Investment Act – Bridge Program

The Oregon Legislature funded a $1.6 billion bridge program with $1.3 million intended for ODOT bridges and $300 million for local government bridges (note: the local bridge component amounted to 19% rather than the 25% provided through the federal bridge program). This program was funded through increase license fees and weight-mile taxes and a planned $32 million per year debt payment for 25 years from the federal bridge program (an approximate 1/3rd reduction to the future federal bridge program).

The expectation was that the local government bridges would be selected through the same process as the federal bridge program with the additional consideration that the projects be limited to freight routes. Through the application of the federal bridge program methodology, the OTIA Big Bridge program included a preliminary allocation of $25 million to the Sauvie Island Bridge and $43 million toward replacement of the Sellwood Bridge. The Sellwood Bridge allocation was withdrawn on the basis of a recommendation from the Oregon Freight Advisory Committee that the long-range plan for the Sellwood Bridge was not a freight route due to planned changes to Tacoma Blvd. These funds were redistributed to other local government bridges. In recognition of this, the local bridge program increased the FY 2008 and 2009 sub-allocation to the Big Bridge category by $8 million per year (for a total of $16 million), a substantial increase above the regular $4 million per year sub-allocation.

Conclusion:

- The federal bridge program is one of the most significant federal highway programs;
- The federal bridge funds are distributed to states on the basis of needs rather than use (like vehicle miles traveled, truck miles traveled, etc.) or size (like population). This results in Oregon receiving about 1.8% of the national bridge apportionment while the other categories result in the overall

apportionment of the federal highway program to Oregon of 1.2%. Oregon is getting their fair share of the federal bridge program.

- The federal bridge funds apportioned to Oregon are sub-allocated to a Big Bridge Program thereby ensuring this category receives its fair share of funding. However, the amount, like the overall statewide apportionment, is insufficient to meet the needs.
- The STP funds are provided to states and MPOs to meet the needs for the broader system not covered by the major categories described above (Interstate Maintenance, National Highway System, etc.). The commitment of these funds toward bridges has been quite modest as a result.

www.**metro-region.org**



REGIONAL FLEXIBLE FUNDS

2010-2013

STEP 1: REGIONAL PROGRAM APPLICATIONS

March 28, 2008 | TPAC

RFF 2010–2013

Process Summary

- Two Step Allocation
  1. Regional Programs
  2. Locally administered projects

- $67.8 million of funding forecast as available in 2012-13

RFF 2010–2013

Step 1: Regional Program Applications

- High Capacity Transit implementation
  - Lake Oswego to Portland D/FEIS
- Metro Planning
- Regional Travel Options (RTO)
- Transit Oriented Development (TOD)/Centers Program
- Transportation System Management and Operations Program (TSMO)
- Willamette River Bridges
- Pedestrian and Bicycle

RFF 2010–2013

Regional Program Applications

High Capacity Transit implementation

RFF 2010–2013

Regional Program Applications

Metro Planning

RFF 2010–2013

Regional Program Applications

Regional Travel Options (RTO)

RFF 2010–2013

RTO Program



RFF 2010–2013

RTO Base

$4.407M MTIP for RTO in FY12 & FY13

RFF 2010–2013

RTO Request

RTO Subcommittee Priorities

1. Employer Outreach Evolution (0.7M)

2. Individualized Marketing for a New Stage of Life (0.6M)

3. Safety Partnership and Safer Crossings (1.0M)

Transit Oriented Development and Centers Implementation Program

Metro Planning Department

Transit Oriented Development and Centers Implementation Program

What we do.

Increase Ridership | Catalyze Markets | Contribute to Placemaking

- Direct Investment
- Change Travel Behavior

| structured parking | elevator | separation of uses | thicker footings | complex fire systems |

Results

TOD Projects produce 50% fewer auto trips

- 3,541 New Transit Riders Each Day
- 2,950 Housing Units in Mixed Use



What we do.

Good Design Can Solve the Density Riddle

Two factors that most influence ridership: density & proximity.

Transit Oriented Development and Centers Implementation Program

What we do.

Structured and/or Low Parking Ratios are key for achieving density

TOD vs. TAD

Cost Premiums: structured parking



Cost Premiums: Firewall Separation



Additional Cost Premiums

Transit Oriented Development and Centers Implementation Program

Addressing RFF Policy Objectives.

| Enhance Viability of 2040 Areas for all People |

- Direct Investment in Mixed Use / Mixed Income
- Increased efficiency : Increased Access

34% (989) **housing units are for HH @ 80% AMI.** 344 **units of senior housing**

TOD Projects are in 5 regional centers, 3 town centers and 19 station areas

| Improve Safety and Access to Transit in 2040 Areas |

- Reinforce pedestrian relationships and scale
- Nodes of activity + near stations areas = “eyes on the street”

Transit Oriented Development and Centers Implementation Program

Addressing RFF Policy Objectives.

| Sustainability |

- Use land more efficiently = less impermeable surface

TOD Projects have used 80 acres of land as compared to 504

- In high density mixed use areas:
  - Greenhouse Gas Emissions are 2 ½ times lower per capita
  - Annual energy use is half

areas with mixed uses have 42% non-auto mode share and reduction of VMT per capita of 55%.

| Efficiently and cost effectively use federal funds |

- $1:$20 ratio of public to private funds.
- $1-$1.2 million/year in additional revenue for the transit system.

Cost per induced rider $.96

Transit Oriented Development and Centers Implementation Program

Historical Funding Perspective.



	Proposed FFY 2012-13	(FFY 10-11)	(FFY 08-09)	(FFY 06-07)	(FFY 04-05)	(FFY 02-03)	(FFY 99-01)	(FFY 96-98)
TOD Station Area Program	$3,500,000	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	$1,500,000	$2,000,000	$2,000,000	$3,000,000
TOD Centers Program	$2,500,000	$2,000,000	$1,000,000	$1,000,000				
Westgate Site			$2,000,000					
Gresham Civic Station				$2,000,000				
Gateway Site					$800,000			
Total: TOD	**$6,000,000**	**$5,000,000**	**$6,000,000**	**$6,000,000**	**$2,300,000**	**$2,000,000**	**$2,000,000**	**$3,000,000**

Transit Oriented Development and Centers Implementation Program

Looking to the Future.

	Base Funding Request	Additional Funding Request
TOD Station Areas Program	$ 3,000,000	$ 500,000
TOD Centers Program	$ 2,000,000	$ 500,000

Additional Funding to support:

- New Lightrail Projects
- Increased Demand in Centers

RFF 2010–2013

Regional Program Applications

Transportation System Management and Operations Program (TSMO)

RFF 2010–2013

Regional Program Applications

Willamette River Bridges

RFF 2010–2013

Regional Program Applications

Pedestrian and Bicycle

RFF 2010–2013

Step 1: Allocation to Regional Programs

- Review program requests
- Evaluate programs relative to objectives and total funding available
- Consider Step 1 allocation options
- Recommend allocation to each program (April meeting)

RFF 2010–2013

Step 2: Solicitation of Local Projects

- Approximate remaining balance of funds
- Assign sub-regional application targets
- Adopt project solicitation categories and policy criteria score weighting
- Review technical evaluation measures
- Publish solicitation packet (May ‘08)