

# Metro | Agenda

Meeting: Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)  
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2009  
Time: 7:30 a.m. to 9 a.m.  
Place: Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

---

- |         |     |   |                              |
|---------|-----|---|------------------------------|
| 7:30 AM | 1.  | <b>CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM</b>  | <b>Rex Burkholder, Chair</b> |
| 7:32 AM | 2.  | <b>INTRODUCTIONS</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• New Members and Alternates</li></ul>   | <b>Rex Burkholder, Chair</b> |
| 7:35 AM | 3.  | <b>CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS</b>   | <b>Rex Burkholder, Chair</b> |
| 7:40 AM | 4.  | <b>COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR &amp; COMMITTEE MEMBERS</b>  | <b>Rex Burkholder, Chair</b> |
| 7:45 AM | 5.  | <b>ACTION ITEMS</b>   |                              |
|         | 5.1 | * Resolution No. 08-4013, For the Purpose of Endorsing the Transportation for America Platform – <u>ACTION REQUESTED</u>  | <b>Rex Burkholder, Chair</b> |
|         | 6.  | <b>INFORMATION / DISCUSSION ITEMS</b>   |                              |
| 7:50 AM | 6.1 | * Resolution No. 09-4016, For the Purpose of Approving the Federal Priorities – <u>STRATEGIC DISCUSSION</u> (for approval in January) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Policy paper</li><li>• Authorization Project List</li><li>• Appropriations Project List</li></ul> | <b>Andy Cotugno</b>          |
| 8:40 AM | 6.2 | # Regional Priorities for Economic Stimulus Bill – <u>DISCUSSION</u>  | <b>Rex Burkholder, Chair</b> |
| 9:00 AM | 7.  | <b>ADJOURN</b>  | <b>Rex Burkholder, Chair</b> |

\* Material available electronically.

\*\* Material to be emailed at a later date.

# Material provided at meeting.

All material will be available at the meeting.

*For agenda and schedule information, call Kelsey Newell at 503-797-1916, e-mail: [kelsey.newell@oregonmetro.gov](mailto:kelsey.newell@oregonmetro.gov).*

*To check on closure or cancellations during inclement weather please call 503-797-1700.*



**REVISED**

Date: November 6, 2008  
To: JPACT Members, Alternates and Interested Parties  
From: Kelsey Newell, Metro  
Re: 2009 JPACT meeting schedule

---

Please mark your calendars with the following 2009 JPACT meeting dates. JPACT meetings will be held from 7:30 to 9 a.m. in the Metro Council Chambers unless otherwise noted:

**Thursday, January 8, 2009 Additional JPACT meeting**  
Thursday, January 15, 2009 Regular JPACT meeting  
Friday, February 6, 2009 JPACT Retreat\*  
Thursday, February 12, 2009 Regular JPACT meeting  
**Thursday, March 5, 2009 Regular JPACT meeting**  
~~Thursday, March 12, 2009 Regular JPACT meeting~~  
Thursday, April 9, 2009 Regular JPACT meeting  
Thursday, May 14, 2009 Regular JPACT meeting  
Thursday, June 11, 2009 Regular JPACT meeting  
Thursday, July 9, 2009 Regular JPACT meeting  
Thursday, August 13, 2009 Regular JPACT meeting  
Thursday, September 10, 2009 Regular JPACT meeting  
Thursday, October 8, 2009 Regular JPACT meeting  
Thursday, November 12, 2009 Regular JPACT meeting  
Thursday, December 10, 2009 Regular JPACT meeting

\*JPACT Retreat time and location to be determined.

**2009 JPACT Work Program**  
**12/30/08**

<p><b><u>January 8, 2009 – Additional Meeting</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Federal Priorities and Project List</li> <li>• Res. No. 08-4013, For the Purpose of Endorsing the Transportation for America Platform – Action</li> <li>• Regional Economic Stimulus Bill - Discussion</li> </ul> <p><b><u>January 15<sup>th</sup> – Regular Meeting</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HCT Evaluation Criteria and Screened Corridors – Action</li> <li>• Adopt regional position of federal reauthorization policy and projects – Action</li> <li>• Report/Debrief on 2009 Joint MPAC/JPACT meetings – Discussion</li> <li>• Placeholder – Economic Stimulus Bill</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>February 6, 2009 – JPACT Retreat</u></b>          Location TBD from 8 – 1 p.m.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frame RTP Investment Strategy Principles and Funding Framework – Discussion</li> <li>• 2009 Work Program</li> <li>• Washington Visit</li> <li>• Greatest Places Update</li> </ul> <p><b><u>February 12<sup>th</sup> – Regular Meeting</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resolution No. 09-4018, For the Purpose of Consideration of the Regional Travel Options Program Work Plan and Funding Suballocations for Fiscal Year 09-10 – Action</li> <li>• Report on Federal Quadrennial Certification</li> </ul> <p><b><u>February 12<sup>th</sup> – Joint JPACT/Council Hearing on MTIP</u></b></p>
<p><b><u>March 5, 2009 – Regular Meeting</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final MTIP Regional Flexible Fund Approval – Action</li> <li>• Confirm RTP Investment Strategy and Financing Framework – Action</li> </ul> <p><b><u>March 10-12<sup>th</sup></u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Washington, DC Trip</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>April 9, 2009 – Regular Meeting</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Portland Metropolitan Area Compliance with Federal Transportation Planning Requirements – Certification</li> <li>• Federal Fiscal Year 2010 Unified Planning Work Program – Adoption</li> <li>• Recommended HCT Priorities and Draft Plan – Information and Discussion</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>May 14, 2009 – Regular Meeting</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direction on Regional Funding Package</li> <li>• Recommended RTP Investment Strategy – Discussion</li> <li>• Recommended HCT Priorities and Draft Plan – Information and Discussion</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>June 11, 2009 – Regular Meeting</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direction on Recommended RTP Investment Strategy and Plan Elements</li> <li>• 2010 TriMet Transit Investment Plan – Review/Comment</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>July 9, 2009 Regular Meeting</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>August 13, 2009 – Regular Meeting</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopt air quality conformity analysis of 2010-13 MTIP</li> <li>• Adopt 2010-13 MTIP</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>September 10, 2009 – Regular Meeting</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Release Draft RTP for Public Review – Action</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>October 8, 2009 – Regular Meeting</u></b></p>
<p><b><u>November 12, 2009 – Regular Meeting</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft RTP – Discussion</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>December 10, 2009 – Regular Meeting</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopt 2035 RTP, Pending Air Quality Conformity – Action</li> </ul>

**Parking Lot:**

- When to Consider LPA/RTP Actions for Sunrise, I-5/99W, Sellwood Bridge
- ODOT Tolling Policy
- ODOT Study of MPOs and ACTs
- Involvement with Global Warming Commission
- Status Reports from TOD, RTO, ITS
- Freight System Plan Adoption
- TSMO

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORSING THE ) RESOLUTION NO. 08-4013  
TRANSPORTATION FOR AMERICA POSITION )  
ON REAUTHORIZATION OF THE SAFE, ) Introduced by Councilor Rex Burkholder  
ACCOUNTABLE, FLEXIBLE, EFFICIENT, )  
TRANSPORTATION ACT:A LEGACY FOR )  
USERS (SAFETEA-LU) )

WHEREAS, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) was adopted by Congress in 2005; and

WHEREAS, SAFETEA-LU is scheduled to expire at the end of federal Fiscal Year 2009 (September 30, 2009); and

WHEREAS, Congress will be considering reauthorization of SAFETEA-LU during 2009; and

WHEREAS, SAFETEA-LU has a significant policy effect on transportation planning and decision-making and funding in the Portland metropolitan region; and

WHEREAS, Transportation for America is a coalition of national organizations that advocate on transportation, land use, environmental, health, energy and social issues of importance to metropolitan areas, and

WHEREAS, Transportation for America has developed a platform for authorization of the new federal transportation bill that addresses the critical need for a balanced, multi-modal transportation system integrated with economic, community, health, social equity, energy and climate change objectives; and

WHEREAS, at its meeting on \_\_\_\_\_, the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation recommended adoption of the following; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council:

Endorses the Transportation for America Platform for the Surface Transportation Program Authorization as reflected in Exhibit A.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this \_\_\_\_\_ day of January 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_  
David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney



# Transportation For America



## Platform for the Surface Transportation Program Authorization

---

## Executive Committee

---

Transportation for America has formed a broad coalition of housing, environmental, public health, urban planning, transportation, real estate, local businesses, and other organizations. We're all seeking to align our national, state, and local transportation policies with an array of issues like economic opportunity, climate change, energy security, health, housing and community development. Our coalition continues to grow. For a current list of partners and more information, please visit our website: [www.t4america.org](http://www.t4america.org) Listed below are the Executive Committee member organizations; each played a critical role in shaping the platform.

### The T4America Executive Committee

Reconnecting America (Co-Chair)

[www.reconnectingamerica.org](http://www.reconnectingamerica.org)

Smart Growth America (Co-Chair)

[www.smartgrowthamerica.org](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org)

Action! For Regional Equity (Action!)

[www.policylink.org/BostonAction/](http://www.policylink.org/BostonAction/)

America Bikes

[www.americabikes.org](http://www.americabikes.org)

American Public Health Association (APHA)

[www.apha.org](http://www.apha.org)

Apollo Alliance

[www.apolloalliance.org](http://www.apolloalliance.org)

LOCUS – Responsible Real Estate Developers and Investors

National Housing Conference

[www.nhc.org](http://www.nhc.org)

National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO)

[www.nacto.org](http://www.nacto.org)

National Association of Realtors

[www.realtor.org/smartgrowth](http://www.realtor.org/smartgrowth)

Natural Resources Defense Council

[www.nrdc.org](http://www.nrdc.org)

PolicyLink

[www.policylink.org](http://www.policylink.org)

Surface Transportation Policy Partnership (STPP)

[www.transact.org](http://www.transact.org)

Transit for Livable Communities (TLC)

[www.tlcmnnesota.org/](http://www.tlcmnnesota.org/)

US PIRG

[www.uspirg.org](http://www.uspirg.org)

---

## Table of Contents

---

Contents

<b><u>Section</u></b>	<b><u>page</u></b>
<b>Executive Committee .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>The Federal Role in Surface Transportation .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>The Need for Change.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Our Vision for Surface Transportation in the US.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Our Platform:</b>	
<b>I. Responsible Investment and Accountability.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>II. Transportation for a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Economy.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>III. Transportation, Energy and Climate Change .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>IV. Transportation Drives Development .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>V. Public Health and Safety .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>VI. Funding a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Transportation System...39</b>	

***This page blank***



---

## Introduction

---

### A Critically Important Program

In 2009, Congress will be working on legislation authorizing and updating the federal surface transportation program. This program guides the federal expenditure of just over \$50 billion annually for public transit, rail, highway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and services across the country. The money is granted principally to state transportation departments, local and regional transit agencies and metropolitan planning organizations.

However, the importance of federal surface transportation program goes far beyond its size.

Transportation policy is perhaps our most important tool for improving our nation's global economic competitiveness and the health and quality of life for households and individuals, and for increasing personal economic opportunity – the foundation of America's economic vitality and strength. Transportation networks are fundamental to how we grow, develop and prosper.

The federal surface transportation program directly influences how states, regions and cities invest in transportation. To a significant degree it determines what the country's transportation networks – interstate, regional and local – will be and how they will function.

This T4America Platform is intended to guide drafting of the authorization bill, which for many reasons promises to be one of the most important pieces of legislation to be taken up by the next Congress. The Platform reflects the work of a wide range of individuals and organizations with expertise in transportation, housing, environment, energy, real estate and development, public health and local governance.

---

## The Federal Role in Surface Transportation

---

### History of the Federal Program

The first national “fuel taxes” were passed in 1932 to support the federal budget which was in deficit due to the Great Depression. The tax rate was increased periodically over the years, primarily to support the national defense budget. The concept of a “user fee” dedicated to development of roads was inaugurated with the 1956 Highway Revenue Act creating the Highway Trust Fund (HTF).

Most people think of the first phase of the federal transportation program – from the mid-1950s to today – as the “Interstate Highway Era.” The Interstate System was conceived as a means of connecting the cities and regions of the country to strengthen the national economy, and as necessary to ensuring the national defense. This idea was first promoted by the “better roads” movement in the 1930s.

However, Congressional approval of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, formally funding the “National System of Interstate and Defense Highways,” was not achieved until the Bureau of Public Roads published a map showing how the national grid of Interstate routes would be connected into all of the country’s major cities. The potential importance of high-speed roadway connections to facilitate commerce between cities and regions was what it took to secure final Congressional approval and funding of a national Interstate Highway network.

Federal involvement in public transit began with the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. This legislation, originally proposed by President John Kennedy in 1962 and later championed by President Lyndon Johnson, established the Urban Mass Transportation Administration Authority (UMTA) and authorized \$375 million in funding over three years for capital grants to local and regional transit providers, using a 50/50 match ratio for federal participation. The agency name was changed to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in 1991.

Over recent decades, the federal transit program has been authorized at 20% or less of the size of the federal highway program. SAFETEA-LU, the current authorization legislation, put about \$40 billion annually into the highway program and about \$9 billion annually into public transit. The program structure has varied over the decades, but today about 80% of the program goes into “Formula and Bus Grants,” with about 15% going into “Capital Investment Grants” (New Starts and Small Starts).

By the late 1980s there was growing discontent in the US with the “highway-only” orientation of the federal surface transportation program as well as with the inflexibility of the system of program categories, the inattention to urban needs and the lack of a solid planning foundation for the program. With active support and participation by a national coalition of environmental, urban policy, transit, bicycle, and planning organizations, Congress began to consider taking a new direction.

## History of the Federal Program

When the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) passed in 1991, it was heralded as a turning point in the history of surface transportation in the US. ISTEA was seen as inaugurating the beginning of the “post-Interstate era.”

Key provisions of the new act included:

- An intermodal approach to highway and transit funding with flexibility to shift certain categories of federal funds between modes based on local priorities;
- A declaration that the Interstate Highway System was effectively “complete” and creation of a new Interstate Maintenance Program for resurfacing, restoring, and rehabilitating the Interstate System;
- Collaborative multimodal planning requirements with significant increases in powers of metropolitan planning organizations;
- A new “enhancements” program that for the first time would open up the Highway Program to new types of project elements, such as pedestrian and bicycle facilities, acquisition of scenic and historic sites, rehabilitation of historic transportation facilities and other purposes;
- A heightened commitment to public involvement in transportation decision making from planning to program development to project design;
- A formal emphasis on “congestion management” including new requirements for MPOs of over 200,000 population to develop congestion management plans; and,
- Direct funding of air quality improvement projects through a new Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program.

ISTEA was designed to introduce sweeping reform in the transportation program such that the federal approach to surface transportation would be truly multimodal, urban areas would be empowered to make planning and design choices based on local needs and priorities, walking and bicycling would once again become significant modes of travel, and the linkage between improving air quality improvement and transportation investment would be direct.

The two federal authorization bills passed since ISTEA have elaborated on these themes - the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) passed in 1997, and the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) passed in 2005. Provisions were written into these acts in an attempt to reinforce the landmark changes that ISTEA had promised. However, these laws were to some extent more focused on issues of distribution of funds between states, with TEA-21 introducing the concept of “guaranteed funding,” intended to ensure a certain minimum level of funding in each state.

Has the ISTEA promise of a balanced, multimodal federal program been achieved? Most analysts of ISTEA performance have concluded: yes and no. There have been improvements in the modal balance of funding. Just in the first eight years following ISTEA passage, federal funds spent on transit almost doubled, from

## History of the Federal Program

just over \$3 billion in 1990 to nearly \$6 billion by 1999. Annual transit funding under SAFETEA-LU has been almost \$9 billion. The amount of federal money spent on bicycle and pedestrian projects also grew from \$7 million before ISTEA passage to more than \$450 million in 2007 under SAFETEA-LU.

However, some of the most important ideas and concepts in ISTEA have yet to fully take hold. Flexible funding provisions have not been exercised by most states, with most of the national total in “flex funds” occurring in just five states: California, Pennsylvania, New York, Oregon and Virginia. Efforts of MPOs to take charge of local transportation program priority setting have met with entrenched resistance from many state DOTs, with the result that in many urban areas (especially smaller areas) the state still controls development of the transportation improvement program. As a result, over three-fourths of the surface transportation program continues to be invested in highway system expansion nationally.

The combination of growth in the size of the program, the setting of minimum guarantees or funding floors, and retention of most decision making within state DOTs has caused the federal transportation program to resemble a blank check or project “ATM.” The lack of a clear statement of national objectives and the lack of accountability for use of funds (or for the impacts of decision making) has created a strategic policy vacuum. In this policy vacuum, states have thrown increasingly vast sums of money at highway and freeway expansion projects in a quixotic pursuit of “congestion alleviation” – a pursuit that has served primarily to accelerate a national expansion of suburban and exurban low density development. This has also set the stage for rampant Congressional “earmarking” – specific listing of projects in the authorization legislation (5,000 projects in SAFETEA-LU).

The increasingly errant nature of the federal transportation program has had profound effects on the national economy, the public health and the quality of life in our communities. Our near-total reliance on petroleum for transportation energy and our outsize contribution to worldwide greenhouse gases imperil our national security, our economy and our way of life. We have lost the ability to walk or bike safely and conveniently in an ever-larger portion of the American landscape with tragic consequences for the health of our population and especially our children. The federal subsidization of low density exurban development has helped create extensive low-density, semi-urban landscapes where homeowners in search of low-cost mortgages endure exhausting drive-alone commutes and household budget problems. Although we are the world’s wealthiest nation, we have a second-tier urban transit system and no intercity high speed rail network.

## Summary of the Federal Role

Beginning in the 1950s, the “federal role” in surface transportation was defined primarily in terms of the Interstate Highway Program and in the concept of a national network of high-capacity, high-speed highways. Beginning with the ISTEA bill passed in 1991, there was an attempt to change direction and redefine the federal role. However, political and bureaucratic resistance to the new multimodal mission proved to be strong and entrenched. As a consequence the surface transportation program rests in an indeterminate, almost direction-less state.

Although there is no longer a clear, official delineation of the federal role in surface transportation, a de facto consensus has been in place during the past two authorization bills. This consensus cannot be found in the published statements of Congress or the USDOT, but rather in the actual pattern of investments, programs and policies that the federal government has pursued.

The primary elements of our de facto federal transportation policy have been:

- The nation’s highest surface transportation priority continues to be to provide capital funding for a national network of high-capacity, high-speed highways linking urban areas and regions of the country for purposes of economic development. A second priority has been expansion of surface roads and streets to provide increased capacity for motor vehicle travel, with an emphasis on suburban and rural routes.
- The creation and expansion of this network of highways has been so important that it has been seen as justifying underinvestment in repair, replacement and rehabilitation of existing infrastructure, leading to a nationwide decline in the condition of existing pavements and bridges.
- Among the surface transportation modes, the priority mode for federal support of human mobility has been personal motor vehicles. Public transit has been a much lower national priority. Intercity rail passenger transportation has not been seen as an appropriate arena for significant federal leadership or funding.
- Among the surface transportation modes, the priority mode for federal support of freight movement has been trucks. Rail freight transportation has not been seen as an appropriate arena for federal leadership or funding. The federal interest in water-borne freight movement has been implemented primarily through the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and has not been seen as an important activity for USDOT.
- For at least the past two decades an overriding objective of the surface transportation program has been capacity expansion of highways for purposes of congestion mitigation. Although never explicitly stated, a tacit feature of this emphasis has been federal subsidization of suburban and exurban settlement patterns.

## National Issues and Priorities

We believe Congress should set forth a clear statement of the federal role in surface transportation that is tied to specific transportation objectives based on national issues and priorities. We further believe Congress should ensure that funding levels, program categories and project criteria are clearly tied to transportation objectives.

The surface transportation authorization should clearly address issues, opportunities and goals that are appropriate for action by the national government in a federal system. In particular, the program should prioritize those national issues and opportunities that cannot be fully addressed without addressing the role surface transportation plays. In this context, we suggest the following short list of national priorities:

1. Energy Security, Economic Growth and Global Competitiveness
2. Environmental Protection and Climate Change
3. Personal Mobility and Location Efficiency
4. Traffic Safety and Public Health

While there is an acknowledged need for an increased level of federal funding for surface transportation, we cannot support increased funding in the absence a clear statement of the federal role in surface transportation coupled to a system of measurement, reporting and accountability for progress toward clearly defined national objectives.

## What the Federal Role Should Be

The federal role in surface transportation, which should guide development of the new surface transportation authorization legislation, should be as follows:

1. *Energy Security, Economic Growth and Global Competitiveness.* National security has always been a major purpose of the surface transportation program. For the next several decades, providing for national security will require strengthening our economy to compete in a global arena and reducing our dependence on petroleum – especially imported oil. We should modernize our freight movement system to make it more efficient and less oil-dependent; we should modernize urban transportation by building high-capacity transit lines; we should connect our major metropolitan regions with high-speed passenger rail lines; and, we should refocus our highway program on repair, rehabilitation and replacement of existing facilities.
2. *Climate Change and the Environment.* The U.S. will be unable to make significant progress on climate change intervention without reducing greenhouse gas emissions from surface transportation. This should be a major priority of the federal program and USDOT and its grantees should be held accountable for progress toward climate change objectives. Congress should also re-confirm our national commitment to environmental protection in the surface transportation program. There should be no weakening of the environmental protections enacted since 1970, including NEPA, the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act and related legislation.
3. *Mobility and Location Efficiency.* Congress should establish a commitment in the surface transportation program to urban infill and redevelopment. There should be a shift away from support of unsustainable suburban and exurban development patterns. Federal funds should be used to improve the quality of life and economic viability of rural regions, small towns and villages rather than being used to convert them to suburban development. This will require explicit federal support for coordination of land use and transportation decision making at the local, regional and state levels. Congestion alleviation as an objective should be replaced with location efficiency – the integration of land development and transportation such that mobility is enhanced while the intrinsic cost and energy requirements of travel are reduced. Congress should commit to broadening the benefits of federal investments in personal mobility to include all income categories so that transportation becomes a positive element supporting a strong workforce and enabling households to better balance domestic budgets.
4. *Traffic Safety and Public Health.* Congress should acknowledge that traffic accidents and other health impacts of surface transportation represent major forces affecting the health and safety of the US population – with significant long-term impacts on the federal budget and the national economy. Safety of non-motorized travel should receive expanded priority in the federal program. The health benefits of active living in our urban regions, cities, towns and villages should be identified as being in the national interest.

---

## The Need for Change

---

### A New Beginning

Functional, safe, and efficient transportation is one of the cornerstones upon which this country was built. America's economic strength and the health of its people depend on our ability to connect people with opportunity and on our ability to move products to market quickly, safely, and efficiently.

Today our strength as a nation is being limited by:

- a dependency on petroleum that threatens our national security, drains household budgets, exacerbates climate issues, undermines public health, and imperils the U.S. economy;
- a haphazard, inefficient relationship between our transportation systems and our land development patterns;
- a backlog of crumbling, unsafe, and obsolete transportation facilities;
- an auto/truck bias that has placed America far down the list of nations in terms of availability of modern public transit services and gives most Americans no option but to pay rising gas prices;
- a freight transportation system that is outmoded, over-capacity, dependent on imported petroleum, and incapable of efficiently linking the US national economy into the global economy; and,
- a legacy of transportation expenditures that benefit a few while leaving many behind in cities, older suburbs and small towns.

A change in direction is needed to help the nation meet its growing demand for transportation while addressing the oncoming challenges of energy security, global warming, changing demographics, public health care costs, and global economic competition. As Congress works on the new surface transportation program, T4America urges our policy makers to seize this opportunity to make a new beginning. That new beginning should include:

1. A commitment to responsible investing that holds recipients of federal funds accountable for progress toward national objectives.
  2. A new strategy for creating a 21<sup>st</sup> Century transportation system that enhances economic opportunity for all, creates jobs, and elevates our position in a competitive global economy.
  3. A program that improves essential connections within and between metropolitan areas while reducing dependence on petroleum and meeting national objectives for managing climate change.
  4. A more strategic approach to managing the land use and transportation relationship that improves efficiency, access, health, and safety, while halting the growth of and ideally, reducing per capita vehicular travel.
  5. A serious and concerted effort to address the impacts that transportation systems have on the health and safety of our people.
-



---

## ***Our Vision for Surface Transportation in the United States***

---

### **Mobility in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century**

In the future, our nation's surface transportation system should provide the foundation for personal opportunity, robust commerce and a healthy population. It should achieve national goals for economic development and environmental sustainability. It should provide equitable access and support healthy behaviors.

It should be a modern, 21st Century system, balancing new capacity with care and upkeep of existing infrastructure. Public transit systems, intercity rail corridors, roadway facilities, waterways, ports, bridges, bicycle and pedestrian facilities all should be kept in a state of good repair. The trillions of dollars in asset value of the systems and facilities built over the past century should be protected and enhanced.

A new generation of "great streets" and boulevards should replace the overly-large, harsh and utilitarian roads and freeways inherited from the suburban era, benefiting and adding value to neighborhoods and communities across the land.

Our transportation system should reflect recognition of the importance of America's metropolitan regions, cities and towns. It should connect regions to each other and to the world; support healthy communities; provide access to jobs, schools, health care and services; provide efficient goods movement; and stimulate economic opportunity. This system should improve mobility choices within our regions, cities and towns, with modern public transit networks and safe walking and bicycling networks.

It should do so in a manner that serves our national interests, adds value to communities, contributes positively to public health and safety, and reflects the equity and fairness that have always been hallmarks of the American egalitarian tradition.

The transportation program should be designed to invigorate local and regional economies and facilitate efficient inter-regional commerce. It should reduce energy use and greenhouse gas emissions by supporting more sustainable land use and travel patterns. Our national transportation investments should help provide affordable housing opportunities near good public transit service and employment centers and should promote walking and bicycling as economical, eco-friendly, and healthy modes. America's surface transportation system should enable us to compete successfully in a global economy and should be a model for other nations to follow.

Transportation for America's proposal for a rejuvenated, redirected surface transportation program would result in a national mobility network that provides a vital, complete array of mobility choices easily accessible to the vast majority of Americans – whether walking, bicycling, driving or traveling on public transportation– in a unified, interconnected, energy-efficient manner.

***This page blank***

# I. Responsible Investment and Accountability

## I. Responsible Investment and Accountability

*We believe: The surface transportation program should be invested in programs and projects that address pressing national priorities and agencies receiving funds should be accountable for how they are spent.*

### Our Objectives

- √ Make **economic competitiveness, energy, climate change, air quality, public health and safety, fairness, and state of good repair** the basis for sweeping transportation policy and program reform.
- √ Put all transportation modes (transit, highway, walking, bicycling) on **equal footing** with respect to match ratios, project eligibility criteria and project delivery processes, eliminating the highway capacity bias of the current program.
- √ Support a substantial increase in the size of the national surface transportation program **contingent** on transportation program reform and on an authorization bill that will lead to achievement of the National Transportation Objectives.
- √ Leverage federal transportation investments by encouraging state, local and private sector funding mechanisms to support local funding of projects and to use in matching federal funds.
- √ Reaffirm our national commitment to environmental protection in the surface transportation program.

### Here's How

1. Establish a set of **National Transportation Objectives** that address:
  - Energy;
  - Climate change;
  - Mode flexibility and travel choice;
  - Safety;
  - Public health;
  - State of good repair;
  - Environmental protection;
  - Equity;
  - System reliability;
  - Economic competitiveness; and
  - Household affordability.
2. **Restructure** program categories, funding allocations, project delivery systems and project eligibility criteria to support achievement of the National Transportation Objectives.
3. Hold federal, state, regional, and metropolitan agencies **accountable** for outcomes of their use of federal funding. Implement funding rewards and penalties for states and regions based on the progress or failure in meeting their share of the transportation energy use and GHG emission reductions.

## Here's How

4. Assign authority and implement direct allocation of formula funds to designated **regional transportation planning** entities. Set financial rewards and penalties based on progress toward National Transportation Objectives.
5. Require states, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), and designated regional transportation planning entities to prioritize **system management and facility repair** and rehabilitation over creation of new travel capacity and new facilities.
6. Strengthen regional decision making for **integrating** transportation, economic development, housing, environment, and energy use planning.
7. Make the State and Metropolitan Long Range Plans **goal-based** and accountable to benchmarks.
8. Incorporate **corridor-level analysis** of system-wide impacts, including location, mode choice, housing, equal access, and environmental quality in to the long-range transportation planning process.
9. Make **complete streets** mandatory in the planning and programming of transportation corridors, so that investments in roads and streets provide safe and convenient accommodation for all modes of travel, including walking, bicycling, transit, and driving.
10. Put all modes on **equal footing** with respect to the analytic process through which projects are selected.
11. Avoid weakening any of the **major environmental protections** enacted since 1970, including NEPA, clean air or clean water legislation, and related environmental protection laws and regulations as a strategy to speed transportation project delivery.

## Basis for These Proposals

### **Travel Choices**

The foundation of our platform is expanding choices for travel. This includes expanding transit service but also building our public facilities for safe and convenient accommodation of walking and bicycling. Roughly 40% of all trips in metropolitan areas are two-miles in length or less, which are trips that can and should be taken on foot or bicycle but are still taken primarily by car due to disjointed land use patterns, poor infrastructure design, and limited connectivity. By investing in our corridors, with a complete streets policy in place, we are making the most efficient use of our transportation funds. Streets that provide flexibility in how they are used, offer the most public benefit by accommodating all users and increasing the efficiency – economically, environmentally, logistically - of our transportation network.

### **Reinvesting in Existing Cities**

A significant part of America's future lies in its metropolitan areas. Our metropolitan areas are home to over 80% of the US population and generate over 85% of the gross domestic product. These percentages will increase in the coming decades.

For the past fifty years, our national surface transportation program has been designed to foster the decentralization of settlement patterns, creating vast areas of suburban and exurban development, and playing an important role in the depopulation of our older core cities, towns and villages. This pattern is not sustainable and does not reflect the needs of a changing population and a changing economy, especially in light of its inherent energy demands. We need to refocus our transportation program on our existing urbanized places – our core cities, our existing suburbs, our towns and our villages - to accommodate our future growth.

Smaller cities have needs too. We must invest in transportation for our small cities, towns and rural areas by supporting improvements in public transit, walking, and bicycling. We must ensure that improved connectivity, safety, and public health are prioritized to prevent sprawl and to provide transportation choices in these important places.

The time has come for an urban renaissance that deploys federal transportation funding as one tool in the redevelopment and revitalization of America's existing places.

## **II. Transportation for a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Economy**

## II. Transportation for a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Economy

*We believe: The surface transportation program should improve and protect U.S. competitiveness in the global economy.*

### Our Objectives

- √ Ensure all Americans have the mobility and access needed to participate fully in a **robust economy**.
- √ Begin addressing our transportation infrastructure crisis by taking better care of what we have already built, bringing our transportation assets into a condition of **good repair**.
- √ Make strategic investments in transportation that catalyze creation of **green jobs** that are environmentally and economically sustainable.
- √ Embark on a national program to bring modern **urban transit networks** to the nation's 50 largest metropolitan areas by 2030.
- √ Support cities, towns, and rural places in the creation of modern, complete **transit, bicycling and walking networks**.
- √ Complete a **national intercity passenger rail network** that links all ten of the nation's mega-regions by 2030 with direct, high-speed (> 90 mph) rail services.
- √ Connect our cities and regions to the global economy by improving the efficiency of **long distance freight** distribution.
- √ Re-establish transportation **research, data collection** and reporting as important federal functions.

### Here's How

1. Set national minimum **State of Good Repair** criteria for all modes and provide financial rewards and penalties for states and regions based on progress toward State of Good Repair objectives.
2. Establish a **National Infrastructure Commission** with the mission of identifying investments of national priority, focusing on multimodal intercity corridors of national significance, including a national intercity rail network and key freight corridors co-located where possible with electricity infrastructure.
3. Significantly enlarge the funding made available for **public transit systems** and for **walking and bicycling facilities**.
4. Provide direct incentives and support for creation of **transit oriented development districts** around corridor transit stations, with bonuses given for preservation and creation of **mixed-income** housing.



Here's  
How

5. Develop an expanded, consistently-funded transportation **research program** that improves our ability to address the challenges identified in this Platform and our ability to achieve National Transportation Objectives, specifically data related to use and safety of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
6. Ensure that any consolidation and reorganization of program funding categories supports the objectives and priorities of this platform and includes creation of a **multimodal metropolitan mobility** program empowering local and regional entities to make investments that strengthen their cities and improves their sustainability and economic competitiveness.

## Basis for These Proposals

### **Economic Competitiveness**

Many nations are rapidly developing 21<sup>st</sup> Century transportation systems that are energy efficient and climate friendly. In today's global economy, America's reliance on a petroleum-based transport system represents a serious competitive disadvantage. To remain competitive, we need more efficient and less polluting ports, high speed passenger rail connections between our cities, improved intercity rail freight capacity, and convenient commuting systems that are not petroleum-dependent and are more resilient to fluctuations in energy costs.

We need intercity passenger rail systems to alleviate capacity and cost issues of air travel and to reduce reliance on auto travel in congested intercity corridors. We need expanded rail freight systems to improve our physical distribution efficiency and to mitigate further growth in truck volumes on rural interstates. We need modern urban transit systems to reduce the amounts that households and businesses spend on gas to get to work and to deliver needed goods and materials.

America's transportation system is still organized to serve a 20<sup>th</sup> Century industrial economy. Without smart, strategic investments in modern transportation systems, America will be supplanted as the world's most productive economy.

### **Maintaining and Improving Infrastructure**

The nation's transportation assets are deteriorating. The need to bring our existing transportation system to a state of good repair and stabilize the condition our surface transportation system has been well documented and has been dramatized for the public by high-profile facility collapses. This need spans all modes, affecting not only highways, but public transit as well.

However, we are making little progress toward more responsible management of these essential assets. This challenge is compounded by the fact that in many states and regions, aggressive roadway expansion continues, increasing our exposure to future maintenance and repair costs. This has prompted a few states, including New Jersey, Michigan and Massachusetts, to adopt "fix-it-first" laws in an attempt to step into the policy vacuum and address this need in the absence of federal direction. Our nation will not be able to compete in a global economy if our basic transportation infrastructure is not maintained or if we continue to pour our transportation investments into low-yield exurban expansion.

### **Freight**

Interstate and international commerce have always been critical elements in U.S. economic strength. Over the last few decades, the development of globalized, trade-dependent supply chains has led to substantial growth in the demand for efficient, long-distance freight movement. Our investment in the efficiency and capacity of our freight infrastructure has lagged behind this demand. Now, we are faced with the additional challenge that our interstate freight networks are almost entirely dependent on petroleum and face steep increases in the cost of fuel that we are unprepared to address.

## Basis for These Proposals

Urgent freight transportation needs include efficient connections from ports to national freight corridors, new intermodal facilities to transfer between rail and truck, and expansion of cross-country rail freight mainlines, which provide an essential alternative to less efficient, oil-dependent motor trucks. (While rail freight movement consumes energy, too, it is far more energy efficient than truck freight for longer distance movement.) In many states, the largest single source of growth in Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions will be growing truck traffic, which is expected to double by 2035. We need to manage this demand and reduce emissions while keeping our economy moving.

Strategic design and intelligent transportation technologies have been underutilized in addressing chokepoints in key freight corridors. Freight is given little priority in regional planning and management of transportation corridors. Energy efficient modes of freight, such as rail and barge, have received less attention and funding in the federal transportation program. As energy prices rise these deficiencies are hampering our economic prospects.

### **Environmental Justice**

Historically, low-income and minority communities across the country have been damaged by highway, freight facilities, and other investments in which they had little voice. Transportation projects have disproportionately benefited some and burdened others, often along race and income lines. Many transportation projects and plans are still developed without meaningful involvement of affected communities, leading to projects that detract from quality of life, public health, safety, and personal mobility. This isolates them from economic opportunity.

This is more than an equity issue. The strongest economies are those that open the doors of opportunity wide to all people. To compete effectively in a global economy we must renew our commitment to egalitarian access to the benefits of a national transportation program.

### **Green Jobs**

The construction, maintenance and operation of transportation services and facilities comprise a large and growing component of the American economy. While the federal transportation program has been seen, in part, as a jobs bill, there has been little or no strategic thinking about creating sustainable jobs that reflect modern energy efficiency and climate change realities.

Investments in transit expansion projects can reduce per capita carbon emissions and create jobs. Transit projects generate nine percent more jobs per dollar spent than road and bridge repair and maintenance projects, and nearly 19 percent more jobs than new road or bridge projects. A modern – 21<sup>st</sup> Century – transportation program would create professional jobs in software engineering; electronic and digital systems design; transit facility and equipment design; and communication systems operation and maintenance; as well as a wide range of jobs in transit facility and equipment maintenance and operations; and road and street maintenance.

***This page blank***

# **III. Transportation, Energy and Climate Change**

### III. Transportation, Energy and Climate Change

*We believe: A core mission of the surface transportation program should be to reduce the amount households and businesses spend on transportation and reduce the nation's dependence on oil.*

#### Our Objectives

- √ Reduce the impact of **rising energy costs** on families by reducing the inherent necessity of motor vehicle travel for access to jobs, education, shopping and recreation.
- √ Reduce our **reliance on petroleum products** for transportation to no more than 20% by 2050 (from more than 95% today).
- √ Make a significant contribution to achievement of the nation's **climate change** objectives through transportation program reform. Assume a world leadership role in addressing climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector to 20% below 1990 levels by 2020 and to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050.
- √ Increase access for households of all incomes to decent, affordable **housing near public transit**, job centers and other locations that facilitate reductions in transportation costs.

#### Here's How

1. Significantly increase the share of federal, state and local **investment in public transit** systems and in **walking and biking** facilities by increasing the funding available for those modes, by erasing the barriers to transit capital projects inherent in current federal rules and procedures, and by placing all modes on an equal footing in terms of federal cost participation ratios.
2. Establish **incentives** to ensure that sufficient state and local **transit operating and maintenance** funds will be available to operate current services and to support proposed service expansions.
3. Set **national transportation energy use and greenhouse gas emission reduction objectives**. Allocate transportation energy use and GHG reduction targets to states and metro regions. Implement funding rewards and penalties for states and regions that fail to make progress toward their share of the transportation energy use and GHG emission reduction objectives.
4. Target transportation investments to support convenient, complete and inclusive communities with a complete mix of housing types and incomes, where necessities and amenities are close by, and people can walk, bike, ride transit and drive.



## Here's How

5. Increase **funding incentives** for transportation policy innovations such as mixed-income, transit-oriented development, car/bike sharing, parking cash out, congestion pricing, complete streets retrofits, technological improvements, pay-only-when you drive insurance, transportation-efficient neighborhoods and developments, and other state and local programs that reduce: the burden on the transportation system; oil consumption; and greenhouse gas emissions..
6. Develop strong program funding incentives for jurisdictions to increase the availability of affordable homes to families with a mix of incomes near public transit stops and job centers.
7. Monitor the **cost burdens** of direct transportation user fees – including transit fares, toll road tolls, and congestion pricing systems –on low and moderate income families to ensure such fee systems are affordable and equitable. When appropriate, require use of toll receipts to fund cross-modal investments to improve equity.

## Basis for These Proposals

### **Affordability**

Americans spend about 20 percent of household budgets on transportation. For many working families that number is much higher, raising transportation above shelter as a percentage of household income. This situation is caused by limited availability of transportation choices and by sprawl, which make it difficult or impossible to reach school, work and shopping without traveling long distances by car. While the need for “affordable housing” has received well-deserved attention, the fact is that achieving “affordable living” may be the more important objective, reflecting the combined burden of transportation and housing costs as a percentage of household income. For many working households the goal of affordable living is becoming less attainable as fuel prices and trip lengths increase.

### **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Nationally the transportation sector is responsible for one third of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. In fact, transportation is our second largest and fastest growing source of greenhouse gases. Each second, America’s transportation system burns 6,300 gallons of oil, producing more CO<sub>2</sub> emissions than any other nation’s entire economy except China.

Transportation sector CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are a function of fuel efficiency, fuel carbon content, and vehicle miles of travel (VMT). Federal and state energy and climate policy initiatives have focused almost exclusively on technological advances in vehicles and fuels, the first two factors. However, we must also address VMT growth or we will not succeed at limiting GHGs to levels required to avoid unacceptable climate change.

### **VMT Growth**

Since 1980, the annual miles driven by Americans have grown three times faster than the U.S. population and almost twice as fast as vehicle registrations. If this trend were to continue, VMT would increase by 60 percent from 2005 to 2030, overwhelming the GHG reductions generated by increases in fleet efficiency. Targets set by the scientific community for reducing GHG emissions by 60 to 80 percent relative to 1990 by 2050 will require significant reductions in the rate of VMT growth in the U.S. in order to avoid the most catastrophic impacts of climate change.

However, VMT trends are now being affected by fuel prices and related economic trends. While vehicular travel continues to grow throughout the Sunbelt, in the Southwest, and on the West Coast, it has slowed or halted in many Midwestern and Eastern states. Overall, the nation has seen two consecutive years of annual VMT decline (2006 and 2007) – the first since the end of World War II. For the nation’s fastest growing states – California, Arizona, Texas and Florida – managing VMT growth will continue to be an urgent need. Other states will face a policy conundrum as they try to determine whether to view recent VMT declines as an opportunity to pull back from costly highway capacity expansion, or as a temporary “dip” in the long term trend.



## Basis for These Proposals

### **Energy Security**

Over 95 percent of U.S. transportation energy is petroleum-based and 60 percent of that is imported. This dependence exposes Americans to economic risks associated with higher fuel prices.

Growth in transportation sector energy demand due to sprawl and the resulting growth in VMT also threatens our energy independence and poses a national security threat. Rising fuel costs are affecting the U.S. economy in ways that go far beyond the pump price of gasoline.

As petroleum costs continue upward, driven to a significant degree by an inefficient, oil-dependent transportation system, the direct economic impacts at the household level include:

- Loss of jobs and increasing unemployment;
- Lower disposable personal income;
- Higher costs for household basics;
- Reduced per capita consumption expenditures, and
- Reduced personal savings.

These effects generate secondary impacts that reverberate throughout the economy, affecting the availability of money for capital investment, the ability of households to buy and make payments on homes and other real estate, and the strength of the U.S. dollar vis-à-vis foreign currencies.

Higher fuel costs are increasing cost of freight transportation, thereby increasing the cost of all retail products. The U.S. independent trucking industry is currently in decline due to the effects of higher fuel costs on small truckers and their inability to charge higher freight costs in a weak economy. Many small trucking companies are simply parking their trucks, unable to stay in business.

These impacts are compounded for public transit providers because their fuel costs are increasing at the same time that demand for transit service is growing rapidly. According to the American Public Transit Association, 85% of transit providers are currently experiencing capacity issues as ridership grows and 91% are unable to meet that demand due to limited budgets. Even more troubling is the fact that more than one-third of transit service providers are being forced to consider service cuts, as a result of increased operating expenses – even as demand is increasing.

***This page blank***

# **IV. Transportation Drives Development**

---

## IV. Transportation Drives Development

---

### Our Objectives

- ✓ Foster **land use patterns** that can be served efficiently and sustainably by well-planned national, regional and local transportation networks.
- ✓ Establish as national policy the principle that land use and transportation must be planned in a coordinated, integrated manner – at the state, regional and local levels of governance.
- ✓ End the federal subsidization of sprawl and replace it with a commitment to transportation investments that support **compact, mixed use, mixed-income development** patterns.
- ✓ Become an active partner with the nation’s cities and counties in the redevelopment of our metropolitan regions by making **urban renaissance** an explicit national objective of the surface transportation program.
- ✓ Invest in transportation choices for rural America that improve economic opportunity, quality-of-life, and help prevent the conversion of rural lands to low-density suburban development.

### Here’s How

1. Create a transit-oriented development **tax credit** to support and accelerate development of compact, mixed use, mixed income development around rail and other high capacity transit stations.
  2. Increase local flexibility and self-determination by removing barriers to use of federal transportation funds for investments in land use and local infrastructure that reduce VMT.
  3. Use federal funds to leverage and invest directly in projects that bring destination land uses, (schools, groceries, health care services, etc.) to transit centers and neighborhoods as part of a comprehensive local accessibility strategy.
  4. Develop technical assistance and guidelines for the routine forecasting and evaluation of the impacts of transportation investments on development patterns, including infill, redevelopment, compact urban development and sprawl.
  5. Establish national minimum guidelines for coordinating state and metropolitan transportation planning with other planning processes to ensure **integration of land use and transportation** activities resulting in more compact, mixed-income communities served by transit.
  6. Require the use of **scenario planning** techniques in the development of future Long Range Transportation plans, similar to Envision Utah or the Sacramento Blueprint. This effort must engage the public and analyze growth, demographics, climate impacts, energy and other trends while fulfilling the National Transportation Objectives as they are realized at the local level.
-

## Here's How

7. Encourage the use of federal funds to replace the overly-large, harsh and utilitarian roads and freeways inherited from the suburban era, by investing in the **redesign and retrofitting** of a new generation of "great streets" benefiting and adding value to the neighborhoods and communities they serve.
8. Support locally-appropriate decision-making and development strategies by empowering regional **transportation planning** entities. Increase their capacity, decision-making authority and allow for direct allocation of federal funds to support their programs.

## Basis for These Proposals

### **Sprawl**

Much of our growth in VMT is non-productive, characterized by an increase in driving without a corresponding increase in access to destinations. This has been caused by inexorable expansion of disconnected land use patterns that require more driving. Across the U.S., land was consumed for development at three times the rate of population growth between 1982 and 2002. Sprawl has the strongest influence on VMT per person – more than population growth, changing demographics or increases in per capita income.

More than 60 percent of the growth in driving and associated energy consumption is due to land use patterns of single uses served by a disconnected road network. American households are spending more on transportation as part of their household budget due to the necessity in much of the country to own vehicles and drive, rather than walk, ride a bike or take public transit. Sprawl is costly financially, environmentally, and from a public health perspective. Auto-oriented communities that don't provide safe active living opportunities are associated with increased levels of obesity; air pollution resulting from increased VMT in these communities threatens respiratory health, particularly for our seniors and children.

For many years, in the face of steadily rising housing costs, many working Americans adapted by finding homes farther and farther out from developed areas – an effect known as "drive 'till you qualify." That trend now has placed thousands and thousands of households in danger as higher pump prices for gasoline, combined with a weaker economy and higher unemployment rates, threaten their ability to make mortgage payments.

### **Traffic Congestion**

For the past two decades transportation policy making and transportation planning have been narrowly focused on traffic congestion. Previous surface transportation bills have called for "managing," "reducing," or "alleviating" congestion. Despite significant investment, congestion is worse than ever.

Congestion is an issue for many Americans. As a result of sprawl and increased driving, congestion in our nation's metropolitan areas is bad and getting worse, wasting fuel and time, and impairing economic vitality. Further, only a small portion of the U.S. population is able to avoid congestion completely by taking public transit, walking or riding a bike.

## Basis for These Proposals

However, the congestion problem has been oversimplified. Land development patterns and transportation interact with each other in complex ways. When new roadway capacity is built to reduce congestion, it has the unintended effect of encouraging low density development of outlying areas, which in turn produces more traffic. Research has shown that much of the capacity of new or expanded roadways is consumed, not by the traffic for which they were planned, but by new traffic produced by sprawling development.

The expenditure of trillions of dollars in the U.S. over the life of the modern highway program has added many thousands of miles of new roadway lanes. But this has not alleviated congestion. The metropolitan regions with the most aggressive freeway construction programs – Los Angeles, Phoenix and Houston, among others – have not been able to reduce per capita annual delay. Today, these same regions are engaged in aggressive plans to build public transit systems to give citizens the choice to opt out of congestion. Our policies have built vast roadway systems with vast amounts of traffic across ever-expanding urban regions. Unfortunately, these policies have also increased congestion.

### **Population Growth and Demographic Trends**

The nation's population is forecast to increase by 40 percent over the first half of the 21st Century to a total of 420 million, leading to significantly heightened demands on an already burdened transportation system. At the same time, related demographic trends – aging and retirement of the Baby Boomers, rise of small and non-traditional households – will significantly increase demand for new housing located in compact mixed use areas in our cities, suburbs and towns – already a large and underserved market.

Our population will be older and demographers anticipate that aging Baby Boomers will drive less than their younger counterparts, though more than the 65 and over population drive today. In studies, many older people say they fear health problems that will make them unable to drive because that would mean they would have to move from their homes and neighborhoods. Many communities have been built without provisions for older people to age in place – getting to the store, healthcare facilities, family, and friends with ease without being required to drive.

### **Environmental Protection**

Roads and streets represent massive infrastructure systems affecting vast areas of the American landscape. These facilities and the traffic they carry put pressure on our natural resources and our human environment.

Transportation impacts on water quality, air quality, wildlife habitat and migration corridors, along with many other effects, are acknowledged and much studied. However, while environmental laws and regulations have grown greatly over the past 50 years, the negative impact of transportation on our environment continues to be an important issue.

While federal legislation has done much to mitigate environmental degradation, the benefits of these efforts – especially in air quality and water quality – are gradually being consumed by fast growth in motor vehicle traffic and in the facilities that carry it.

# **V. Public Health and Safety**

## V. Public Health and Safety

*We believe: The surface transportation program should improve public health and safety.*

### Our Objectives

- ✓ Reduce the rate of **serious injuries and loss of life** on our nation's streets and highways for motorized and non-motorized travel.
- ✓ Ensure that **public health** issues are addressed in transportation investment decision making.
- ✓ Invest in transportation initiatives that improve the health and safety of our **children**.
- ✓ Expand transportation programs that offer options to the **elderly and disabled** so that driving is not the only option available in their communities.
- ✓ Make safe, convenient walking and bicycling the cornerstones of a higher quality of life in communities and neighborhoods and encourage a shift of short trips to these modes.
- ✓ Expand public transit and mixed-income transit-oriented development to improve access to health care and reduce time and environmental pollution associated with high daily per capita VMT.

### Here's How

1. Set specific national targets for safety improvement, particularly in walking and bicycling, as part of the **National Transportation Objectives**.
2. Revise the current Safety Program to better reflect the risks to bicyclists and pedestrians; and increase the level of commitment to **Safe Routes to School**.
3. Make **Active Transportation** a mandatory design and project eligibility criterion for all surface transportation programs.
4. Formalize **Context Sensitive Design and Solutions** as required elements of program and project development. Provide updated design guidance for well-connected, sustainable street design.
5. Make **Health Impact Assessments** (HIAs) mandatory evaluation elements of transportation environmental impact statements and environmental assessments; account for direct and indirect economic impacts of health burdens and benefits.



## Here's How

6. Increase the funding for **paratransit** and other specialized services for the elderly and disabled that improve their access to services and local destinations.
7. Reduce and mitigate the health impacts associated with the location of highways, diesel rail lines, and freight facilities near residential areas.
8. Rewrite the air quality "**conformity**" provisions and the **Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality** (CMAQ) program to improve simplicity and efficacy in selecting better projects.

## Basis for These Proposals

### **Public Health**

Increased reliance on autos as the primary mode of transportation contributes to a host of negative health impacts in addition to the immediate health consequences of traffic accidents. These impacts include increased incidence of obesity, cardiovascular disease, diabetes, asthma and lung disease, among others. Two principal factors are at work here.

First, the trend toward built environments that are dominated by large streets and heavy traffic has discouraged active living in most of our neighborhoods. People (especially children) do not walk or bicycle as much as they did thirty years ago. Research over the past decade has confirmed that the way we have been building our neighborhoods, business districts and schools is reducing our physical activity, and that in turn is adversely affecting our health.

Second, increased traffic is harming public health by exposing people to high levels of air pollution. For example, people who suffer from asthma and live near heavy vehicular traffic are nearly three times more likely to visit the emergency department or be hospitalized for their condition than those with less traffic exposure. Moreover, living in areas exposed to heavy traffic is a burden borne disproportionately by people in low income, under-served communities and by communities of color.

This is a critical economic issue. Annual health care costs in the U.S. total \$2 trillion. Health care costs are a leading cause of bankruptcy for individuals and families. Many of the diseases that drive these statistics are directly affected by transportation and land use decisions and could be mitigated by active living, improvements in air quality and improvements in traffic safety.

### **Safety**

Traffic crashes take a significant toll on Americans. Over the last two decades, traffic deaths have hovered around 43,000 per year, about 5,000 of whom are bicyclists or pedestrians. Motor vehicle accidents are the leading cause of death for Americans aged three to 33 and 2.5 million people are injured on our roads each year.

This toll affects our nation's economy. According to research conducted for the American Automobile Association (AAA), auto accidents cost each American more than \$1,000 a year. Traffic accidents in total cost the U.S. economy \$164 billion annually.

We have taken major strides nationally to improve traffic safety. Drunk driving laws, driver education programs, increased law enforcement, seat belts, and airbags are just a few of the positive steps taken. However, we have not yet seriously addressed the relationship between traffic volume, traffic speed and motor vehicle accidents, injuries and deaths.

# **VI. Funding a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Transportation System**

## VI. Funding a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Transportation System

*We believe: New or increased revenue sources for the federal surface transportation program should be equitable, consistent with national goals, and sustainable over the long term.*

### Our Objectives

- √ Develop revenue sources sufficient to fund the levels of investment called for in this Platform.
- √ Choose **long term revenue** sources that are not dependent on petroleum consumption and are **consistent** with the nation's energy, climate change and economic goals.
- √ Allocate the financial burden of new or increased revenues **equitably** across income groups.
- √ Ensure that revenue sources **reward energy efficiency**, are closely linked with actual transportation system use, and **allocate user costs fairly** across modes and vehicle types.
- √ Involve the private sector in transportation funding in a responsible manner that ensures long term public benefit and **protects public assets**.

### Here's How

1. Require a **direct connection between support for new revenue sources and the priorities** called for in this Platform: development of modern urban transit systems; development of an intercity rail passenger system; and redirection of the roads and streets programs into "state of good repair." **Do not allow a general across-the-board increase** in transportation funding that continues the single mode, highway-only orientation inherent in the surface transportation program over the past 50 years.
2. Use **fuel tax increases as interim stopgap measures** only. Begin setting the stage for a new set of **sustainable and equitable funding sources**. Consider the potential for a national VMT tax as a key long term basis for funding surface transportation by requiring appropriate equipment in new vehicles and service station fueling devices and by funding continuing technical research and development with the intent that a VMT tax potentially could be implemented in the next update of surface transportation authorization legislation.
3. Dedicate that portion of proceeds from a national **cap and trade system or a carbon tax** that are derived from mobile surface transportation sources to funding those components of the surface transportation program that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Here's  
How,  
Continued

4. Establish a **National Infrastructure and Transportation Bank** to monetize tax increment financing and private sector value capture benefits for capital improvements.
5. Provide clear guidance for **public-private partnerships (PPP)**, including toll facilities, congestion pricing systems, turnkey projects, and privatization of public infrastructure. Require that PPP business deals conform to the following principles:
  - Ensure complete **transparency** of all business deals and an open public review process;
  - Retain **public control** over decisions about transportation planning and management;
  - Guarantee **fair value** so that facilities and future toll revenues are not sold off at a discount;
  - Protect the public interest in **location efficient development** patterns, in reducing **greenhouse gas emissions**, and in protecting the **environment**; and,
  - Ensure full **political accountability** for outcomes.

## Basis for These Proposals

### **Transportation Revenue Sources**

Motor fuel taxes have been the principal source of highway funding for the last 80 years, although other revenue sources are prominent in the funding of local roads and transit.

As fuel prices have rapidly escalated since 2006, the US has begun to see the first sustained decline in national daily vehicle miles of travel (VMT) since before World War II. This has aggravated a problem that was already anticipated: receipts to the Federal Highway Trust Fund have not been enough to support the contract obligations authorized by Congress through SAFETEA-LU and recent appropriations bills.

Now, with VMT below forecast, fuel tax revenues are even lower than expected, with the result that the gap between authorization levels and income has arrived sooner and in greater magnitude than originally forecast. In September 2008, Congress made an emergency appropriation of \$8 billion from general funds to keep the Highway Trust Fund solvent through the end of calendar year 2008.

Whether this is a long term trend or not is difficult to predict. There is assuredly some amount of elasticity of motor vehicle travel in relation to gas prices, but in the past Americans have tended to increase their driving again once the initial “sticker shock” has passed. In the present case, however, it is also difficult to predict what will happen with future fuel prices. The underlying forces driving petroleum prices higher – economic growth in China, India and Third World nations, coupled with a leveling off of growth in worldwide petroleum production capacity – are not going to go away. A world recession could slow the trend but will not likely reverse it.

A surface transportation program that is dependent on petroleum consumption is a bad idea for many reasons. The original concept of the fuel tax as a user fee dedicated to road construction will be increasingly out-of-date in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century as the nation’s surface transportation program becomes more multimodal, with a new emphasis on investments in urban rail transit and intercity high speed rail. Over-reliance on fuel taxes also makes the surface transportation program dependent on growth in petroleum consumption with the attendant economic, national security and climate change issues.

Continued reliance on increases in fuel purchases to grow revenue for transportation system investments is no longer good policy. Congress should begin the process of replacing the fuel tax with more sustainable revenue sources.

## Transportation for America – Partners

### Executive Committee

Reconnecting America  
Smart Growth America  
Action! For Regional Equity  
America Bikes  
American Public Health Association  
Apollo Alliance  
LOCUS – Responsible Real Estate Developer and Investors  
National Housing Conference  
National Association of City Transportation Officials  
National Association of Realtors  
National Resources Defense Council  
PolicyLink  
Surface Transportation Policy Partnership  
Transit for Livable Communities  
US PIRG

### Elected Officials

U.S. Representative Diane Watson (Los Angeles, CA)  
King County Executive Ron Sims (Seattle, WA)  
City of Missoula Mayor's Office (MT)

### National Groups

Smart Growth America (co-chair)  
Reconnecting America (co-chair)  
The Surface Transportation Policy Partnership  
PolicyLink  
Amalgamated Transit Union  
America 2050  
America Bikes  
The American Institute of Architects  
America Walks  
American Public Health Association  
Apollo Alliance  
BOMA International  
CEOs for Cities  
Center for Neighborhood Technology  
Coalition on Regional Equity (CORE)  
Congress for the New Urbanism  
Enterprise Community Partners  
Environment America  
Environmental & Energy Study Institute (EESI)  
Environmental Defense Fund  
Fresh Energy  
Holland & Knight  
Housing Preservation Project  
Jonathan Rose Companies  
League of Conservation Voters  
Local Initiative Support Corporation (LISC)  
LOCUS: Responsible Real Estate Developers and Investors

### State, Regional, and Local Groups

1,000 Friends of Wisconsin (WI)  
10,000 Friends of Pennsylvania (PA)  
Action Committee for Transit (MD)  
All Aboard Ohio (OH)  
Action! For Regional Equity (MA)  
Bike, Walk Ohio! (OH)  
b'more mobile (MD)  
Central Maryland Transportation Alliance (MD)  
Citizens for Progressive Transit (GA)  
CNU New York (NY)  
Connecticut Fund for the Environment (CT)  
Council of Senior Centers & Services  
Elm City Cycling  
Dane Alliance for Rational Transportation (DART)  
Environmental Law and Policy Center  
FRESC: Good Jobs, Strong Communities  
Georgia Conservancy (GA)  
Georgia PIRG (GA)  
Greater Baltimore Committee (MD)  
Greenbelt Alliance (CA)  
Green Millennium  
Green Wheels (CA)  
Growsmart Maine (ME)  
Growth And Justice (MN)  
Houston Tomorrow (TX)  
Livable Communities Coalition (GA)  
Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition (CA)  
Los Angeles Walks (CA)

Main Street Project  
National Association of Local Boards of Health (NALBOH)  
National Association of City Transportation Officials  
National Association of County and City Health Officials (NACCHO)  
National Association of Realtors  
National Center for Bicycling & Walking  
National Coalition for Promoting Physical Activity  
National Housing Conference  
National Housing Trust  
Natural Resources Defense Council  
National Recreation and Park Association  
Project for Public Spaces  
Sam Schwartz Engineering, PLLC  
Stewards of Affordable Housing for the Future  
STV Inc  
Transportation Equity Network (TEN)  
Thunderhead Alliance  
Trust for America's Health  
U.S. Public Interest Research Group

Madison Area Bus Advocates (WI)  
Massachusetts Smart Growth Alliance (MA)  
Metropolitan Planning Council (IL)  
Michigan Environmental Council (MI)  
Michigan Suburbs Alliance (MI)  
Missouri Bicycle Federation (MO)  
Montana Smart Growth Coalition (MT)  
New Jersey Future (NJ)  
Northeast-Midwest Institute (NE & MW States)  
Parry Transit  
PenTrans (Pennsylvanians for Transportation Solutions, Inc.) (PA)  
PennEnvironment (PA)  
Plan It (NY)  
Regional Transportation Authority (Chicago) (IL)  
Regional Plan Association (NY-CT-NJ)  
San Luis Obispo County Bicycle Coalition  
Smart Growth Partnership  
Sonoran Institute (Western States)  
Southern Environmental Law Center  
SPUR  
San Francisco Bicycle Coalition (CA)  
The Transit Coalition (CA)  
Transit for Livable Communities (MN)  
TransForm (Formerly TALC)  
Tri-State Transportation Campaign (NYC)  
Urban Habitat  
Utah Transit Authority (UT)  
Vision Long Island (NY)  
Washington Area Bicyclist Association (DC)  
WALKSacramento (CA)



BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORSING A	)	RESOLUTION NO. 09-4016
REGIONAL POSITION ON	)	
REAUTHORIZATION OF THE SAFE,	)	Introduced by Councilor Rex Burkholder
ACCOUNTABLE, FLEXIBLE, EFFICIENT,	)	
TRANSPORTATION ACT:A LEGACY FOR	)	
USERS (SAFETEA-LU)	)	

WHEREAS, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) was adopted by Congress in2005; and

WHEREAS, SAFETEA-LU is scheduled to expire at the end of federal Fiscal Year 2009 (September 30, 2009); and

WHEREAS, Congress will be considering reauthorization of SAFETEA-LU during 2009; and

WHEREAS, SAFETEA-LU has a significant policy effect on transportation planning and decision-making and funding in the Portland metropolitan region; and

WHEREAS, reauthorization results in the “earmarking” or identification of specific projects and establishes the amount of federal funding eligible to be appropriated to those projects; and

WHEREAS, further review of proposed legislation will lead to possible amendment and refinement to this policy postion and project priority list; and

WHEREAS, at its meeting on \_\_\_\_\_, the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation recommended approval of the following; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council:

1. Endorses the Federal Transportation Authorization Policy Priorities as reflected in Exhibit A.
2. Endorses the projects identified in Exhibit B as the region's priority projects for SAFETEA-LU reauthorization earmarking.
3. Endorses the projects identified in Exhibit C as the regional priority projects for fiscal year 2010 appropriation earmarking.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this \_\_\_\_\_ day of January 2009.

---

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

---

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

**DRAFT #7**

**Portland Metropolitan Area  
Federal Transportation Authorization Policy Priorities**

**Implementing a Transportation Strategy for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century**

**Text that is highlighted is new since Dec. 11<sup>th</sup> JPACT Meeting**

December 31, 2008

**Introduction**

The Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) was enacted August 10, 2005. SAFETEA-LU authorizes the Federal surface transportation programs for highways, highway safety, and transit for the 5-year period 2005-2009, expiring September 30, 2009. The House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has initiated the authorization process for the new 5-6 year period through a series of hearings to solicit input and share proposals.

With America confronting a new era of economic crisis, fluctuating energy prices, rapidly escalating construction costs, deteriorating infrastructure, global climate change and the need to reduce greenhouse gases, the virtual bankruptcy of the federal highway trust fund, an aging population and increased global competition, the model represented by the Portland region's strategy should be viewed as the framework around which to authorize new national transportation legislation. Or, as suggested by Congressman James Oberstar, the Portland region serves as "the template for America."

**Regional Strategy for Integrating Land Use and Transportation**

For over 30 years, through strong regional cooperation and determination, the Portland region has been pursuing a radically different path than most urban areas of the United States. The result is economic vitality that positions the region well in a competitive global economy, produces a high level of livability enjoyed by its citizens and a pride in significant environmental accomplishments. In the 1970's, the region chose to arrest sprawl by establishing an enforceable urban growth boundary, cancel a long standing freeway expansion program, direct resources into a multi-modal transportation system and align regional and local land use plans to support growth in targeted centers and industrial areas and complement investments in the transportation system. Through this period, the region has leveraged federal transportation programs to support the regional strategy. Through successful application of flexibility provided through federal formula programs and competitive use of federal discretionary programs, particularly "New Starts," the region has implemented an integrated strategy of targeted highway expansion, aggressive transit expansion, demand management and system management. As a result of this direction, the region has continued to maintain a strong, globally competitive economy, attractive, livable communities and have more than met federal air quality standards. Declining vehicle travel per capita as a result of strong pedestrian, bike and

transit travel have established the Portland region in the position of best reducing greenhouse gases consistent with the national goal.

Changes to the national program consistent with the recommendations presented here can assist the region in implementing its strategy and could provide the framework for other regions to pursue. This strategy is based upon a collaborative transportation improvement strategy consisting of the following:

- a comprehensive approach to each major mobility corridor with targeted highway expansion, transit improvement, system management and integration with parallel arterials;
- aggressive development of a regional high capacity transit system comprised of light rail, commuter rail, streetcar and frequent bus service;
- implementation of an award-winning “Drive Less, Save More” demand management program;
- introduction of peak-period pricing with the replacement of the Columbia River Crossing;
- improvements for the movement of freight to industrial areas, marine and air cargo terminals and intermodal truck terminals;
- coordination with management of land uses; and
- coordination with programs to meet and exceed air pollution and air toxic standards, manage storm water runoff and reduce greenhouse gases to address climate change.

The next transportation authorization bill will encompass a very broad range of policy, programmatic and funding issues. The purpose of this paper is to define those elements of the bill that are of greatest concern to the Portland metropolitan area. This is presented in two parts: first, those issues that represent the most significant, overarching directions that the Portland region believes the bill should be structured around and second, a more detailed compilation of specific recommendations on aspects of the bill that impact the Portland region.

## **Priority Recommendations:**

**Metropolitan mobility:** Recognize metropolitan mobility to support these urban economies as a key area of federal interest and establish a program structure to address a defined set of expected metropolitan mobility outcomes that provide the metropolitan area with adequate tools to implement a comprehensive program of multi-modal improvements.

**Mega-projects:** In addition to a formula-based Metropolitan Mobility Program, there is a need for a national discretionary funding program for transit and highway projects too large to implement through the cash-flow of an annual formula. Congress should retain and reform the New Starts/Small Starts program as a significant funding tool (rather than folding it into the Metropolitan Mobility program). In addition, retain and reform the Projects of National and Regional Significance.

**Freight:** Establish a program to address the movement of freight into and through metropolitan areas and across the country to ensure the federal interest in interstate commerce is addressed.

**State of Good Repair:** Provide funding to maintain, rehabilitate and manage the existing transportation asset with funding levels and program requirements tied to expectations on the condition of the system.

**Funding:** Provide a realistic funding increase tied to the outcomes that the federal legislation calls for. Without a funding increase, the program will have to be reduced by some 40% or more. If this is the case, managing and maintaining the existing asset will be all the program can fund. Furthermore, current funding levels are not sufficient to address the backlog of unmet maintenance and rehabilitation needs and an increase in funding is needed to fund improvements.

**Climate change:** Provide a clear integration with federal climate change policy. Individual projects cannot be held accountable for meeting regional greenhouse gas reduction targets. However, the overall regional system can be held accountable and the federal transportation programs should ensure this accountability (much like the current air quality conformity requirement).

## **Detailed Recommendations:**

### **I. Program Focus**

#### **A. Energy Security and Global Warming -**

At the same time that the transportation bill is up for authorization for the next six-year period, the Congress is also considering or has recently enacted legislation related to energy security and reducing greenhouse gases to support national climate change initiatives. It is important that these legislative initiatives be linked and that the transportation program reinforces and helps implement energy and greenhouse gas goals. In particular, if a carbon tax and/or a carbon cap and trade program is established, it should be structured to allow use of these funds on transportation projects that reduce greenhouse gases based upon the merits of those projects. Furthermore, if the carbon tax extends to motor vehicle fuel, these funds should be integrated with the broader transportation funding programs to ensure funding for transportation projects that reduce greenhouse gases in proportion to the share of greenhouse gases produced by motor vehicles. Finally, much like the transportation/Clean Air Act link, investments from the transportation bill should be consistent with energy and climate change mandates and include a conformity requirement.

#### **B. Clearly establish the National Interest -**

Since the completion of the Interstate system, the national purpose of the federal transportation program has been a shifting target. While ISTEA, TEA-21 and SAFETEA-LU have brought considerable state and local flexibility, the national debate has been dominated by funding equity issues (i.e. donor/donee)– which while very important – have crowded out a discussion of a performance based funding system. A lack of clarity in the program’s mission has led to inadequate funding for the program. The key priorities for the Portland region that would help define the federal program’s mission are as follows:

- Metropolitan Mobility – ensure the multi-modal transportation system supports the economic vitality of the nation’s largest metropolitan areas where most of the economic activity exists.
- Interstate Commerce – ensure freight can be efficiently moved across the nation and globally through a multi-modal freight network providing for the movement of goods to and through metropolitan areas and connecting to international air cargo and marine ports.
- Manage the Asset – ensure that the substantial past federal, state and local investment in the transportation system is

maintained in good condition and is operated in an efficient manner.

- Safety – ensure the multi-modal transportation system moves goods and people in a safe manner.

## **II. Program Funding**

### **A. Adequately fund the system –**

There has been considerable erosion of the gas tax from construction inflation, increased fuel efficiency of the fleet and reduced fuel consumption as gas prices rise. As a result, there is a substantial shortfall in the Highway Trust Fund’s Highway Account and Mass Transit Account, both to maintain current programs and to expand programs to meet actual need. In the next authorization bill (starting in Federal Fiscal Year 2010), the equivalent of at least a 10-cent gas tax increase is needed to simply maintain current program funding levels in SAFETEA-LU. Furthermore, according to the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Commission, a 25 to 40-cent gas tax increase over the next 5-years plus indexing for inflation is needed to fully meet the Preservation, Safety and Expansion needs of the national transportation system.

Clearly, a substantial increase in federal funding is needed. Regardless of the overall funding level, the authorization bill should be clear about expected outcomes and then provide a sufficient funding level to meet those outcomes.

### **B. Take steps toward transitioning to a VMT fee**

Although Oregon was the first to implement a gas tax as the primary method for funding transportation infrastructure, it is apparent that this mechanism is not sufficient in the future. It is an inelastic revenue source that has historically lost value to inflation and improvements in fuel efficiency and is currently losing revenue due to reductions in driving. As the national fleet continues to convert to higher fuel efficiency and electric vehicles in response to energy security and global warming concerns, the long-term viability of the revenue source is greatly threatened and its role as a “user fee” is undermined.

ODOT carried out a successful pilot project demonstrating that it is feasible to implement a VMT-based fee system as a long-term replacement for the gas tax. They demonstrated that the system is technically feasible, can be implemented at the gas pump, preserves individual privacy and can be implemented with variable rates accounting for time of day and geography.

To advance the concept, the Congress should:

- Set a six-year timetable to complete development of a new system so it can be implemented in the next authorization cycle.
- Fund research and development efforts to identify the best option and design the system and technology required to implement it.
- Create working groups within US DOT to develop the system and an independent policy oversight body with the responsibility and authority to make recommendations to Congress.
- Give the Secretary of Transportation authority to require equipment be placed in all new vehicles in order to speed transition.

### III. Program Direction

#### A. Metropolitan Mobility -

A Metropolitan Mobility Program should be established in the 50 largest metropolitan regions to ensure a focus on supporting the movement of goods and people in the metropolitan regions of the nation, which generate 60% of the value of US goods and services. An adequate transportation system is vital to continued productivity in our nation’s metropolitan areas and therefore the economic well being of the nation. Funds from the program should be distributed for use in metropolitan areas in partnership between metropolitan planning organizations, states, transit operators and local governments to implement a comprehensive set of strategies to manage demand, improve operations, and expand multi-modal capacity, while meeting goals for the reduction of greenhouse gases. Performance standards should be set and serve as the basis for certification of compliance with federal requirements in those areas. Coordination with agencies responsible for land use and natural resources should be mandatory.

Authorization projects that are being requested to implement this policy strategy include:

Project Description	Funding Request (\$millions)	Sponsor	Congressional Districts
I-205/I-5 Interchange	\$14.35	ODOT	OR-1
OR 99W/McDonald/Gaarde Intersection	\$4.50	City of Tigard	OR-1
I-205/Airport Way Interchange	\$20.00	Port of Portland	OR-3
172nd Ave. Improvements (Sunnyside Rd. to 177 <sup>th</sup> Ave.)	\$15.00	Happy Valley	OR-5
OR 213: I-205 - Redland Road (Jug Handle Project)	\$12.00	City of Oregon City	OR-5

OR 10 Farmington Rd. at Murray Blvd. Intersection Safety & Mobility Improvements	\$8.00	City of Beaverton	OR-1
Hwy 26/Shute Rd. Interchange	\$10.00	City of Hillsboro	OR-1
Bethany Overcrossing of Hwy 26	\$10.00	Washington County	OR-1
OR10: Olseon/Scholls Ferry Intersection	\$11.00	Washington County	OR-1
Walker Road: 158 <sup>th</sup> to Murray	\$10.00	Washington County	OR-1
Farmington Rd.: Kinnaman to 198 <sup>th</sup>	\$30.00	Washington County	OR-1
Hwy 99W/Sunset/Elwert/Kruger Intersection	\$2.50	City of Sherwood	OR-1
72 <sup>nd</sup> Ave.: Dartmouth St. to Hampton St.	\$13.00	City of Tigard	OR-1
Nimbus Extension from Hall Blvd. To Denney Rd.	\$15.40	City of Beaverton	OR-1

Appropriation projects that are being requested to implement this policy strategy include:

Project Description	Funding Request (\$millions)	Sponsor	Congressional Districts
OR 213/Redland Road Lane Improvements	\$5.40	City of Oregon City	OR-5
Tooze Road Improvements	\$2.50	City of Wilsonville	OR-5
122 <sup>nd</sup> /129 <sup>th</sup> Ave. Improvements - Sunnyside to King Road	\$2.00	City of Happy Valley	OR-3

## B. Freight -

One of the most important and constitutionally established functions of the federal government is to ensure the free-flow of interstate commerce, which is central to the transport of freight. Because of this mandate, the U.S. Department of Transportation should develop a national multi-modal freight transportation plan that articulates a vision and strategies for achieving national freight transportation objectives. Associated with that plan, the next authorization bill should establish an integrated freight transportation program within the U.S. Department of Transportation, and coordination between the Transportation Department and other transportation-related federal agencies should be strengthened. Federal policies and funding should strengthen the capacity of all U.S. gateways to handle the increasing volume of international trade. Creating the capacity to move more freight on mainline and shortline railroads and waterways would generate cost, efficiency, and environmental benefits.

To implement the Freight Program, a multi-modal Freight Trust Fund should be established within the Highway Trust Fund, capitalized with traditional truck user fees, fuel taxes on railroads and customs and cargo fees (those that are not already dedicated to waterways improvements and maintenance).



Authorization projects that are being requested to implement this policy strategy include:

Project Description	Funding Request (\$millions)	Sponsor	Congressional Districts
I-84/257 <sup>th</sup> Ave. Troutdale Interchange	\$20.00	Port of Portland	OR-3
Sunrise System Improvements	\$30.00	Clackamas County	OR-3
Kinsman Road Freight Route Extension Project, Phase I	\$10.50	City of Wilsonville	OR-5
Troutdale Reynolds Industrial Park Road Improvements	\$6.00	Port of Portland	OR-3
124 <sup>th</sup> Ave. Extension: Tualatin-Sherwood to Tonquin	\$8.00	Washington County	OR-1

Appropriation projects that are being requested to implement this policy strategy include:

Project Description	Funding Request (\$millions)	Sponsor	Congressional Districts
Springwater Industrial Area Phase I Access	\$5.00	City of Gresham	OR-3
124 <sup>th</sup> Ave. Extension: Tualatin-Sherwood to Tonquin	\$4.00	Washington County	OR-1
Columbia River Channel Deepening Project	\$25.00	Port of Portland	

### C. Managing the Existing System –

To protect the substantial investment in the nation’s transportation system, it is essential that the federal program manage the existing asset to the greatest extent possible. This includes:

- System preservation to ensure the existing system doesn’t deteriorate so severely as to compromise its function and lead to a backlog of higher costs,
- Implementation of safety measures across all parts of the system to reduce fatalities and injuries, and
- Funding for new transportation system improvements must include adequate resources to manage and mitigate their environmental impacts, and incorporate sustainable stormwater management systems into their design.
- Funding investments in the rehabilitation and enhancement of historic inter-modal facilities.

Authorization projects that are being requested to implement this policy strategy include:

Project Description	Funding Request (\$millions)	Sponsor	Congressional Districts
Regional Multi-Modal Safety Education Initiative	\$4.50	Metro	OR-1,3,5

Appropriation projects that are being requested to implement this policy strategy include:

Project Description	Funding Request (\$millions)	Sponsor	Congressional Districts
Willamette Locks	\$2.00	Clackamas County	OR-5

#### D. System Management –

Management of the transportation system through Intelligent Transportation Systems equipment and operating practices provides a cost-effective means to realize the maximum possible performance of the existing investment. Toward this, the region has developed a Transportation and System Management and Operations (TSMO) plan and Implementation Strategy. Elements of the plan includes integrated signal systems, ramp metering, interactive information signage, incident response and transit and emergency vehicle priority. Federal legislation should provide specific eligibility for system management improvements and should ensure system management elements are included in expansion projects.

Authorization projects that are being requested to implement this policy strategy include:

Project Description	Funding Request (\$millions)	Sponsor	Congressional Districts
I-84/Central Multnomah County ITS	\$3.00	City of Gresham	OR-3
Regional Arterial Management Program (signal system coordination)	\$12.00	Metro	OR-1,3,5

Appropriation projects that are being requested to implement this policy strategy include:

Project Description	Funding Request (\$millions)	Sponsor	Congressional Districts
SW Farmington Road Arterial Adaptive Signal Control	\$0.67	City of Beaverton	OR-1

**E. Demand Management -**

Managing travel demand is an essential strategy to reduce VMT and to complement improvements to and management of the system. Programs aimed at employers and residents assist people to meet their travel needs while making use of biking, walking, transit, carpooling, vanpooling, trip chaining and avoiding the congested peak hour. Federal funding programs should include explicit eligibility for demand management programs to reduce vehicle-miles-traveled and single-occupant vehicle trips and ensure major system expansion projects include demand management strategies. This is essential to ensure that expansion projects are cost-effective, to keep costs to the consumer reasonable and to help meet energy and greenhouse gas reduction targets.

Authorization projects that are being requested to implement this policy strategy include:

Project Description	Funding Request (\$millions)	Sponsor	Congressional Districts
Drive Less Save More Marketing Pilot Project	\$4.50	Metro	OR-1,3,5

**F. Transit Oriented Development -**

Coordinating land use and transportation can produce both more livable communities and a more efficiently operating transportation system. In particular, ensuring that the federal transportation funding programs explicitly support development physically or functionally connected to transit results in better transit ridership and a more cost-effective transit improvement. Specific investments to support transit oriented development includes complementary street and sidewalk infrastructure, amenities such as parks and plazas, structured parking and site preparation and foundations for air rights development and higher density, mixed-use development. The resulting land use pattern not only results in greater transit ridership but also increased levels of walking and biking thereby reducing vehicle travel, energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions.

Authorization projects that are being requested to implement this policy strategy include:

<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Funding Request (\$millions)</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Congressional Districts</b>
College Station TOD (at PSU)	\$10.00	PSU/TriMet	OR-1
Gresham Civic Neighborhood Station/TOD/Parking Structure	\$5.00	City of Gresham	OR-3
Transit Station Area Connectivity Program to promote transit oriented development	\$20.00	Metro	OR-1,3,5
Rockwood Town Center	\$ 10.00	City of Gresham	OR-3

**G. Bridges -**

Although Oregon has addressed the condition of many bridges statewide through the Oregon Transportation Investment Act, there is a continuing need to address deficient bridges in order to avoid impacting commerce and safety. This requires a sustained and increased funding commitment and legislative changes to ensure investment in the highest priority bridges. Specific changes include:

- Elimination of the 10-year rule which removes any bridges that have been partially rehabilitated with federal funds from the formula used to apportion funds to the state;
- Allowing states that share an adequate amount of bridge funding with local agencies to waive the requirement to spend a minimum of 15% of the federal bridge funds on bridges that are off the federal-aid highway system. This provision was created to ensure federal bridge funds are sub-allocated to bridges under the jurisdiction of local governments and agencies. However, all local government bridges on the arterial and collector systems are “on-system,” leading to a requirement to spend a disproportionately high funding level on very low priority bridges.
- Creation of a Seismic Retrofit Program within the federal bridge program.

Authorization projects that are being requested to implement this policy strategy include:

<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Funding Request (\$millions)</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Congressional Districts</b>
Sellwood Bridge on SE Tacoma St. between Hwy 43 & SE 6 <sup>th</sup> Ave.	\$100.00	Multnomah County	OR-3,5

## H. Intercity Passenger Rail -

The Pacific Northwest Cascades Corridor from Eugene to Vancouver, BC is one of 10 major corridors nationally that have been designated for improvements that would increase the frequency and reliability of high-speed rail service. More frequent and reliable service could make intercity passenger rail a more viable travel alternative for trips between the Northwest's urban areas and reduce pressure on I-5. The Winter Olympics to be held in British Columbia in 2010 afford the country an opportunity to showcase that High Speed Rail can succeed in the United States and the Pacific Northwest corridor should be a major investment focus in the next bill. The region should support programs designed to carry this out and in particular should guarantee a robust funding level for Amtrak.

Authorization projects that are being requested to implement this policy strategy include:

Project Description	Funding Request (\$millions)	Sponsor	Congressional Districts
Union Station Rehabilitation	\$24.00	City of Portland	OR-1

## I. Transit and Greenhouse Gases -

With the Nation facing higher oil prices, insecure oil supplies, and greenhouse gas reduction targets, the Transit Program needs new direction and emphasis. The nation now needs to build sustainable and energy-resilient cities so that the metropolitan areas responsible for two-thirds of our nations economic output remain strong. Transit also needs to serve the growing numbers of aging citizens. To make substantial progress toward these goals, the transit program needs to grow aggressively, as suggested below:

- Increase funding for transit as recommended by the National Commission from \$10.3 billion annually in FFY 2009 to a range of \$21 to \$32 billion. (Note: FFY 09 transit funding is \$8.3 billion from the trust fund, and \$1.98 billion from the general fund for new and small starts). Cover the current general fund portion of the total from an augmented trust fund.
- The Fixed Guideway Modernization program should increase from \$1.6 billion annually to between \$4 billion and \$6 billion; growing at a rate which reflects the addition of eligible rail miles throughout the nation and the aging of the nation's essential urban transit infrastructure.
- Increase the funding for Section 5307 Urbanized Area formula funds to reflect the growth in employment and the travel needs

of the demographic tsunami of aging citizens. Funding should be increased from \$4 billion to between \$8.5 billion and \$11 billion.

- Increase the New Starts overall funding from \$1.6 billion to a range of \$6 billion to \$11 billion annually; and Small Starts from \$200 million to \$500 million to \$1 billion annually.
- Turn the Section 5309 Bus and Bus Facilities into the ‘Very Small Starts’ competitive program per current FTA guidelines (which establishes minimum ‘warrants’ for cost effective bus investments), and combine it with other miscellaneous grant programs such as the intermodal terminals program. Increase funding from \$1 billion annually to between \$2 billion and \$3 billion.

Authorization projects that are being requested to implement this policy strategy include:

Project Description	Funding Request (\$millions)	Sponsor	Congressional Districts
TriMet Buses (\$15.4 million per year/6-years)	\$92.40	TriMet	OR-1,3,5
West Metro HCT Bus Rapid Transit Alternatives Analysis		Washington Co./TriMet/Metro	OR-1
Central East HCT Bus Rapid Transit Alternatives Analysis		City of Gresham/TriMet/Metro	OR-3
Prototype Diesel Multiple Unit (commuter rail vehicles)	\$5.00	TriMet	OR-1,3,5
Wilsonville SMART Fleet Services Facility	\$7.00	City of Wilsonville/SMART	OR-5
SMART Bus Replacements (\$2.7 million per year/6-years)	\$16.20	City of Wilsonville/SMART	OR-5
Wilsonville SMART Offices/Administration Facility	\$1.50	City of Wilsonville/SMART	OR-5
City of Sandy Transit	\$1.50	City of Sandy	OR-3
Canby Area Transit	\$1.25	City of Canby	OR-5
South Clackamas Transit	\$0.75	City of Molalla	OR-5

Appropriation projects that are being requested to implement this policy strategy include:

Project Description	Funding Request (\$millions)	Sponsor	Congressional Districts
TriMet Bus Replacement	\$15.40	TriMet	OR-1,3,5
Wilsonville SMART Fleet Services Facility	\$1.20	City of Wilsonville/SMART	OR-5
City of Sandy Transit	\$0.60	City of Sandy	OR-3
Canby Area Transit	\$0.60	City of Canby	OR-5
South Clackamas Transportation District Bus Facility	\$0.60	SCTD/Molalla	OR-5

**J. New Starts/Small Starts -**

The New Starts program has been important to building the Portland region’s regional rail infrastructure, including light rail (MAX), streetcar, and commuter rail (WES). The New Starts program under the current administration has discouraged the local/federal partnership in transit, as evidenced by the decline of rail projects in the New Starts pipeline and failure to streamline smaller projects as intended by the Small Starts Program. Given the nation’s need to build stronger cities, address energy security and sustainability, this must be reversed. Reauthorization priorities must focus on improving project evaluation and streamlining project delivery.

Authorization projects that are being requested to implement this policy strategy include:

<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Funding Request (\$millions)</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Congressional Districts</b>
South Corridor Light Rail (\$80 m. in 2010, \$25 m. in 2011)	\$345.40	TriMet	OR-3
Eastside Streetcar Loop	\$75.00	City of Portland	OR-3
Portland to Milwaukie - New Starts	\$850.60	TriMet	OR-3
Portland to Lake Oswego Streetcar - New Starts or Small Starts	\$237.30	City of Lake Oswego/Portland/TriMet	OR-5
Columbia River Crossing - New Starts	\$750.00	ODOT/WSDOT	OR-3/WA-3
Portland to Tigard and Sherwood/99W/Barbur Blvd. Alternatives Analysis		City of Tigard/TriMet	OR-1
Hillsboro to Forest Grove Alternative Analysis		City of Forest Grove/TriMet	OR-1
East Metro North South HCT Alternative Analysis		City of Gresham/TriMet	OR-3
Light Rail to Oregon City Alternative Analysis		Clackamas County/TriMet	OR-5
Portland Streetcar Planning and Alternatives Analysis	\$5.00	Portland/Gresham	OR-3

Appropriation projects that are being requested to implement this policy strategy include:

<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Funding Request (\$millions)</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Congressional Districts</b>
South Corridor Light Rail	\$80.00	TriMet	OR-3
Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail	\$25.00	TriMet	OR-3
Eastside Streetcar Loop	\$25.00	City of Portland	OR-3
Portland to Lake Oswego Streetcar	\$4.00	City of Lake Oswego/TriMet/Metro	OR-5
Next Corridor Alternatives Analysis	\$1.00	Metro	OR-1,3,5

**K. Walking and Cycling -**

A number of converging trends – increasing gas prices, worsening congestion, growing health problems related to inactivity, climate change – all argue for increasing our national commitment to active transportation. Safer and more convenient on-street routes and off-street trails lead to substantial increases in mode share for walking and cycling, which, in addition to addressing the issues cited above, also reduces wear and tear on our nation’s aging infrastructure. Metro, working with government and nonprofit partners throughout the region, has convened a Blue Ribbon Committee for Trails that is developing strategies to create the most complete urban trails network in the US. The Rails to Trails Conservancy (RTC) has launched a “2010 Campaign for Active Transportation” that aims to double federal funding for walking and biking infrastructure in the upcoming federal transportation authorization bill. The City of Portland and Metro took the lead in submitting a “case statement” to the RTC that includes a list of projects that illustrate the potential impact of walking and cycling investments. Congress should support the RTC’s proposal to invest at least \$50 million in each of 40 metropolitan areas in the US as a means to substantially increase mode share for cycling and walking.

If the authorization bill implements the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy Proposal, the region is seeking the following projects through this new program:

Project Description	Funding Request (\$millions)	Sponsor	Congressional Districts
Non-Motorized Mobility Strategy (on and off-street bike paths)	\$75.00	Metro	OR-1,3,5
Portland Citywide Bicycle Boulevard Construction	\$25.00	City of Portland	OR-1,3

If the authorization bill does not implement the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy Proposal, the region is seeking from the “High Priority Projects” earmark category:

Project Description	Funding Request (\$millions)	Sponsor	Congressional Districts
Congressional District 1 Trails/Bikepath Program	\$5.00	Washington County & Cities	OR-1
Congressional District 3 Trails/Bikepath Program	\$5.00	Portland/Gresham	OR-3
Congressional District 5 Trails/Bikepath Program	\$5.00	Clackamas County & Cities	OR-5



Specific bike paths and trails that would be implemented depending upon the size of the program are as follows:

<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Funding Request (\$millions)</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Congressional Districts</b>
<b>Multnomah County</b>			
SW Capitol Hwy: Multnomah to Taylors Ferry	\$10.00	City of Portland	OR-1
Gresham/Fairview Trail, Phase 4/5	\$6.10	City of Gresham	OR-3
<b>Clackamas County</b>			
French Prairie Bike-Ped-Emergency Bridge Over Willamette River	\$12.60	City of Wilsonville	OR-5
Springwater to Trolley Trail - 17 <sup>th</sup> Avenue from Ochoco to McLoughlin Blvd.	\$3.20	NCPRD/City of Milwaukie	OR-3
Mt. Scott Creek Trail - Mt. Talbert to Springwater Corridor	\$4.60	NCPRD/Happy Valley	OR-3
Scouter's Mt. Trail - Springwater/Powell Butte to Springwater	\$7.37	NCPRD/Happy Valley	OR-4
Phillips Creek Trail - I-205 Trail to N. Clackamas Greenway	\$2.27	NCPRD/Clackamas County	OR-5
Monroe Bike Blvd.	\$2.00	City of Milwaukie	OR-3
Iron Mtn. Bike Lanes - 10 <sup>th</sup> St. to Bryant Rd.	\$3.80	City of Lake Oswego	OR-3
Carmen Drive Sidewalk and Bike Lanes from Meadow Rd. to I-5	\$1.70	City of Lake Oswego	OR-3
Pilkington Sidewalk and Bike Lanes from Boones Ferry to Childs Rd.	\$5.25	City of Lake Oswego	OR-3
<b>Washington County</b>			
Westside Regional Rail Trail		Washington County	OR-1
Council Creek Regional Trail: Banks to Hillsboro	\$5.25	Washington County	OR-1
Tonquin Trail/Cedar Creek Corridor	\$2.50	Washington County	OR-1

Appropriation projects that are being requested to implement this policy strategy include:

<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Funding Request (\$millions)</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Congressional Districts</b>
Sandy River Trail Connections	\$5.00	Multnomah County	OR-3
SE 122 <sup>nd</sup> Ave. Sidewalk Construction	\$2.12	City of Portland	OR-3
High Priority Trail Projects in Washington County	\$1.00	Washington County	OR-1
17 <sup>th</sup> Avenue Trolley Trail - Springwater Connector	\$3.36	City of Milwaukie	OR-1
French Prairie Bike-Ped Emergency Bridge over Willamette River, Wilsonville	\$2.10	City of Wilsonville	OR-5
I-84/Sandy River Bridge Trail Connections	\$5.00	ODOT/Metro/Troutdale/Mult. Co.	OR-3
SW Vermont St./Capitol Highway - 30 <sup>th</sup> Ave. Intersection Reconfiguration	\$1.71	City of Portland	OR-1

## **L. Highway Project Delivery -**

Federal transportation and environmental laws contain rigorous protections that ensure transportation projects do not unnecessarily harm the human and natural environment. Too often, however, these requirements add time and cost to projects without a corresponding improvement in environmental outcomes. Oregon, with its strong green ethos and focus on sustainability, has been a leader in ensuring that transportation projects complement rather than compromise the natural and human environment.

In order to further streamline the regulatory process, Congress should consider a number of steps:

- Focus on accountability for overall environmental outcomes, not following processes that may or may not make sense for a particular project.
- Move FHWA from a permitting role to a quality assurance role, so the federal government would ensure environmental outcomes without having to approve every action.
- Enable and encourage states to use programmatic permits that provide a single set of terms and conditions for a specific type of work and specify expected environmental outcomes.
- Enable and encourage states to use a streamlined environmental review process that brings regulatory agencies into the project development process to identify and address issues at an early stage, such as the Collaborative Environmental and Transportation Agreement for Streamlining (CETAS) program that was pioneered by ODOT.

## **M. Critical Highway Corridors -**

The next authorization bill should create a discretionary funding category for large, complex projects that generate benefits of national significance or of significance beyond the area within which they are located. Congress should continue the “Projects of National and Regional Significance” program created under SAFETEA-LU and also consider creating a program focused on the high-priority trade corridors such as Interstate 5 that carry most of the nation’s commerce and are disproportionately impacted by rapidly rising truck volumes.

Any project to address the Columbia River Crossing will depend on this program for funding and should not be expected to be funded through the customary federal funding formulas to states and metro areas. The Columbia River Crossing Project is a model for this funding program and advances the region’s strategy of implementing targeted highway improvement programs, aggressively expanding transit, managing

demand, particularly through peak period pricing and managing the operation of the system. Implementation of this strategy is carried out through the following key elements:

- Replacement of the antiquated I-5 draw bridges with a new, expanded bridge;
- Reconstruction of approach interchanges to meet merge, weave and safety standards;
- Extension of light rail transit from Portland, Oregon to Vancouver, Washington;
- Financing predominantly through the implementation of tolls on a peak-period pricing basis.
- In addition to these project elements, the project is integrated with the regional demand management program, the freeway system management program and a program to address environmental justice issues in the corridor.

Authorization projects that are being requested to implement this policy strategy include:

Project Description	Funding Request (\$millions)	Sponsor	Congressional Districts
Columbia River Crossing Project	\$400.00	ODOT and WSDOT	OR-3/WA-3

Appropriation projects that are being requested to implement this policy strategy include:

Project Description	Funding Request (\$millions)	Sponsor	Congressional Districts
I-5 Columbia River Crossing	\$3.00	ODOT & WSDOT	OR-3/WA-3

## N. Urban Highway Design Standards –

Federal design standards as they are applied in urban areas lead to conflicts between the land use and environmental objectives of the community and the design for roadway improvements. Of particular concern are the following circumstances:

- Boulevards/Main Streets – As a state highway built to operate as an arterial-type facility passes through a compact downtown type area, it is essential that the design treatment shift from an objective to move traffic quickly to an objective of slowing traffic, minimizing impacts and creating a compatible urban streetscape. These designs are chronically difficult to obtain approval for through FHWA. Design standards need to be revised to allow development and approval of these types of projects on a more routine basis.

Authorization projects that are being requested to implement this policy strategy include:

Project Description	Funding Request (\$millions)	Sponsor	Congressional Districts
Downtown Milwaukie Station Streetscape	\$5.00	City of Milwaukie	OR-3
Main Street Ped. & Streetscape Improvements (5 <sup>th</sup> St. to Division)	\$2.20	City of Gresham	OR-3
East Burnside/Couch Couplet, NE 3 <sup>rd</sup> Ave. to NE 14 <sup>th</sup> Ave.	\$6.00	City of Portland	OR-3
102 <sup>nd</sup> Ave. St. Improvement: Project Phase II - NE Glisan to SE Washington St.	\$5.00	City of Portland	OR-3

- Parkways – New or expanded expressways through rural and urbanizing areas on the outskirts of metropolitan areas are increasingly difficult to build due to their environmental impacts. As an alternative to a conventional 60-70 mph fully limited access facility, there should be the option of developing a fully or partially limited access facility built to a 35-45 mph standard. This would allow tighter vertical and horizontal curves and a smaller cross-section, thereby allowing a project that can be more readily accommodated following the contours of the land and minimizing impacts.

Authorization projects that are being requested to implement this policy strategy include:

Project Description	Funding Request (\$millions)	Sponsor	Congressional Districts
Sunrise System: Parkway Demonstration Project	\$30.00	Clackamas County	3

- Orphaned or Abandoned Highways – It is common for an old arterial-type state highway to be functionally inadequate for through traffic due to the development pattern that has been established over time. In many cases, these state highways were bypassed by higher speed limited access facilities. In these circumstances, the old state highway generally falls into a state of disrepair since it no longer is of highest priority for the state transportation department. A program could be established to transfer these facilities from the state agency to the local government in recognition of their defacto function as a local facility. Funding should be provided to bring the state highway to an urban street standard in exchange for a transfer of ownership.
- Green Infrastructure – One of the biggest sources of polluted stormwater run-off is from streets and highways. Since state and local governments are under the federal mandate of the Clean Water Act to address this issue, there should be further assistance through the federal transportation program to

develop green infrastructure approaches, including stormwater infiltration design guidelines, research and development of improved green techniques, funding eligibility for green techniques and performance monitoring to evaluate the effectiveness of these techniques over time.

Authorization projects that are being requested to implement this policy strategy include:

Project Description	Funding Request (\$millions)	Sponsor	Congressional Districts
Kellogg Creek Bridge Replacement	\$4.00	City of Milwaukie	OR-3
Tabor to the River/SE Division St. Reconstruction, Streetscape & Green Infrastructure Project	\$4.50	City of Portland	OR-3

Appropriation projects that are being requested to implement this policy strategy include:

Project Description	Funding Request (\$millions)	Sponsor	Congressional Districts
Kellogg Creek Bridge Replacement	\$1.50	City of Milwaukie	OR-1
Beaver Creek Culvert Replacement Project	\$6.00	Multnomah County	OR-5

## O. Research

In the last authorization bill, SAFETEA-LU, Congress significantly expanded the SURFACE TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND DEPLOYMENT (STRRD) PROGRAM and with it, the University Transportation Research Program. In doing so, Congress declared:

“research and development are critical to developing and maintaining a transportation system that meets the goals of safety, mobility, economic vitality, efficiency, equity, and environmental protection.”

The Portland region benefitted by this action by the designation of the Oregon Transportation Research and Education Consortium (OTREC) as one of the University Transportation Centers. This is a consortium of Portland State University (PSU), Oregon State University, University of Oregon and Oregon Institute of Technology, housed at PSU. Through this research center, the policy direction and programs that the Portland region are implemented are greatly improved through the application of independent and credible research capabilities which have been upgraded through the federal support for the program. This federal research connection also serves to communicate these Portland region-based research topics to the rest of the country for their implementation.

Appropriation projects that are being requested to implement this policy strategy include:

<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Funding Request (\$millions)</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Congressional Districts</b>
Oregon Transportation Research & Education Consortium (OTREC)	\$16.00	PSU/UO/OSU/OIT	OR-1,2,3,4,5

## Regional Project Requests

### Criteria

Projects must include a narrative describing how it is consistent with the region's integrated land use and transportation strategy – the 2040 Growth Concept (see narrative page 1).

Project must be in the financially constrained RTP.

The project request must be deliverable within the 6-year timeframe of the legislation.

The jurisdiction making the request must be prepared to deliver a logical project or project phase in the event of receipt of less than the requested amount. The project must be capable of being scaled down to have a smaller phase fit within the earmark or supplemented by the local government to make up the shortfall.

For requests for project planning or engineering or a partial funding request for construction, the jurisdiction should provide a financial strategy on how the ultimate project construction will be funded.

In light of the on-going development of the RTP and the likely 1-2 year period that will be required for Congress to adopt new authorization legislation, an adopted project list should remain flexible to be reexamined in the future.

The final project list should be adopted as part of the region's priorities. It should include:

1. Priorities adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission. Note: projects that the region recommended that the OTC consider as part of their priorities that the OTC does not include may be considered for inclusion under #4 below.
2. Priorities for New Start and Small Start Programs for continued implementation of the region's light rail, streetcar and bus rapid transit system consistent with the Federal Transit Administration's project development process and the upcoming High Capacity Transit System Plan. TriMet and Metro to recommend the list for JPACT's consideration.
3. Support for reauthorization through the research section of the bill of the Oregon Transportation Research and Education Consortium (OTREC).
4. Priorities for local projects to be funded through the "highway" component of the bill based upon the following guidelines:
  - a. The three counties will organize the priorities for the jurisdictions within each county.
  - b. Each county and their respective cities will endeavor to submit a list that is reasonable in the size of the overall request.
  - c. Each counties' and their respective cities lists will be prioritized at least to the level of top third, middle third and bottom third.
  - d. Metro requests should be for programs of region wide benefit.

## AUTHORIZATION PRIORITIES

Map Number	Project Description	Funding Request (\$millions)	Sponsor	Congressional District	Purpose	Program Category	Priority
<b>Northwest National Highway Project</b>							
	Columbia River Crossing Project	\$400.00	ODOT and WSDOT	OR-3/WA-3	Design/ROW/Construction	Project of National Significance	
<b>Oregon Transportation Commission Priorities</b>							
	I-84/Central Multnomah County ITS	\$3.00	City of Gresham	OR-3		System Management	
	I-205/I-5 Interchange	\$14.35	ODOT	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	
	OR 99W/McDonald/Gaarde Intersection	\$4.50	City of Tigard	OR-1		Metropolitan Mobility	
	I-205/Airport Way Interchange	\$20.00	Port of Portland	OR-3	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	A
	I-84/257th Ave. Troutdale Interchange	\$20.00	Port of Portland	OR-3	Construction	Freight	A
	Sunrise System Improvements	\$30.00	Clackamas County	OR-3	ROW/Construction	Freight	
<b>Transit Priorities</b>							
<b>Projects under Construction:</b>							
	South Corridor Light Rail (\$80 m. in 2010, \$25 m. in 2011)	\$345.40	TriMet	OR-3	Construction	New Starts	
	Eastside Streetcar Loop	\$75.00	City of Portland	OR-3	Construction	Small Starts	
<b>Projects in Development:</b>							
	Portland to Milwaukie - New Starts	\$850.60	TriMet	OR-3	PE/Final Design/Construction	New Starts	
	Columbia River Crossing - New Starts	\$750.00	ODOT/WSDOT	OR-3/WA-3	PE/Final Design/Construction	New Starts	
	Portland to Lake Oswego Streetcar - New Starts or Small Starts	\$237.30	City of Lake Oswego/Portland/TriMet	OR-5	PE/DEIS/FEIS	New or Small Starts	
<b>Projects that may begin Development:</b>							
	Portland Streetcar Planning and Alternatives Analysis	\$5.00	Portland/Gresham	OR-3	Planning/Alternatives Analysis	Small Starts	
	Portland to Tigard and Sherwood/99W/Barbur Blvd. Alternatives Analysis		City of Tigard/TriMet	OR-1	Planning/PE	New Starts	
	Hillsboro to Forest Grove Alternative Analysis		City of Forest Grove/TriMet	OR-1	Planning/PE	New Starts	
	East Metro North South HCT Alternative Analysis		City of Gresham/TriMet	OR-3	Planning/PE	New Starts	
	Light Rail to Oregon City Alternative Analysis		Clackamas County/TriMet	OR-5	Planning/PE	New Starts	
<b>Bus-related Improvements:</b>							
	Wilsonville SMART Fleet Services Facility	\$7.00	City of Wilsonville/SMART	OR-5	Construction	Transit	A
	SMART Bus Replacements (\$2.7 million per year/6-years)	\$16.20	City of Wilsonville/SMART	OR-5	Acquisition	Transit	B
	Wilsonville SMART Offices/Administration Facility	\$1.50	City of Wilsonville/SMART	OR-5	Construction	Transit	C
	TriMet Buses (\$15.4 million per year/6-years)	\$92.40	TriMet	OR-1,3,5	Acquisition	Transit	
	West Metro HCT Bus Rapid Transit Alternatives Analysis		Washington Co./TriMet/Metro	OR-1	AA	Transit	
	Central East HCT Bus Rapid Transit Alternatives Analysis		City of Gresham/TriMet/Metro	OR-3	AA	Transit	
<b>Other Transit Improvements:</b>							
	College Station TOD (at PSU)	\$10.00	PSU/TriMet	OR-1	Construction	Transit Oriented Development	
	Gresham Civic Neighborhood Station/TOD/Parking Structure	\$5.00	City of Gresham	OR-3	Acquisition	Transit Oriented Development	
	Union Station Rehabilitation	\$24.00	City of Portland	OR-1	Construction	Intercity Passenger Rail	
	Prototype Diesel Multiple Unit (commuter rail vehicles)	\$5.00	TriMet	OR-1,3,5	Engineer/manufacture	Transit	
<b>Demand Management and System Management</b>							
	Regional Arterial Management Program (signal system coordination)	\$12.00	Metro	OR-1,3,5	PE/Construction	System Management	A
	Drive Less Save More Marketing Pilot Project	\$4.50	Metro	OR-1,3,5	Marketing	Transportation Demand Management	A
	Regional Multi-Modal Safety Education Initiative	\$4.50	Metro	OR-1,3,5	Planning/Implementation	Managing the Existing System	A
	Transit Station Area Connectivity Program to promote transit oriented development	\$20.00	Metro	OR-1,3,5	PE/ROW/Construction	Transit Oriented Development	A
<b>Transit Priorities</b>							
	Non-Motorized Mobility Strategy (on and off-street bike paths)	\$75.00	Metro	OR-1,3,5	PE/ROW/Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	A
	Congressional District 1 Trails/Bikepath Program	\$5.00	Washington County & Cities	OR-1	PE/ROW/Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	A
	Congressional District 3 Trails/Bikepath Program	\$5.00	Portland/Gresham	OR-3	PE/ROW/Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	A
	Congressional District 5 Trails/Bikepath Program	\$5.00	Clackamas County & Cities	OR-5	PE/ROW/Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	A



Map Number	Project Description	Funding Request (\$Millions)	Sponsor	Congressional District	Purpose	Program Category	Priority
<b>Road, Street and Bridge Priorities</b>							
<b>Clackamas County Jurisdictions</b>							
	Sunrise System: Parkway Demonstration Project	\$30.00	Clackamas County	OR-3	Planning	Parkway	A
	172nd Ave. Improvements (Sunnyside Rd. to 177th Ave.)	\$15.00	Happy Valley	OR-5	ROW/PE	Metropolitan Mobility	A
	Kellogg Creek Bridge Replacement	\$4.00	City of Milwaukie	OR-3	Construction	Green Infrastructure	A
	Downtown Milwaukie Station Streetscape	\$5.00	City of Milwaukie	OR-3	Construction	Blvd./Main Streets	A
	OR 213: I-205 - Redland Road (Jug Handle Project)	\$12.00	City of Oregon City	OR-5	PE/Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	
	Kinsman Road Freight Route Extension Project, Phase I	\$10.50	City of Wilsonville	OR-5		Freight	A
<b>Multnomah County Jurisdictions</b>							
	Rockwood Town Center	\$10.00	City of Gresham	OR-3	PE/Construction	Transit Oriented Development	
	Main Street Ped. & Streetscape Improvements (5th St. to Division)	\$2.20	City of Gresham	OR-3	PE/Construction	Blvd./Main Streets	
	Troutdale Reynolds Industrial Park Road Improvements	\$6.00	Port of Portland	OR-3	Construction	Freight	A
	Portland Citywide Bicycle Boulevard Construction	\$25.00	City of Portland	OR-1,3	PE/ROW/Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	A
	East Burnside/Couch Couplet, NE 3rd Ave. to NE 14th Ave.	\$6.00	City of Portland	OR-3	PE/Construction	Blvd./Main Streets	A
	102nd Ave. St. Improvement: Project Phase II - NE Glisan to SE Washington St.	\$5.00	City of Portland	OR-3	Construction	Blvd./Main Streets	A
	SW Capitol Hwy: Multnomah to Taylors Ferry	\$10.00	City of Portland	OR-1	PE/Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	A
	Tabor to the River/SE Division St. Reconstruction, Streetscape & Green Infrastructure Project	\$4.50	City of Portland	OR-3	PE/Construction	Green Infrastructure	A
	Sellwood Bridge on SE Tacoma St. between Hwy 43 & SE 6th Ave.	\$100.00	Multnomah County	OR-3,5	Construction	Bridges	A
<b>Washington County Jurisdictions</b>							
	OR 10 Farmington Rd. at Murray Blvd. Intersection Safety & Mobility Improvements	\$8.00	City of Beaverton	OR-1	ROW/Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	A
	Nimbus Extension from Hall Blvd. To Denney Rd.	\$15.40	City of Beaverton	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	B
	Hwy 26/Shute Rd. Interchange	\$10.00	City of Hillsboro	OR-1	PE/ROW	Metropolitan Mobility	A
	124th Ave. Extension: Tualatin-Sherwood to Tonquin	\$8.00	Washington County	OR-1	Preliminary Engineering	Freight	A
	Bethany Overcrossing of Hwy 26	\$10.00	Washington County	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	A
	OR10: Olseon/Scholls Ferry Intersection	\$11.00	Washington County	OR-1	ROW	Metropolitan Mobility	B
	Walker Road: 158th to Murray	\$10.00	Washington County	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	B
	Farmington Rd.: Kinnaman to 198th	\$30.00	Washington County	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	C
	Hwy. 99W/Sunset/Elwert/Kruger Intersection	\$2.50	City of Sherwood	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	B
	72nd Ave.: Dartmouth St. to Hampton St.	\$13.00	City of Tigard	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	B
<b>Research</b>							
	Oregon Transportation Research & Education Consortium (OTREC)	\$16.00	PSU/UO/OSU/OIT	OR-1,2,3,4,5	Research	Research	A
<b>Regional Support for Transit Priorities Outside Metro</b>							
	City of Sandy Transit	\$1.50	City of Sandy	OR-3	Acquisition	Transit	A
	Canby Area Transit	\$1.25	City of Canby	OR-5	Acquisition	Transit	
	South Clackamas Transit	\$0.75	City of Molalla	OR-5	Acquisition	Transit	

**\*Note: The region is supporting the Rails-to Trails Conservancy's (RTC) proposal to establish a program to invest \$50 million in each of 40 areas to substantially increase biking and walking. Both Metro and Portland have submitted a "Case Statement" to RTC to be a designated area. If this approach is successful, the \$75 million request would be through this program. If this is not successful, a Bikepath & Trails earmark in each of the Congressional Districts of \$5 million each is requested through the "High Priority Projects" category. The bikepaths and trails listed below are the ones under consideration to be funded depending upon funding level.**

<b>Clackamas County Jurisdictions</b>					
	French Prairie Bike-Ped-Emergency Bridge Over Willamette River	\$12.60	City of Wilsonville	OR-5	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Springwater to Trolley Trail - 17th Avenue from Ochoco to McLoughlin Blvd.	\$3.20	NCPRD/City of Milwaukie	OR-3	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Mt. Scott Creek Trail - Mt. Talbert to Springwater Corridor	\$4.60	NCPRD/Happy Valley	OR-3	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Scouter's Mt. Trail - Springwater/Powell Butte to Springwater	\$7.37	NCPRD/Happy Valley	OR-4	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Phillips Creek Trail - I-205 Trail to N. Clackamas Greenway	\$2.27	NCPRD/Clackamas County	OR-5	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Monroe Bike Blvd.	\$2.00	City of Milwaukie	OR-3	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Iron Mtn. Bike Lanes - 10th St. to Bryant Rd.	\$3.80	City of Lake Oswego	OR-3	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Carmen Drive Sidewalk and Bike Lanes from Meadow Rd. to I-5	\$1.70	City of Lake Oswego	OR-3	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Pilkington Sidewalk and Bike Lanes from Boones Ferry to Childs Rd.	\$5.25	City of Lake Oswego	OR-3	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
<b>Multnomah County Jurisdictions</b>					
	Gresham/Fairview Trail, Phase 4/5	\$6.10	City of Gresham	OR-3	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
<b>Washington County Jurisdictions</b>					
	Westside Regional Rail Trail		Washington County	OR-1	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Council Creek Regional Trail: Banks to Hillsboro	\$5.25	Washington County	OR-1	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Tonquin Trail/Cedar Creek Corridor	\$2.50	Washington County	OR-1	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian

**FY '10 APPROPRIATIONS PRIORITIES**

Map Number	Project Description	Funding Request (\$Millions)	Sponsor	Congressional District	Source of Federal Funds	Purpose	Program Category
<b>Northwest National Highway Project</b>							
	I-5 Columbia River Crossing	\$3.00	ODOT & WSDOT	OR-3/WA-3	Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	PE/Final Design/ROW	Project of National Significance
<b>Regional Transit Priorities</b>							
	South Corridor Light Rail	\$80.00	TriMet	OR-3	FTA 5309 New Starts	Construction	New Starts
	Eastside Streetcar Loop	\$25.00	City of Portland	OR-3	FTA 5309 Small Starts	Construction	Small Starts
	Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail	\$25.00	TriMet	OR-3	FTA 5309 New Starts	Final Design/ROW	New Starts
	Portland to Lake Oswego Streetcar	\$4.00	City of Lake Oswego/TriMet/Metro	OR-5	FTA 5339 Alternatives Analysis	DEIS/FEIS	New Starts/Small Starts
	Next Corridor Alternatives Analysis	\$1.00	Metro	OR-1,3,5	FTA 5339 Alternatives Analysis	AA	New Starts
	TriMet Bus Replacement	\$15.40	TriMet	OR-1,3,5	FTA 5309 Bus & Bus Facilities	Acquisition	Transit
	Wilsonville SMART Fleet Services Facility	\$1.20	City of Wilsonville/SMART	OR-5	FTA 5309 Bus & Bus Facilities	Construction	Transit
<b>Regional Bike, Pedestrian and Trail Priorities</b>							
	SE 122nd Ave. Sidewalk Construction	\$2.12	City of Portland	OR-3		Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	High Priority Trail Projects in Washington County	\$1.00	Washington County	OR-1			Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	17th Avenue Trolley Trail - Springwater Connector	\$3.36	City of Milwaukie	OR-1			Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	French Prarie Bike-Ped Emergency Bridge over Willamette River, Wilsonville	\$2.10	City of Wilsonville	OR-5			Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	I-84/Sandy River Bridge Trail Connections	\$5.00	ODOT/Metro/Troutdale/Mult. Co.	OR-3		Final Design/Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
<b>Roads, Street and Bridge Priorities</b>							
	Springwater Industrial Area Phase I Access	\$5.00	City of Gresham	OR-3		PE/ROW/Construction	Freight
	SW Vermont St./Capitol Highway - 30th Ave. Intersection Reconfiguration	\$1.71	City of Portland	OR-1		Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	OR 213/Redland Road Lane Improvements	\$5.40	City of Oregon City	OR-5		PE/Construction	Metropolitan Mobility
	Tooze Road Improvements	\$2.50	City of Wilsonville	OR-5		ROW/Construction	Metropolitan Mobility
	Kellogg Creek Bridge Replacement	\$1.50	City of Milwaukie	OR-1		Construction	Green Infrastructure
	122nd/129th Ave. Improvements - Sunnyside to King Road	\$2.00	City of Happy Valley	OR-3		PE/ROW	Metropolitan Mobility
	124th Ave. Extension: Tualatin-Sherwood to Tonquin	\$4.00	Washington County	OR-1		PE	Freight
	SW Farmington Road Arterial Adaptive Signal Control	\$0.67	City of Beaverton	OR-1		Construction	System Management
<b>Regional Support for Transit Priorities Outside Metro</b>							
	City of Sandy Transit	\$0.60	City of Sandy	OR-3		Acquisition	Transit
	Canby Area Transit	\$0.60	City of Canby	OR-5	FTA 5309 Bus & Bus Facilities	Acquisition	Transit
	South Clackamas Transportation District Bus Facility	\$0.60	SCTD/Molalla	OR-5	FTA 5309 Bus & Bus Facilities	Acquisition	Transit
<b>Non Transportation Bills</b>							
	Columbia River Channel Deepening Project	\$25.00	Port of Portland		Energy & Water	Construction	Freight
	Beaver Creek Culvert Replacement Project	\$6.00	Multnomah County	OR-5	Fish & Wildlife	Construction	Green Infrastructure
	Willamette Locks	\$2.00	Clackamas County	OR-5	Army Corps of Engineers	Inspection and Repair	Managing the Existing System
	Sandy River Trail Connections	\$5.00	Multnomah County	OR-3	National Scenic Area Act	Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian

Materials following this page were distributed at the meeting.

## AUTHORIZATION PRIORITIES

Map Number	Project Description	Funding Request (\$millions)	Sponsor	Congressional District	Purpose	Program Category	Priority
<b>Northwest National Highway Project</b>							
	Columbia River Crossing Project	\$400.00	ODOT and WSDOT	OR-3/WA-3	Design/ROW/Construction	Project of National Significance	
<b>Oregon Transportation Commission Priorities</b>							
	I-84/Central Multnomah County ITS	\$3.00	City of Gresham	OR-3		System Management	
	I-205/I-5 Interchange	\$14.35	ODOT	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	
	OR 99W/McDonald/Gaarde Intersection	\$4.50	City of Tigard	OR-1		Metropolitan Mobility	
	I-205/Airport Way Interchange	\$20.00	Port of Portland	OR-3	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	A
	I-84/257th Ave. Troutdale Interchange	\$20.00	Port of Portland	OR-3	Construction	Freight	A
	Sunrise System Improvements	\$30.00	Clackamas County	OR-3	ROW/Construction	Freight	
<b>Transit Priorities</b>							
<b>Projects under Construction:</b>							
	South Corridor Light Rail (\$80 m. in 2010, \$25 m. in 2011)	\$345.40	TriMet	OR-3	Construction	New Starts	
	Eastside Streetcar Loop	\$75.00	City of Portland	OR-3	Construction	Small Starts	
<b>Projects in Development:</b>							
	Portland to Milwaukie - New Starts	\$850.60	TriMet	OR-3	PE/Final Design/Construction	New Starts	
	Columbia River Crossing - New Starts	\$750.00	ODOT/WSDOT	OR-3/WA-3	PE/Final Design/Construction	New Starts	
	Portland to Lake Oswego Streetcar - New Starts or Small Starts	\$237.30	City of Lake Oswego/Portland/TriMet	OR-5	PE/DEIS/FEIS	New or Small Starts	
<b>Projects that may begin Development:</b>							
	Portland Streetcar Planning and Alternatives Analysis	\$5.00	Portland/Gresham	OR-3	Planning/Alternatives Analysis	Small Starts	
	Portland to Tigard and Sherwood/99W/Barbur Blvd. Alternatives Analysis		City of Tigard/TriMet	OR-1	Planning/PE	New Starts	
	Hillsboro to Forest Grove Alternative Analysis		City of Forest Grove/TriMet	OR-1	Planning/PE	New Starts	
	East Metro North South HCT Alternative Analysis		City of Gresham/TriMet	OR-3	Planning/PE	New Starts	
	Light Rail to Oregon City Alternative Analysis		Clackamas County/TriMet	OR-5	Planning/PE	New Starts	
<b>Bus-related Improvements:</b>							
	Wilsonville SMART Fleet Services Facility	\$7.00	City of Wilsonville/SMART	OR-5	Construction	Transit	A
	SMART Bus Replacements (\$2.7 million per year/6-years)	\$16.20	City of Wilsonville/SMART	OR-5	Acquisition	Transit	B
	Wilsonville SMART Offices/Administration Facility	\$1.50	City of Wilsonville/SMART	OR-5	Construction	Transit	C
	TriMet Buses (\$15.4 million per year/6-years)	\$92.40	TriMet	OR-1,3,5	Acquisition	Transit	
	West Metro HCT Bus Rapid Transit Alternatives Analysis		Washington Co./TriMet/Metro	OR-1	AA	Transit	
	Central East HCT Bus Rapid Transit Alternatives Analysis		City of Gresham/TriMet/Metro	OR-3	AA	Transit	
<b>Other Transit Improvements:</b>							
	College Station TOD (at PSU)	\$10.00	PSU/TriMet	OR-1	Construction	Transit Oriented Development	
	Gresham Civic Neighborhood Station/TOD/Parking Structure	\$5.00	City of Gresham	OR-3	Acquisition	Transit Oriented Development	
	Union Station Rehabilitation	\$24.00	City of Portland	OR-1	Construction	Intercity Passenger Rail	
	Prototype Diesel Multiple Unit (commuter rail vehicles)	\$5.00	TriMet	OR-1,3,5	Engineer/manufacture	Transit	
<b>Demand Management and System Management</b>							
	Regional Arterial Management Program (signal system coordination)	\$12.00	Metro	OR-1,3,5	PE/Construction	System Management	A
	Drive Less Save More Marketing Pilot Project	\$4.50	Metro	OR-1,3,5	Marketing	Transportation Demand Management	A
	Regional Multi-Modal Safety Education Initiative	\$4.50	Metro	OR-1,3,5	Planning/Implementation	Managing the Existing System	A
	Transit Station Area Connectivity Program to promote transit oriented development	\$20.00	Metro	OR-1,3,5	PE/ROW/Construction	Transit Oriented Development	A
<b>Transit Priorities</b>							
	Non-Motorized Mobility Strategy (on and off-street bike paths)	\$75.00	Metro	OR-1,3,5	PE/ROW/Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	A
	Congressional District 1 Trails/Bikepath Program	\$5.00	Washington County & Cities	OR-1	PE/ROW/Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	A
	Congressional District 3 Trails/Bikepath Program	\$5.00	Portland/Gresham	OR-3	PE/ROW/Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	A
	Congressional District 5 Trails/Bikepath Program	\$5.00	Clackamas County & Cities	OR-5	PE/ROW/Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	A

Map Number	Project Description	Funding Request (\$Millions)	Sponsor	Congressional District	Purpose	Program Category	Priority
<b>Road, Street and Bridge Priorities</b>							
<b>Clackamas County Jurisdictions</b>							
	Sunrise System: Parkway Demonstration Project	\$30.00	Clackamas County	OR-3	Planning	Parkway	A
	172nd Ave. Improvements (Sunnyside Rd. to 177th Ave.)	\$15.00	Happy Valley	OR-5	ROW/PE	Metropolitan Mobility	A
	Kellogg Creek Bridge Replacement	\$4.00	City of Milwaukie	OR-3	Construction	Green Infrastructure	A
	Downtown Milwaukie Station Streetscape	\$5.00	City of Milwaukie	OR-3	Construction	Blvd./Main Streets	A
	OR 213: I-205 - Redland Road (Jug Handle Project)	\$12.00	City of Oregon City	OR-5	PE/Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	
	Kinsman Road Freight Route Extension Project, Phase I	\$10.50	City of Wilsonville	OR-5		Freight	A
<b>Multnomah County Jurisdictions</b>							
	Rockwood Town Center	\$10.00	City of Gresham	OR-3	PE/Construction	Transit Oriented Development	
	Main Street Ped. & Streetscape Improvements (5th St. to Division)	\$2.20	City of Gresham	OR-3	PE/Construction	Blvd./Main Streets	
	Troutdale Reynolds Industrial Park Road Improvements	\$6.00	Port of Portland	OR-3	Construction	Freight	A
	Portland Citywide Bicycle Boulevard Construction	\$25.00	City of Portland	OR-1,3	PE/ROW/Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	A
	East Burnside/Couch Couplet, NE 3rd Ave. to NE 14th Ave.	\$6.00	City of Portland	OR-3	PE/Construction	Blvd./Main Streets	A
	102nd Ave. St. Improvement: Project Phase II - NE Glisan to SE Washington St.	\$5.00	City of Portland	OR-3	Construction	Blvd./Main Streets	A
	SW Capitol Hwy: Multnomah to Taylors Ferry	\$10.00	City of Portland	OR-1	PE/Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	A
	Tabor to the River/SE Division St. Reconstruction, Streetscape & Green Infrastructure Project	\$4.50	City of Portland	OR-3	PE/Construction	Green Infrastructure	A
	Sellwood Bridge on SE Tacoma St. between Hwy 43 & SE 6th Ave.	\$100.00	Multnomah County	OR-3,5	Construction	Bridges	A
<b>Washington County Jurisdictions</b>							
	OR 10 Farmington Rd. at Murray Blvd. Intersection Safety & Mobility Improvements	\$8.00	City of Beaverton	OR-1	ROW/Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	A
	Nimbus Extension from Hall Blvd. To Denney Rd.	\$15.40	City of Beaverton	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	B
	Hwy 26/Shute Rd. Interchange	\$10.00	City of Hillsboro	OR-1	PE/ROW	Metropolitan Mobility	A
	124th Ave. Extension: Tualatin-Sherwood to Tonquin	\$4.00	Washington County	OR-1	Preliminary Engineering	Freight	A
	Bethany Overcrossing of Hwy 26	\$10.00	Washington County	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	A
	OR10: Olseon/Scholls Ferry Intersection	\$11.00	Washington County	OR-1	ROW	Metropolitan Mobility	B
	Walker Road: 158th to Murray	\$10.00	Washington County	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	B
	Farmington Rd.: Kinnaman to 198th	\$30.00	Washington County	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	C
	Hwy. 99W/Sunset/Elwert/Kruger Intersection	\$2.50	City of Sherwood	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	B
	72nd Ave.: Dartmouth St. to Hampton St.	\$13.00	City of Tigard	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	B
<b>Research</b>							
	Oregon Transportation Research & Education Consortium (OTREC)	\$16.00	PSU/UO/OSU/OIT	OR-1,2,3,4,5	Research	Research	A
<b>Regional Support for Transit Priorities Outside Metro</b>							
	City of Sandy Transit	\$1.50	City of Sandy	OR-3	Acquisition	Transit	A
	Canby Area Transit	\$1.25	City of Canby	OR-5	Acquisition	Transit	
	South Clackamas Transit	\$0.75	City of Molalla	OR-5	Acquisition	Transit	

**\*Note: The region is supporting the Rails-to Trails Conservancy's (RTC) proposal to establish a program to invest \$50 million in each of 40 areas to substantially increase biking and walking. Both Metro and Portland have submitted a "Case Statement" to RTC to be a designated area. If this approach is successful, the \$75 million request would be through this program. If this in not successful, a Bikepath & Trails earmark in each of the Congressional Districts of \$5 million each is requested through the "High Priority Projects" category. The bikepaths and trails listed below are the ones under consideration to be funded depending upon funding level.**

<b>Clackamas County Jurisdictions</b>					
	French Prairie Bike-Ped-Emergency Bridge Over Willamette River	\$12.60	City of Wilsonville	OR-5	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Springwater to Trolley Trail - 17th Avenue from Ochoco to McLoughlin Blvd.	\$3.20	NCPRD/City of Milwaukie	OR-3	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Mt. Scott Creek Trail - Mt. Talbert to Springwater Corridor	\$4.60	NCPRD/Happy Valley	OR-3	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Scouter's Mt. Trail - Springwater/Powell Butte to Springwater	\$7.37	NCPRD/Happy Valley	OR-4	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Phillips Creek Trail - I-205 Trail to N. Clackamas Greenway	\$2.27	NCPRD/Clackamas County	OR-5	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Monroe Bike Blvd.	\$2.00	City of Milwaukie	OR-3	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Iron Mtn. Bike Lanes - 10th St. to Bryant Rd.	\$3.80	City of Lake Oswego	OR-3	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Carmen Drive Sidewalk and Bike Lanes from Meadow Rd. to I-5	\$1.70	City of Lake Oswego	OR-3	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Pilkington Sidewalk and Bike Lanes from Boones Ferry to Childs Rd.	\$5.25	City of Lake Oswego	OR-3	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
<b>Multnomah County Jurisdictions</b>					
	Gresham/Fairview Trail, Phase 4/5	\$6.10	City of Gresham	OR-3	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
<b>Washington County Jurisdictions</b>					
	Westside Regional Rail Trail	\$9.00	Tualatin Hills Parks & Rec. District (THPRD)	OR-1	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Council Creek Regional Trail: Banks to Hillsboro	\$5.25	City of Forest Grove	OR-1	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Tonquin Trail/Cedar Creek Corridor	\$2.50	City of Sherwood	OR-1	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Fanno Creek Trail Projects	\$0.70	City of Tigard	OR-1	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian

**DRAFT #4, b.**  
**Revised Format**

**AUTHORIZATION PRIORITIES**

Map Number	Project Description	Funding Request (\$millions)	Sponsor	Congressional District	Purpose	Program Category	Priority
<b>Metropolitan Mobility</b>							
	I-205/I-5 Interchange	\$14.35	ODOT	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	
	OR 99W/McDonald/Gaarde Intersection	\$4.50	City of Tigard	OR-1		Metropolitan Mobility	
	I-205/Airport Way Interchange	\$20.00	Port of Portland	OR-3	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	A
	172nd Ave. Improvements (Sunnyside Rd. to 177th Ave.)	\$15.00	Happy Valley	OR-5	ROW/PE	Metropolitan Mobility	A
	OR 213: I-205 - Redland Road (Jug Handle Project)	\$12.00	City of Oregon City	OR-5	PE/Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	
	OR 10 Farmington Rd. at Murray Blvd. Intersection Safety & Mobility Improvements	\$8.00	City of Beaverton	OR-1	ROW/Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	A
	Hwy 26/Shute Rd. Interchange	\$10.00	City of Hillsboro	OR-1	PE/ROW	Metropolitan Mobility	A
	Bethany Overcrossing of Hwy 26	\$10.00	Washington County	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	A
	OR10: Olseon/Scholls Ferry Intersection	\$11.00	Washington County	OR-1	ROW	Metropolitan Mobility	B
	Walker Road: 158th to Murray	\$10.00	Washington County	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	B
	Farmington Rd.: Kinnaman to 198th	\$30.00	Washington County	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	C
	Hwy. 99W/Sunset/Elwert/Kruger Intersection	\$2.50	City of Sherwood	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	B
	72nd Ave.: Dartmouth St. to Hampton St.	\$13.00	City of Tigard	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	B
	Nimbus Extension from Hall Blvd. To Denney Rd.	\$15.40	City of Beaverton	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility	B
<b>Freight</b>							
	I-84/257th Ave. Troutdale Interchange	\$20.00	Port of Portland	OR-3	Construction	Freight	A
	Sunrise System Improvements	\$30.00	Clackamas County	OR-3	ROW/Construction	Freight	
	Kinsman Road Freight Route Extension Project, Phase I	\$10.50	City of Wilsonville	OR-5		Freight	A
	Troutdale Reynolds Industrial Park Road Improvements	\$6.00	Port of Portland	OR-3	Construction	Freight	A
	124th Ave. Extension: Tualatin-Sherwood to Tonquin	\$4.00	Washington County	OR-1	Preliminary Engineering	Freight	A
<b>Managing the Existing System</b>							
	Regional Multi-Modal Safety Education Initiative	\$4.50	Metro	OR-1,3,5	Planning/Implementation	Managing the Existing System	A
<b>System Management</b>							
	I-84/Central Multnomah County ITS	\$3.00	City of Gresham	OR-3		System Management	
	Regional Arterial Management Program (signal system coordination)	\$12.00	Metro	OR-1,3,5	PE/Construction	System Management	A
<b>Demand Management</b>							
	Drive Less Save More Marketing Pilot Project	\$4.50	Metro	OR-1,3,5	Marketing	Transportation Demand Management	A
<b>Transit Oriented Development</b>							
	College Station TOD (at PSU)	\$10.00	PSU/TriMet	OR-1	Construction	Transit Oriented Development	
	Gresham Civic Neighborhood Station/TOD/Parking Structure	\$5.00	City of Gresham	OR-3	Acquisition	Transit Oriented Development	
	Transit Station Area Connectivity Program to promote transit oriented development	\$20.00	Metro	OR-1,3,5	PE/ROW/Construction	Transit Oriented Development	A
	Rockwood Town Center	\$10.00	City of Gresham	OR-3	PE/Construction	Transit Oriented Development	
<b>Bridges</b>							
	Sellwood Bridge on SE Tacoma St. between Hwy 43 & SE 6th Ave.	\$100.00	Multnomah County	OR-3,5	Construction	Bridges	A
<b>Intercity Passenger Rail</b>							
	Union Station Rehabilitation	\$24.00	City of Portland	OR-1	Construction	Intercity Passenger Rail	
<b>Transit and Greenhouse Gases</b>							
	TriMet Buses (\$15.4 million per year/6-years)	\$92.40	TriMet	OR-1,3,5	Acquisition	Transit	
	West Metro HCT Bus Rapid Transit Alternatives Analysis		Washington Co./TriMet/Metro	OR-1	AA	Transit	
	Central East HCT Bus Rapid Transit Alternatives Analysis		City of Gresham/TriMet/Metro	OR-3	AA	Transit	
	Prototype Diesel Multiple Unit (commuter rail vehicles)	\$5.00	TriMet	OR-1,3,5	Engineer/manufacture	Transit	
	Wilsonville SMART Fleet Services Facility	\$7.00	City of Wilsonville/SMART	OR-5	Construction	Transit	A
	SMART Bus Replacements (\$2.7 million per year/6-years)	\$16.20	City of Wilsonville/SMART	OR-5	Acquisition	Transit	B
	Wilsonville SMART Offices/Administration Facility	\$1.50	City of Wilsonville/SMART	OR-5	Construction	Transit	C
	City of Sandy Transit	\$1.50	City of Sandy	OR-3	Acquisition	Transit	A
	Canby Area Transit	\$1.25	City of Canby	OR-5	Acquisition	Transit	
	South Clackamas Transit	\$0.75	City of Molalla	OR-5	Acquisition	Transit	



Map Number	Project Description	Funding Request (\$millions)	Sponsor	Congressional District	Purpose	Program Category	Priority
<b>New Starts/Small Starts</b>							
	South Corridor Light Rail (\$80 m. in 2010, \$25 m. in 2011)	\$345.40	TriMet	OR-3	Construction	New Starts	
	Eastside Streetcar Loop	\$75.00	City of Portland	OR-3	Construction	Small Starts	
	Portland to Milwaukie - New Starts	\$850.60	TriMet	OR-3	PE/Final Design/Construction	New Starts	
	Portland to Lake Oswego Streetcar - New Starts or Small Starts	\$237.30	City of Lake Oswego/Portland/TriMet	OR-5	PE/DEIS/FEIS	New or Small Starts	
	Columbia River Crossing - New Starts	\$750.00	ODOT/WSDOT	OR-3/WA-3	PE/Final Design/Construction	New Starts	
	Portland to Tigard and Sherwood/99W/Barbur Blvd. Alternatives Analysis		City of Tigard/TriMet	OR-1	Planning/PE	New Starts	
	Hillsboro to Forest Grove Alternative Analysis		City of Forest Grove/TriMet	OR-1	Planning/PE	New Starts	
	East Metro North South HCT Alternative Analysis		City of Gresham/TriMet	OR-3	Planning/PE	New Starts	
	Light Rail to Oregon City Alternative Analysis		Clackamas County/TriMet	OR-5	Planning/PE	New Starts	
	Portland Streetcar Planning and Alternatives Analysis	\$5.00	Portland/Gresham	OR-3	Planning/Alternatives Analysis	Small Starts	
<b>Walking and Cycling</b>							
<b>If the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy Proposal is implemented:</b>							
	Non-Motorized Mobility Strategy (on and off-street bike paths)	\$75.00	Metro	OR-1,3,5	PE/ROW/Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	A
	Portland Citywide Bicycle Boulevard Construction	\$25.00	City of Portland	OR-1,3	PE/ROW/Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	A
<b>If the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy Proposal is not implemented:</b>							
	Congressional District 1 Trails/Bikepath Program	\$5.00	Washington County & Cities	OR-1	PE/ROW/Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	A
	Congressional District 3 Trails/Bikepath Program	\$5.00	Portland/Gresham	OR-3	PE/ROW/Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	A
	Congressional District 5 Trails/Bikepath Program	\$5.00	Clackamas County & Cities	OR-5	PE/ROW/Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	A
<b>Projects under consideration:</b>							
<b>Multnomah County Jurisdictions</b>							
	Gresham/Fairview Trail, Phase 4/5	\$6.10	City of Gresham	OR-3		Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	
	SW Capitol Hwy: Multnomah to Taylors Ferry	\$10.00	City of Portland	OR-1	PE/Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	A
<b>Clackamas County Jurisdictions</b>							
	French Prairie Bike-Ped-Emergency Bridge Over Willamette River	\$12.60	City of Wilsonville	OR-5		Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	
	Springwater to Trolley Trail - 17th Avenue from Ochoco to McLoughlin Blvd.	\$3.20	NCPRD/City of Milwaukie	OR-3		Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	
	Mt. Scott Creek Trail - Mt. Talbert to Springwater Corridor	\$4.60	NCPRD/Happy Valley	OR-3		Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	
	Scouter's Mt. Trail - Springwater/Powell Butte to Springwater	\$7.37	NCPRD/Happy Valley	OR-4		Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	
	Phillips Creek Trail - I-205 Trail to N. Clackamas Greenway	\$2.27	NCPRD/Clackamas County	OR-5		Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	
	Monroe Bike Blvd.	\$2.00	City of Milwaukie	OR-3		Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	
	Iron Mtn. Bike Lanes - 10th St. to Bryant Rd.	\$3.80	City of Lake Oswego	OR-3		Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	
	Carmen Drive Sidewalk and Bike Lanes from Meadow Rd. to I-5	\$1.70	City of Lake Oswego	OR-3		Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	
	Pilkington Sidewalk and Bike Lanes from Boones Ferry to Childs Rd.	\$5.25	City of Lake Oswego	OR-3		Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	
<b>Washington County Jurisdictions</b>							
	Council Creek Regional Trail: Banks to Hillsboro	\$5.25	City of Forest Grove	OR-1		Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	
	Tonquin Trail/Cedar Creek Corridor	\$2.50	City of Sherwood	OR-1		Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	
	Fanno Creek Trail Projects	\$0.70	City of Tigard				
	Westside Regional Rail Trail	\$9.00	Tualatin Hills Parks & Rec. Districts (THPRD)	OR-1		Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian	
<b>Critical Highway Corridors</b>							
	Columbia River Crossing Project	\$400.00	ODOT and WSDOT	OR-3/WA-3	Design/ROW/Construction	Project of National Significance	
<b>Boulevards/Main Streets</b>							
	Downtown Milwaukie Station Streetscape	\$5.00	City of Milwaukie	OR-3	Construction	Blvd./Main Streets	A
	Main Street Ped. & Streetscape Improvements (5th St. to Division)	\$2.20	City of Gresham	OR-3	PE/Construction	Blvd./Main Streets	
	East Burnside/Couch Couplet, NE 3rd Ave. to NE 14th Ave.	\$6.00	City of Portland	OR-3	PE/Construction	Blvd./Main Streets	A
	102nd Ave. St. Improvement: Project Phase II - NE Glisan to SE Washington St.	\$5.00	City of Portland	OR-3	Construction	Blvd./Main Streets	A
<b>Parkways</b>							
	Sunrise System: Parkway Demonstration Project	\$30.00	Clackamas County	OR-3	Planning	Parkway	A
<b>Green Infrastructure</b>							
	Kellogg Creek Bridge Replacement	\$4.00	City of Milwaukie	OR-3	Construction	Green Infrastructure	A
	Tabor to the River/SE Division St. Reconstruction, Streetscape & Green Infrastructure Project	\$4.50	City of Portland	OR-3	PE/Construction	Green Infrastructure	A
<b>Research</b>							
	Oregon Transportation Research & Education Consortium (OTREC)	\$16.00	PSU/UO/OSU/OIT	OR-1,2,3,4,5	Research	Research	A

**\*Note:** The region is supporting the Rails-to Trails Conservancy's (RTC) proposal to establish a program to invest \$50 million in each of 40 areas to substantially increase biking and walking. Both Metro and Portland have submitted a "Case Statement" to RTC to be a designated area. If this approach is successful, the \$75 million request would be through this program. If this is not successful, a Bikepath & Trails earmark in each of the Congressional Districts of \$5 million each is requested through the "High Priority Projects" category. The bikepaths and trails listed below are the ones under consideration to be funded depending upon funding level.

**DRAFT #4, b.**  
**Revised Format**

**FY '10 APPROPRIATIONS PRIORITIES**

Map Number	Project Description	Funding Request (\$millions)	Sponsor	Congressional District	Source of Federal Funds	Purpose	Program Category
<b>Metropolitan Mobility</b>							
	OR 213/Redland Road Lane Improvements	\$5.40	City of Oregon City	OR-5		PE/Construction	Metropolitan Mobility
	Tooze Road Improvements	\$2.50	City of Wilsonville	OR-5		ROW/Construction	Metropolitan Mobility
	122nd/129th Ave. Improvements - Sunnyside to King Road	\$2.00	City of Happy Valley	OR-3		PE/ROW	Metropolitan Mobility
<b>Freight</b>							
	Springwater Industrial Area Phase I Access	\$5.00	City of Gresham	OR-3		PE/ROW/Construction	Freight
	124th Ave. Extension: Tualatin-Sherwood to Tonquin	\$4.00	Washington County	OR-1		PE	Freight
	Columbia River Channel Deepening Project	\$25.00	Port of Portland		Energy & Water	Construction	Freight
<b>Managing the Existing System</b>							
	Willamette Locks	\$2.00	Clackamas County	OR-5	Army Corps of Engineers	Inspection and Repair	Managing the Existing System
<b>System Management</b>							
	SW Farmington Road Arterial Adaptive Signal Control	\$0.67	City of Beaverton	OR-1		Construction	System Management
<b>Transit and Greenhouse Gases</b>							
	TriMet Bus Replacement	\$15.40	TriMet	OR-1,3,5	FTA 5309 Bus & Bus Facilities	Acquisition	Transit
	Wilsonville SMART Fleet Services Facility	\$1.20	City of Wilsonville/SMART	OR-5	FTA 5309 Bus & Bus Facilities	Construction	Transit
	City of Sandy Transit	\$0.60	City of Sandy	OR-3		Acquisition	Transit
	Canby Area Transit	\$0.60	City of Canby	OR-5	FTA 5309 Bus & Bus Facilities	Acquisition	Transit
	South Clackamas Transportation District Bus Facility	\$0.60	SCTD/Molalla	OR-5	FTA 5309 Bus & Bus Facilities	Acquisition	Transit
<b>New Starts/Small Starts</b>							
	South Corridor Light Rail	\$80.00	TriMet	OR-3	FTA 5309 New Starts	Construction	New Starts
	Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail	\$25.00	TriMet	OR-3	FTA 5309 New Starts	Final Design/ROW	New Starts
	Eastside Streetcar Loop	\$25.00	City of Portland	OR-3	FTA 5309 Small Starts	Construction	Small Starts
	Portland to Lake Oswego Streetcar	\$4.00	City of Lake Oswego/TriMet/Metro	OR-5	FTA 5339 Alternatives Analysis	DEIS/FEIS	New Starts/Small Starts
	Next Corridor Alternatives Analysis	\$1.00	Metro	OR-1,3,5	FTA 5339 Alternatives Analysis	AA	New Starts
<b>Walking and Cycling</b>							
	Sandy River Trail Connections	\$5.00	Multnomah County	OR-3	National Scenic Area Act	Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	SE 122nd Ave. Sidewalk Construction	\$2.12	City of Portland	OR-3		Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	High Priority Trail Projects in Washington County	\$1.00	Washington County	OR-1			Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	17th Avenue Trolley Trail - Springwater Connector	\$3.36	City of Milwaukie	OR-1			Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	French Prarie Bike-Ped Emergency Bridge over Willamette River, Wilsonville	\$2.10	City of Wilsonville	OR-5			Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	I-84/Sandy River Bridge Trail Connections	\$5.00	ODOT/Metro/Troutdale/Mult. Co.	OR-3		Final Design/Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	SW Vermont St./Capitol Highway - 30th Ave. Intersection Reconfiguration	\$1.71	City of Portland	OR-1		Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
<b>Critical Highway Corridors</b>							
	I-5 Columbia River Crossing	\$3.00	ODOT & WSDOT	OR-3/WA-3	Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	PE/Final Design/ROW	Project of National Significance
<b>Green Infrastructure</b>							
	Kellogg Creek Bridge Replacement	\$1.50	City of Milwaukie	OR-1		Construction	Green Infrastructure
	Beaver Creek Culvert Replacement Project	\$6.00	Multnomah County	OR-5	Fish & Wildlife	Construction	Green Infrastructure



## New Starts Suggested Improvements

The New Starts program has been critical for the Portland metropolitan area's success in building a more livable region. The program is critical for our nation's future. High-quality, fixed-guideway transit provides permanent infrastructure that enables and encourages vibrant, livable, walkable, and therefore sustainable communities. Fixed-guideway transit and the development it enables and attracts are the most effective way to address oil price volatility, energy security threats, greenhouse gases, sustainability and energy-resiliency, all issues that are essential to economic prosperity economically in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

The following improvements are needed to keep the New Starts program effective:

- *Increase funding due to the extreme need across the country*

Dozens of transit agencies across the country are seeking to expand their light rail or other high capacity transit systems. There is not enough New Starts funding to build all of the good projects.

- *Require FTA to follow Congressional direction to allow more than 50% federal funding for projects.*

By statute, transit projects must bring 20% non-federal funding to projects, yet FTA has continuously sought and in some cases has outright required projects to contribute 50%. Effective projects should receive the same treatment that highway and other federal-aid projects get, allowing 80% federal funding for projects that meet other requirements.

- *Direct FTA to include all factors identified by Congress for determining a project's eligibility for federal funding. No single factor or measure can be allowed to outweigh all the others or be a "must pass".*

The outcome of a complicated and controversial computer modeling projection has come to represent half or more of FTA's rating of a project. In both the creation of the New Starts program and in reauthorizations, Congress has identified many measures that should be used to determine the merit of a project. FTA should be directed to follow the law and use multiple measures to rate projects.

- *Adjust cost effectiveness thresholds to keep pace with the escalating cost of construction*  
FTA-defined cost effectiveness thresholds have lagged behind construction costs for years. They should be updated for past cost escalation and updated yearly in the future.

- *Create a separate track for experienced grantees that allows more of the oversight function to be programmatic requiring less time and streamlining process for those grantees that have proven successful in the past*

Many grantees are becoming experienced with multiple successful projects completed, yet all FTA oversight procedures are developed for neophyte grantees. For those with a successful track record, procedures should be streamlined and made programmatic, to allow FTA to fulfill oversight duties without slowing projects and increasing the cost of project delivery.

- *Redefine and reduce the steps of project advancement into two clear and distinct steps: 1) determination of eligibility for New or Small Starts funding, 2) design and funding commitment by grantee and FTA.*

Currently, New Starts projects must clear three major hurdles (PE approval, Final Design approval, and FFGA approval). Each review cycle takes 6 months or more. When Small Starts procedures

were developed, the Final Design and FFGA approval steps were combined. FTA should follow this lead for New Starts as well. Because FTA already caps the amount of federal support for a project at Final Design, most of the key decisions have already been made. Merging the Final Design and FFGA approval steps into a single cycle would reduce 6 months or more off project development timelines with no significant loss in control.

- *For calculation of cost effectiveness - Eliminate Baseline bus scenario except in rare circumstances*

Current guidance forces project sponsors to compare proposed projects to a Baseline bus project that may be developed without public input and is not necessarily a project that the local agency would or could ever build. Despite this, the Baseline scenario greatly determines the outcome of current user benefit analysis and cost effectiveness, while forcing the methodology to ignore many benefits that most transit agencies consider fundamental to the purpose of fixed-guideway transit. FTA should be directed to eliminate the Baseline scenario and require comparison to a No Build.

- *Clarify the intent and the methodologies of the Small Starts program to ensure that streetcar and other rail projects are competitive.*

The Small Starts program, and especially the Very Small Starts program have disproportionately funded bus rapid transit projects. Very Small Starts makes it almost impossible to compete using any other mode than bus rapid transit. FTA should be directed to reform process and methodologies to ensure that Streetcars and other rail projects that deliver benefits can compete for Small Starts funding.

### **Small Starts Suggested Improvements**

Cities throughout the country are promoting modern streetcars as a transportation choice for their citizens that attract economic development, link jobs and housing, reduce carbon emissions and encourage a more sustainable development pattern. Unfortunately, FTA's direction in implementing the initial Small Starts authorization was to turn it into a 'bus solution preferred' program. The following improvements are specifically needed to make the Small Starts program effective:

- *Increase funding due to the extreme need across the country*

Dozens of transit agencies across the country are seeking to create a streetcar line, bus rapid transit line (BRT), or expand other high capacity transit systems at relatively low costs. There is not enough Small Starts funding to build all of the good projects.

- *Clarify the intent and the methodologies of the Small Starts program to ensure that streetcar and other rail projects are competitive.*

The Small Starts program, and especially the Very Small Starts program have only funded bus rapid transit projects to date. Very Small Starts makes it almost impossible to compete using any other mode than bus rapid transit. FTA should be directed to reform its process and evaluation methodologies to ensure that Streetcars and other rail projects that deliver benefits can compete for Small Starts funding.

- *Reform the "cost effectiveness" criteria to better measure the benefits of streetcars and other proposed Small Starts rail projects.*

Prohibit the use of FTA's current "cost effectiveness" measure as the primary criteria for federal funding. Direct FTA to use multiple measures of project benefits, which better reflect the different

purposes for BRT and streetcar development -- for example, central area circulation vs. commuter services.

- *Revise funding levels for a new authorization*

Change maximum federal participation to \$150 million (now \$75 million) and \$300 million total project cost (currently \$250 million) to be eligible.

- *Electric Rail Transit*

The authorization should include a policy that the federal government give a priority to development of electric rail transportation in the United States to encourage long-term energy security and reduced greenhouse gas and other emissions.

- *Electric Rail Transit and "Buy America"*

Federal funding should be made available for rolling stock to ensure that US-based manufacturers have a competitive chance to help build the new round of electric rail transit in the US. Up to \$20 million per project shall be made available for purchase of rolling stock under simplified Federal authorization.

- *Establish Fast Starts Program*

To ensure that street car projects are not delayed by lengthy FTA rule-making processes, and to encourage their consideration in the context of economic stimulus, the authorization should include a one-time authorization for \$400 million in FY10-11 that will be used to support electric rail transportation projects that are able to be under construction within 24 months of the passage of the authorization. Applicants could pursue this program as a "jump start" for electric rail programs in the country. Projects taking longer than 24 months to be under construction would expect to apply through the Small Starts or New Starts programs as authorized. A maximum of \$60 million for any one project shall be available.

# ECONOMIC STIMULUS LEGISLATION AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

The ongoing economic downturn and recent interest in an economic stimulus package by President-elect Obama and congressional leaders has increased speculation that Congress could pass legislation that might include an infusion of funding for transportation projects, including highways and public transportation. While it is by no means certain that a stimulus package will be passed into law, and the specific details of an economic stimulus package will be determined by Congress, ODOT has prepared this frequently asked questions document to respond to recent inquiries on how the agency would likely handle an infusion of funding.

## ***How much highway funding will Oregon receive?***

If Congress passes an economic stimulus bill that includes highway funding, it will likely send money through the federal highway program distribution formula. Under this formula, Oregon receives about 1.2 percent of total funding. In September the U.S. House of Representatives passed an economic stimulus bill (HR 7110) that included \$12.8 billion for the federal highway program. This would have provided Oregon \$152 million in funding.

## ***What requirements will this money come with?***

In addition to the normal requirements to which all federally-funded highway projects are subject, it is likely that funding under an economic stimulus package would come with the requirement to get projects under contract and under construction in 2009. The House-passed legislation required that all funds be obligated by the state (which happens shortly before a project goes to bid) within 180 days of enactment of the legislation. There will likely be an expectation that all funding will supplement and not supplant existing resources.

## ***What types of projects will likely meet these requirements?***

Given the likely requirement to get projects under contract quickly, projects should require minimal design, not require acquisition of right of way, and have minimal need for environmental work; most viable projects will be classified as a Categorical Exclusion under NEPA. Most projects that meet these criteria will involve preservation of the existing road and highway system, such as paving, bridge repairs, and safety measures; very few highway capacity projects could proceed given the likely requirements to quickly obligate funds.

## ***How will ODOT select state highway projects?***

Although it is not yet clear whether Congress will pass an economic stimulus package, how much money Oregon would receive, or the requirements for use of funds, in advance of congressional action ODOT is working to identify state highway projects that could receive funding so the agency can move quickly if an infusion of resources becomes available. ODOT will focus on selecting projects that can move quickly and be under construction within the timeframe required by the legislation and envisioned by Congress. ODOT's highway regions will select projects to add to their highway construction programs.

***Would local governments get any money for projects?***

Regardless of whether a funding package includes specific direction to share funds with local governments, ODOT would set aside a portion of the funds for local government projects. If Congress maintains the normal process of passing all federal-aid highway program funds through state DOTs, ODOT would administer the funds.

***How will local government projects be selected?***

ODOT has offered local governments the opportunity to propose projects that meet the likely requirements. As with state highway projects, ODOT will work to pre-position projects for funding in order to move quickly to get projects under contract if a funding package is provided. The Oregon Local Program Committee (OLPC), a partnership between counties, cities, ODOT and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), would oversee this effort in conjunction with staff from ODOT's Local Government Section. Any local government that wishes to propose a project for consideration should contact Martin Andersen at (503) 986-3640 or by e-mail to martin.e.andersen@odot.state.or.us.

***When will funds be available?***

The availability of funding will depend on when a package is signed into law. Congressional leaders have indicated they may take up a stimulus package shortly after the new Congress takes office in early January.

***Will there be a matching requirement?***

The House-passed legislation (HR 7110) did not require project sponsors to provide a non-federal funding match. However, any economic stimulus package that becomes law may differ from the House legislation.

***Will funding for public transportation be included?***

A stimulus bill could include funding for public transportation. The House-passed bill would have provided \$35 million to Oregon's urban areas for capital projects and \$7 million for capital projects in non-urbanized areas. The legislation would also provide an additional \$8.6 million for urban areas and \$3.9 million for non-urban areas for assistance coping with high energy costs. As with the existing Federal Transit Administration programs, funding for the large urban districts (TriMet, Salem-Keizer Transit, Lane Transit District) would flow directly to those districts, while ODOT's Public Transit Division would administer the funding for non-urbanized areas.

***What other types of public works projects could receive funding?***

Congress has discussed including resources for other types of infrastructure, but it is not clear what will receive consideration for funding in a stimulus package. The House-passed legislation included funding for airport grants and drinking water and wastewater projects, among others. However, ODOT would likely not be involved in administration of these funds, as federal programs other than highways and transit do not flow through state DOTs.

*For additional information, please contact Travis Brouwer, ODOT Federal Affairs Advisor, at (503) 986-3448 or by e-mail at [travis.brouwer@odot.state.or.us](mailto:travis.brouwer@odot.state.or.us).*



**STAFF REPORT/RESOLUTION**

**TO:** Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council Board of Directors  
**FROM:** Dean Lookingbill, Transportation Director  
**DATE:** December 29, 2008  
**SUBJECT:** **2009-2012 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program  
Amendment: Federal Economic Stimulus Projects, Resolution 01-09-02**

---

**BACKGROUND**

The incoming Obama Administration has staked out a firm position in support of a major national infrastructure economic stimulus package to be ready for President Obama's signature on January 21, 2009. While the support for the package is evident across the political spectrum, the size, the timing, and the type of projects that would be eligible are still being debated. Yet within the discussions around the transportation projects, it appears there is agreement that the funding will not be "earmarked" and would flow through existing federal transportation program funding channels. In addition, the new Administration has labeled this a "jobs bill" to be directed toward projects that would create jobs and that could go to construction within a 90-day window.

RTC staff, in working with member agencies and WSDOT Local Programs, has prepared a regional list of projects that meets the key criteria of the economic stimulus package as is currently being discussed in Washington, D.C. In order to best position our region to meet the deadlines of the proposed stimulus package, the RTC Board is being asked to "conditionally" amend the list of projects into the 2009-2012 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) at their January 6, 2009 meeting. By conditionally amending the projects into the MTIP at this time, the project selection process would be completed in a very timely fashion. Given the Board's action, the projects would be amended into the MTIP conditioned upon the receipt of economic stimulus project funding. The projects that aren't selected to receive stimulus funding wouldn't be amended into the MTIP. The attached list of projects has been developed by RTAC and is being recommended to the Board. It should be noted that the list only includes local projects. WSDOT projects will be selected separately by the Governor's office.

**FEDERAL ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE**

As stated above, it is not known at this time the size, the timing, or the type of projects to be eligible for funding under the proposed economic stimulus package. Notwithstanding this lack of clarity, RTC staff has assembled the best set of projects possible given the information known at this time. Initially, it appeared that nearly every state agency or association was asking for their own project list. WSDOT Local Programs has now asked the MPOs/RTPOs to develop and submit a list of economic stimulus transportation projects for their respective region. Since the

projects, if funded, must follow the typical federal transportation programming process, it made good sense to have the MPOs/RTPOs utilize their established project programming processes.

The list of projects proposed for RTC Board action is directed toward the federal economic stimulus package and its goal of job creation. At this point, it is our understanding that OFM will calculate jobs based on a standardized methodology. In addition to the jobs criteria, there are several other guidelines that are coming from Washington, D.C. and the Governor's office that are shaping the projects for the economic stimulus package. These include the following: 1) project delivery and accountability will be required; 2) funding will be formula driven and will follow the federal Surface Transportation Program process, Washington State can be expected to receive a formula share of the national package; 3) the Governor's Office will lead the project selection process; 4) there has been some discussion of a statewide formula that allocates money between WSDOT and MPO/RTPO regions; 5) the economic stimulus package may have two steps, the first calls for construction within 90 days, and the second has construction within one year.

In order to assemble a package of stimulus projects that also meet both the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) programming process and the stimulus package criteria, the projects selected must meet the following thresholds:

- Projects must be in local plans
- Projects must be consistent with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)
- Projects must have the environmental classification statement approved
- Projects must have right of way certified
- Project must be able to go to bid within 90 days

The attached list includes the total set of projects from Clark County that would be eligible for funding per the proposed federal economic stimulus funding initiative. Action by the RTC Board on this list would complete RTC's project selection action as required by the MPO and move the projects forward to be amended into the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and thereby eligible for the receipt of federal funding. The proposed RTC Board action on the MTIP is "conditional" and dependent upon funding through the federal economic stimulus legislation. At this point, it is not clear who will make the actual project funding decision. The project funding decision may happen at a state level or at the regional level; which ever the case, those projects not funded would be removed from the MTIP.

### **POLICY IMPLICATION**

The proposed package of federal economic stimulus projects will be conditionally amended into the FY 2009 element of the MTIP. This amendment is consistent with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

### **BUDGET IMPLICATION**

All regionally significant or federally funded projects must be programmed in the MTIP and STIP prior to obligating federal funds. The attached list of federal economic stimulus projects

totaling \$128,232,100 is conditionally amended into FY 2009 MTIP and selected for inclusion into the STIP.

**ACTION REQUESTED**

Adoption of Resolution 01-09-02 "2009-2012 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program Amendment: Federal Economic Stimulus Projects."

SOUTHWEST WASHINGTON  
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

ATTEST:

---

Steve Stuart  
Chair of the Board

---

Dean Lookingbill  
Transportation Director

Attachment



**2009-2012 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program Amendment: Federal Economic Stimulus Projects, Resolution 01-09-02**

City District	Leg District	WSDOT Region	Agency	Project Title	Stimulus Amount	Total Construction	Ad Ready (PS&E Complete) (Mo/Yr)	Work Description	NEPA Approved Approved/Anticipated (Mo/Yr)	Right of Way Certified Approved/Anticipated (Mo/Yr)
3rd	18	SW	Battle Ground	North Parkway Improvement, N 5th to Onsdorff	\$500,000	\$3,600,000	4/1/2009	Reconstruct to 3 lane arterial w/ sidewalk and bicycle lanes	2/1/2009	3/1/2009
3rd	18	SW	Camas	City Overlay Project, 3rd Av., 6th Av., Brady, Lake	\$2,800,000	\$2,800,000	7/1/2009	Arterial Overlays	Exempt	7/1/2009
3rd	17/18	SW	Clark County	Ward Road/NE 172nd Av. Intersection	\$7,100,000	\$8,000,000	4/14/2009	Safety: Realign Intersection	3/1/2009	12/31/2008
3rd	49	SW	Clark County	NE 88th Street, St. Johns to Andresen	\$2,300,000	\$6,800,000	10/1/2008	Widen to 3 lane arterial	1/9/2007	7/7/2008
3rd	17/18/49	SW	Clark County	NE 134th Street Traffic Signal Optimization	\$500,000	\$1,329,000	2/1/2009	Upgrade signal system	9/29/2008	NA
3rd	17	SW	Clark County	NE 99th Street, SR-503 to NE 137th Av.	\$4,800,000	\$4,800,000	5/1/2009	Widen to 3 lane arterial	5/15/2009	6/1/2009
3rd	49	SW	Clark County	NE 72nd Ave Sidewalk, NE 63rd St to NE 66th St	\$80,000	\$90,000	4/1/2009	Construct sidewalk	Exempt	NA
3rd	17	SW	Clark County	NE 142nd Ave Sidewalk, NE 78th St to NE 81st St	\$100,000	\$110,000	4/1/2009	Construct sidewalk	Exempt	NA
3rd	15/17/18/49	SW	Clark County	Arterial Overlays	\$3,300,000	\$3,546,000	4/1/2009	Overlays - list attached	Exempt	NA
3rd	15/17/18/49	SW	Clark County	Various Bridge Rehab/Repairs	\$600,000	\$800,000	5/1/2009	Bridge rehabs - list attached	Exempt	NA
3rd	49	SW	Clark County	Clark County Rail Rehab Project, Fruit Valley to 78th St.	\$1,000,000	\$5,872,169	1/1/2009	Rail upgrade	Exempt	N/A
3rd	17/49	SW	Clark County	Railroad Interchange Tracks	\$5,900,000	\$5,900,000	4/1/2009	New railroad interchange yard	Exempt	N/A
3rd	49	SW	Port of Vancouver	West Vancouver Freight Access Project	\$5,000,000	\$101,000,000	1/1/2009	Relocate rail tracks to improve mainline access and unit train capacity into the Port of Vancouver	6/1/2009	6/1/2009
3rd	18	SW	Ridgefield/WSDOT	I-5/SR-501 Interchange	\$10,000,000	\$40,000,000	5/1/2009	Reconstruct existing interchange	5/1/2009	5/1/2009
3rd	49	SW	Vancouver	Downtown Vancouver Waterfront Access Project	\$10,000,000	\$38,500,000	4/1/2009	Construct street undercrossings of rail berm and new street extensions	4/1/2009	3/1/2009
3rd	49	SW	Vancouver	Main Street Project (6th to 15th)	\$10,793,000	\$10,793,000	3/1/2009	Roadway reconstruction and pedestrian enhancements	Exempt	N/A
3rd	17	SW	Vancouver	136th Avenue and Mill Plain Intersection	\$2,700,000	\$4,254,000	2/1/2009	Construct additional turn lanes and signal upgrades	4/9/2008	N/A
3rd	47/17	SW	Vancouver	Pave Arterial Streets (E 5th, SE 34th Street, NE 136th Ave, SE Columbia Way, SE Ellsworth Rd., E Evergreen Blvd., Grand Blvd., N Garrison Rd., Lieser Rd.)	\$3,700,000	\$3,700,000	4/1/2009	Overlays	Exempt	N/A
3rd	49/17	SW	Vancouver	Reconstruct - Columbia St (8th St to 44th St)	\$4,200,000	\$4,200,000	2/1/2009	Full Street reconstruction	Exempt	N/A
3rd	18	SW	Washougal	SR-14 Pedestrian Tunnel	\$900,000	\$3,382,700	2/1/2009	Construct pedestrian tunnel and additive alternate bid items (sidewalk, etc.)	1/9/2009	1/9/2009
3rd	18	SW	Washougal	17th St Sidewalk (E Street to H Street)	\$120,000	\$120,000	5/1/2009	Add sidewalks to 17th Street from E to H Streets.	May-09	NA
3rd	18	SW	Washougal	17th Street Bridge Scour	\$65,000	\$25,000	7/1/2009	Address Bridge Scour	4/1/2009	NA
3rd	17/18/49	SW	C-TRAN	Fleet Maintenance and Vehicle Replacement & Expansion	\$2,439,000	\$2,439,000	4/1/2009	(10) Vans, (3) 40' Buses, parts	Exempt	N/A
3rd	17/18/49	SW	C-TRAN	Maintenance Facility Expansion and Upgrade	\$674,000	\$674,000	4/1/2009	Replace 6 lifts and expand	Exempt	N/A
3rd	17/18/49	SW	C-TRAN	Radio Coverage Upgrade	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	4/1/2009	Transition to cellular service	Exempt	N/A
3rd	17/18/49	SW	C-TRAN	Upgrade Customer Service Phone System	\$160,000	\$160,000	4/1/2009	Integrated voice recognition software	Exempt	N/A
3rd	17/18/49	SW	C-TRAN	Expand Security Surveillance System to S.C. P&R	\$145,000	\$145,000	4/1/2009	Wireless IP CCTV cameras	Exempt	N/A
<b>Sub Total</b>					<b>\$81,376,000</b>	<b>\$254,539,869</b>				

**2009-2012 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program Amendment: Federal Economic Stimulus Projects, Resolution 01-09-02**

**Longer-Term Projects**

Congr District	Leg District	WSDOT Region	Agency	Project Title	Stimulus Amount	Total Construction	Ad Ready (PS&E Complete) (Mo/Yr)	Work Description	NEPA Approved/ Anticipated (Mo/Yr)	Right of Way Certified/ Anticipated (Mo/Yr)
3rd	18	SW	Battle Ground	South Parkway Improvement, Rassmussen to 199th	\$3,700,000	\$3,900,000	12/31/2009	Reconstruct to 3 lane arterial w/	12/31/2009	12/31/2009
3rd	18	SW	Clark County	Dayton Bridge	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	4/1/2010	Bridge replacement	03/30/10	N/A
3rd	17	SW	Clark County	NE 99th Street/SR-503 Intersection	\$2,400,000	\$2,400,000	10/1/2009	Upgrade Failing Intersection	10/1/09	8/1/09
3rd	17	SW	Clark County	NE 119 <sup>th</sup> Street, NE 72 <sup>nd</sup> Ave to SR 503	\$16,000,000	\$20,000,000	4/1/2010	Widen to 5 lane arterial	03/30/10	02/01/09
3rd	17	SW	Clark County	NE 159 <sup>th</sup> Street -Hockinson Walkway	\$800,000	\$800,000	11/1/2009	Sidewalk from Jr. High to High School	12/1/09	10/10/09
3rd	17	SW	Vancouver	NE 18th Street (Four Seasons Dr to NE 137th Ave)	\$10,000,000	\$15,000,000	2010	5 lane arterial urban upgrade	EA Approved	
3rd	18	SW	Washougal	E Street - Base Bid Project (30% design Complete Jan. 2009)	\$5,441,000	\$9,284,000	9/1/2009	Reduce to 3 lanes with roundabouts and sidewalks (~9,000 LF of Principal Arterial Street - 6th to 32nd Street).	11/1/2009	11/1/2009
3rd	18	SW	Washougal	E Street Pavement Rehabilitation	\$6,515,100	\$6,515,100	9/1/2009	Rehabilitate failed pavement (6th to 32nd St).	11/1/2009	NA
<b>Sub Total</b>					<b>\$46,856,100</b>	<b>\$59,899,100</b>				
<b>Total</b>					<b>\$128,232,100</b>	<b>\$314,438,969</b>				

The above list does not include non-transportation stimulus projects.

# The Obama-Biden Plan

Our country faces its most serious economic crisis since the great depression. Working families, who saw their incomes decline by \$2,000 in the economic "expansion" from 2000 to 2007, now face even deeper income losses. Retirement savings accounts have lost \$2 trillion. Markets have fallen 40% in less than a year. Millions of homeowners who played by the rules can't meet their mortgage payments and face foreclosure as the value of their homes have plummeted. With credit markets nearly frozen, businesses large and small cannot access the credit they need to meet payroll and create jobs.

Barack Obama and Joe Biden have a plan to revitalize the economy.

1. Immediate Action to Create Good Jobs in America
2. Immediate Relief for Struggling Families
3. Direct, Immediate Assistance for Homeowners, Not a Bailout for Irresponsible Mortgage Lenders
4. A Rapid, Aggressive Response to Our Financial Crisis, Using All the Tools We Have

## 1. IMMEDIATE ACTION TO CREATE GOOD JOBS IN AMERICA

The economy has lost 760,000 jobs this year -- and some forecasters expect the unemployment rate to exceed 8 percent by the end of next year. Addressing the financial crisis will help prevent the most severe loss of jobs from the crisis. But taking direct steps to create jobs will also strengthen the economy and help with the financial crisis. Barack Obama and Joe Biden's overall economic agenda is pro-jobs, including their plans to eliminate America's dependence on foreign oil and bring down healthcare costs. But Obama and Biden believe we must take additional aggressive steps to jump-start job creation right now:

- **A New American Jobs Tax Credit:** Obama and Biden will provide a new temporary tax credit to companies that add jobs here in the United States. During 2009 and 2010, existing businesses will receive a \$3,000 refundable tax credit for each additional full-time employee hired. For example, if a company that currently has 10 U.S. employees increases its domestic full time employment to 20 employees, this company would get a \$30,000 tax credit -- enough to offset the entire added payroll tax costs to the company for the first \$50,000 of income for the new employees. The tax credit will benefit all companies creating net new jobs, even those struggling to make a profit.
- **Raise the small business investment expensing limit to \$250,000 through the end of 2009:** Obama and Biden will give small businesses an additional incentive to make investments and start creating jobs again by providing temporary business tax incentives through 2009. The February

2008 stimulus bill increased maximum Section 179 expenses to \$250,000 but this expires in December 2008. This provision will encourage all firms to pursue investment in the coming months, but will particularly benefit small firms which generally have smaller amounts of annual property purchases and so choose to expense the cost of their acquired property.

- **Zero capital gains rate for investment in small businesses:** Barack Obama and Joe Biden believe that we need to encourage investment in small businesses to help create jobs and turn our economy around. That's why they will eliminate all capital gains taxes on investments made in small and start-up businesses. They also want to cut taxes for the small businesses that create jobs but are struggling with restricted access to credit on top of skyrocketing health care and energy costs.
- **Save one million jobs through immediate investments to rebuild America's roads and bridges and repair our schools:** The Obama-Biden emergency plan would make \$25 billion immediately available in a Jobs and Growth Fund to help ensure that in-progress and fast-tracked infrastructure projects are not sidelined, and to ensure that schools can meet their energy costs and undertake key repairs starting this fall. This increased investment is necessary to stem growing budget pressures on infrastructure projects. In addition, in an environment where we may face elevated unemployment levels well into 2009, making an aggressive investment in urgent, high-priority infrastructure will serve as a triple win: generating capital deployment and job creation to boost our economy in the near-term, enhancing U.S. competitiveness in the longer term, and improving the environment by adopting energy efficient school and infrastructure repairs. In total, Obama and Biden's \$25 billion investment will result in 1 million jobs created or saved, while helping to turn our economy around.
- **Partner with America's automakers to help save jobs and ensure that the next generation of clean vehicles is built in the United States:** Senator Obama pushed for \$50 billion in loan guarantees to help the auto industry retool, develop new battery technologies and produce the next generation of fuel efficient cars here in America. Congress passed only half of this amount -- it is critical that the administration speeds up the implementation of the first half and that Congress move quickly to enact the second half. In addition, Obama and Biden believe that with the tremendous uncertainty facing the auto industry, and the small and medium business suppliers who depend on them, it is critical that we keep all options on the table for helping them weather the financial crisis.

## **2. IMMEDIATE RELIEF FOR STRUGGLING FAMILIES**

Even when the overall economy was growing, most American families were not sharing in this growth. The typical non-elderly household saw its income decline by more than \$2,000 from 2000 to 2007 as expenses skyrocketed. Weekly wages, adjusted for inflation, are now lower than they were a decade ago. Barack Obama and Joe Biden's overall economic plan will relieve the squeeze on families and foster bottom-up growth. But they are proposing that we implement several measures immediately:

- **A tax cut for 95 percent of workers and their families -- plus seniors:** Barack Obama and Joe Biden propose a permanent tax cut of \$500 for workers and \$1,000 for families. A first round of these tax credits could be mailed out quickly by the IRS based on tax returns already filed for tax year 2007. In addition, Obama and Biden would extend these expedited tax credits to senior citizens who are retired as a down payment on his plan to eliminate taxes for all seniors making up to \$50,000.
- **Extend unemployment insurance benefits and temporarily suspend taxes on these benefits:** Millions of Americans are looking for work but unable to find it in the weak economy. Today, more than one in five unemployed workers has been out of work for more than half a year -- the highest level since early 2005. Obama supported extending unemployment insurance this summer, but already 800,000 jobless workers have exhausted those benefits and are being left without any unemployment compensation. Obama and Biden believe Congress should immediately extend unemployment insurance for an additional 13 weeks to help families that are being hit hardest by this downturn. In addition, they believe we should temporarily suspend taxes on unemployment insurance benefits as a way of giving more relief to families.
- **Penalty-free hardship withdrawals from IRAs and 401(k)s in 2008 and 2009:** Many families are going to be facing unique economic hardship over the coming year. To help these families pay their bills and their mortgages and make it through these tough times, Obama and Biden are calling for legislation that would allow withdrawals of 15% up to \$10,000 from retirement accounts without penalty (although subject to the normal taxes). This would apply to withdrawals in 2008 (including retroactively) and 2009.
- **Instruct the Treasury to allow seniors to delay required withdrawals from 401(k)s and IRAs:** Currently seniors are required to start withdrawing from their 401(k)s and IRAs at age 70 1/2 and every year thereafter over their lifetime. But the explicit requirement that withdrawals continue on an annual basis -- and the related requirement that the amount withdrawn be based on currently much higher year-end 2007 asset values -- is based on Treasury regulations, not the statute, which has a less specific mandate. That means the Secretary of the Treasury has authority to change its regulations to protect seniors from being forced, at this critical time, to sell their investments and

"lock in" their losses just after market values have plummeted in an almost unprecedented fashion. Obama and Biden are calling on Treasury to temporarily suspend the required withdrawals for retirees over age 70 1/2. Because retirees often make these required withdrawals late in the year, there is still time to help millions of affected seniors -- but only if done promptly. In addition, because lower-income seniors may have no choice but to take withdrawals this year and in 2008, Obama and Biden will exempt any withdrawals made up to the required minimum amount from taxation. This will give seniors the flexibility they deserve -- to forgo withdrawals if they choose or to take those withdrawals tax free if they need those resources to pay their bills.

- **Funds to counteract high heating costs this winter:** Obama and Biden are calling for supplementing the recently passed LIHEAP funding to ensure that cold-weather states can cushion the impact of high energy prices for their residents this winter. The Energy Information Administration said that consumers will pay a projected \$1,137 to heat their homes from Oct. 1 to March 31 -- 15 percent more than last year's heating outlay during this time. Homeowners that use heating oil rather than natural gas could see increases of 23 percent compared to last year. As part of his \$25 billion state fiscal relief package, Obama's plan will supplement existing LIHEAP funding to help state programs expand to cover more residents while continuing to provide a meaningful benefit.

### **3. DIRECT, IMMEDIATE ASSISTANCE FOR HOMEOWNERS, NOT A BAILOUT FOR IRRESPONSIBLE MORTGAGE LENDERS**

Over the past two years, Americans have lost 20 percent of the value of their homes. In some parts of the country home values have fallen by twice that amount. In combination with a rapidly deteriorating economy, that means more and more families are having a hard time meeting their monthly mortgage payments. At the same time, many states are considering property tax hikes that will burden homeowners still further. And millions of families who have seen the value of their homes fall below the cost of their mortgages need assistance in restructuring their mortgages to stay in their homes.

Barack Obama and Joe Biden's plan provides direct relief to help America's homeowners pay their mortgages, stay in their homes, and avoid painful tax increases while protecting taxpayers and not rewarding the bad behavior and bad actors who got us into this mess:

- **Instruct the Secretaries of the Treasury and Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to use their existing authority to more aggressively modify the terms of mortgages:** Barack Obama was an early champion of the HOPE for Homeowners Act that passed over the summer. In addition, Obama insisted that the financial rescue plan Congress recently passed include authority

for the Secretary to work with servicers to modify the terms of mortgages for homeowners who played by the rules. Obama and Biden believe that both of these plans should be implemented aggressively and comprehensively. In addition, Obama and Biden are calling on Treasury and HUD to develop a plan to work with state housing agencies to coordinate broad mortgage restructurings. The Dodd-Frank legislation gives states broader authority to help struggling homeowners, and coordination is essential to ensure that state and national efforts are working in concert to help as many homeowners as possible at the minimum cost to taxpayers.

- **Reform the bankruptcy code to assist homeowners and remove legal impediments to encouraging broader mortgage restructuring:** Obama and Biden are also calling for legislation to close the loophole in our bankruptcy code that allows bankruptcy judges to modify the terms of mortgages on investment properties and vacation homes but not on primary residences. He also believes we should clarify the legal liability of mortgage servicers so that servicers who work with struggling homeowners to modify their mortgages will receive legal protections. And we should remove any tax- or legal-related impediments to encouraging shared-equity mortgages within the HOPE for Homeownership process.
- **Enact a 90-day foreclosure moratorium for homeowners who are acting in good faith:** Financial institutions that participate in the financial rescue plan should be required to adhere to a homeowner's code of conduct, including a 90-day foreclosure moratorium for any homeowners living in their homes who are making good faith efforts to pay their mortgages. This will help create stability until the more far-reaching solutions are implemented and give both sides a chance to work out an agreement.
- **Provide \$25 Billion in state fiscal relief to help avoid painful property tax increases:** Budget crunches across the nation are putting our local governments in the untenable position of having to choose between raising property taxes and cutting vital services. Obama has proposed \$25 billion in state fiscal relief that, coupled with the new emergency facility to address the state credit crunch, will help states and localities continue to provide essential services like health care, police, fire and education without raising taxes or fees.
- **Create a universal mortgage tax credit for homeowners:** Barack Obama believes we should immediately enact a 10 percent refundable tax credit on the mortgage interest paid by hardworking American families who do not itemize their taxes. This credit will help offset the cost of mortgage payments for at least 10 million middle-class homeowners.

#### **4. A RAPID, AGGRESSIVE RESPONSE TO THE FINANCIAL CRISIS -- USING ALL THE TOOLS WE HAVE**

Barack Obama and Joe Biden believe that our deep systemic financial market crisis requires a systemic response. They fought to ensure that the recently-passed financial rescue package gave the Treasury the tools to stabilize the financial system, while protecting taxpayers and ensuring CEOs would not get rich in the process. However, this stabilization will only occur if the Treasury, Federal Reserve, FDIC, and other government entities use their authority and move quickly and aggressively to address the financial crisis.

It is now clear that our financial markets will not restart until financial institutions are lending again. Because of the extensive losses many of these institutions have suffered, they need more capital so that they will have the money to lend to families and businesses. Obama and Biden recognized this early, and were heartened by the Treasury's stated intention to use its recently granted authority to inject capital into our financial institutions. However, Secretary Paulson must turn this intention into action quickly and aggressively, in a manner that strengthens confidence in our banks, protects taxpayers, does not reward CEOs, and is strictly temporary.

In addition, our financial authorities must stand ready to take additional, complementary actions -- consistent with the systemic nature of this crisis -- to ensure this Treasury initiative is successful:

- **Be prepared, if necessary, for broader assurances for credit to banks:** First, we must be prepared to provide additional, temporary assurances to achieve the effective functioning of financial markets. Depending on developing circumstances, these steps could include additional measures by the Federal Reserve, extending insurance to all deposits, or guaranteeing a broader range of liabilities of the banking system including overnight loans. Any such steps should be coordinated internationally where appropriate and feasible. They should be accompanied by additional oversight to ensure appropriate use of guaranteed funds and by the expectation that financial institutions taking advantage of these guarantees will raise more capital.
- **Extend asset purchases to unfreeze other critical sectors:** Second, the Treasury should not limit itself to purchasing mortgage-backed securities under the financial rescue plan recently passed by Congress. The Treasury should use the authority it has under the new law to help unfreeze markets for individual mortgages, student loans, car loans, loans for multi-family dwellings, and credit card loans.
- **Make credit available to small businesses and state or local governments:** Third, we should take immediate steps to support non-financial institutions including small businesses and states and municipalities. The Federal Reserve and Treasury have acted to preserve the availability of liquidity for financial institutions and, more recently, have created a program to purchase commercial paper directly from the large corporate issuers. Small businesses and state and local



governments, however, are having serious difficulty obtaining necessary financing from debt markets.

- **Address the credit crisis facing our states and localities:** Barack Obama and Joe Biden propose that the Federal Reserve and the Treasury work together to design a facility to provide a funding backstop to the state and municipal government debt market similar to the recently announced program for the commercial paper market. The Federal Reserve should determine whether it has sufficient legal authority to establish such a facility on its own -- if not, it should work with Treasury and the Congress to achieve this goal. This new facility should be designed to protect taxpayer resources while ensuring that state and local governments can continue to provide vital services to their residents.
- **Address the credit crisis facing our small businesses:** To address the massive credit crunch that is threatening America's small businesses, Barack Obama and Joe Biden are proposing two immediate steps: (1) a nationwide emergency lending facility for small businesses that could be run through the SBA's Disaster Loan Program, which helped thousands of businesses in the wake of 9/11; and (2) temporarily eliminating fees on the SBA's 7(a) and 504 loan guarantee programs for small businesses, to help increase private lending for small businesses.

## Trade

Barack Obama and Joe Biden believe that trade with foreign nations should strengthen the American economy and create more American jobs. They will stand firm against agreements that undermine our economic security.

- **Fight for Fair Trade:** Obama and Biden will fight for a trade policy that opens up foreign markets to support good American jobs. They will use trade agreements to spread good labor and environmental standards around the world and stand firm against agreements like the Central American Free Trade Agreement that fail to live up to those important benchmarks. Obama and Biden will also pressure the World Trade Organization to enforce trade agreements and stop countries from continuing unfair government subsidies to foreign exporters and nontariff barriers on U.S. exports.
- **Amend the North American Free Trade Agreement:** Obama and Biden believe that NAFTA and its potential were oversold to the American people. They will work with the leaders of Canada and Mexico to fix NAFTA so that it works for American workers.

- **Improve transition assistance:** To help all workers adapt to a rapidly changing economy, Obama and Biden will update the existing system of Trade Adjustment Assistance by extending it to service industries, creating flexible education accounts to help workers retrain, and providing retraining assistance for workers in sectors of the economy vulnerable to dislocation before they lose their jobs.
- **End tax breaks for companies that send jobs overseas:** Barack Obama and Joe Biden believe that companies should not get billions of dollars in tax deductions for moving their operations overseas. They will fight to ensure that public contracts are awarded to companies that are committed to American workers.
- **Reward companies that support American workers:** Barack Obama introduced the Patriot Employer Act of 2007 with Senators Richard Durbin (D-Ill) and Sherrod Brown (D-Oh) to reward companies that create good jobs with good benefits for American workers. The legislation would provide a tax credit to companies that maintain or increase the number of full-time workers in America relative to those outside the U.S.; maintain their corporate headquarters in America if it has ever been in America; pay decent wages; prepare workers for retirement; provide health insurance; and support employees who serve in the military.

## **Manufacturing and Green Jobs**

- **Invest in our next generation innovators and job creators:** Obama and Biden will create an Advanced Manufacturing Fund to identify and invest in the most compelling advanced manufacturing strategies. The Fund will have a peer-review selection and award process based on the Michigan 21st Century Jobs Fund, a state-level initiative that has awarded over \$125 million to Michigan businesses with the most innovative proposals to create new products and new jobs in the state.
- **Double funding for the manufacturing extension partnership:** The Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP) works with manufacturers across the country to improve efficiency, implement new technology and strengthen company growth. This highly-successful program has engaged in more than 350,000 projects across the country and in 2006 alone, helped create and protect over 50,000 jobs. But despite this success, funding for MEP has been slashed by the Bush administration. Barack Obama and Joe Biden will double funding for the MEP so its training centers can continue to bolster the competitiveness of U.S. manufacturers.
- **Invest in a clean energy economy and create 5 million new green jobs:** Obama and Biden will invest \$150 billion over 10 years to advance the next generation of biofuels and fuel

infrastructure, accelerate the commercialization of plug-in hybrids, promote development of commercial scale renewable energy, invest in low emissions coal plants, and begin transition to a new digital electricity grid. The plan will also invest in America's highly-skilled manufacturing workforce and manufacturing centers to ensure that American workers have the skills and tools they need to pioneer the first wave of green technologies that will be in high demand throughout the world.

- **Create new job training programs for clean technologies:** The Obama-Biden plan will increase funding for federal workforce training programs and direct these programs to incorporate green technologies training, such as advanced manufacturing and weatherization training, into their efforts to help Americans find and retain stable, high-paying jobs. Obama and Biden will also create an energy-focused youth jobs program to invest in disconnected and disadvantaged youth.
- **Boost the renewable energy sector and create new jobs:** The Obama-Biden plan will create new federal policies, and expand existing ones, that have been proven to create new American jobs. Obama and Biden will create a federal Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) that will require 25 percent of American electricity be derived from renewable sources by 2025, which has the potential to create hundreds of thousands of new jobs. They will also extend the Production Tax Credit, a credit used successfully by American farmers and investors to increase renewable energy production and create new local jobs.

## **National Infrastructure Investment**

Barack Obama and Joe Biden believe that it is critically important for the United States to rebuild its national transportation infrastructure -- its highways, bridges, roads, ports, air, and train systems -- to strengthen user safety, bolster our long-term competitiveness and ensure our economy continues to grow.

- **Create a National Infrastructure Reinvestment Bank:** Barack Obama and Joe Biden will address the infrastructure challenge by creating a National Infrastructure Reinvestment Bank to expand and enhance, not supplant, existing federal transportation investments. This independent entity will be directed to invest in our nation's most challenging transportation infrastructure needs. The Bank will receive an infusion of federal money, \$60 billion over 10 years, to provide financing to transportation infrastructure projects across the nation. These projects will directly and indirectly create up to two million new jobs and stimulate approximately \$35 billion per year in new economic activity.

## **Technology, Innovation and Creating Jobs**

Barack Obama and Joe Biden will increase federal support for research, technology and innovation for companies and universities so that American families can lead the world in creating new advanced jobs and products.

- **Invest in the sciences:** Obama and Biden support doubling federal funding for basic research and changing the posture of our federal government from being one of the most anti-science administrations in American history to one that embraces science and technology. This will foster home-grown innovation, help ensure the competitiveness of U.S. technology-based businesses, and ensure that 21st century jobs can and will grow in America.
- **Make the Research and Development Tax Credit permanent:** Barack Obama and Joe Biden want investments in a skilled research and development workforce and technology infrastructure to be supported here in America so that American workers and communities will benefit. Obama and Biden want to make the Research and Development tax credit permanent so that firms can rely on it when making decisions to invest in domestic R&D over multi-year timeframes.
- **Deploy next-generation broadband:** Barack Obama and Joe Biden believe we can get broadband to every community in America through a combination of reform of the Universal Service Fund, better use of the nation's wireless spectrum, promotion of next-generation facilities, technologies and applications, and new tax and loan incentives.

## Small Business

- **Provide tax relief for small businesses and start-up companies:** Obama and Biden will eliminate all capital gains taxes on start-up and small businesses to encourage innovation and job creation. Obama and Biden will also support small business owners by providing a \$500 "Making Work Pay" tax credit to almost every worker in America. Self-employed small business owners pay both the employee and the employer side of the payroll tax, and this measure will reduce the burdens of this double taxation.
- **Create a national network of public-private business incubators:** Obama and Biden will support entrepreneurship and spur job growth by creating a national network of public-private business incubators. Business incubators facilitate the critical work of entrepreneurs in creating start-up companies. Obama and Biden will invest \$250 million per year to increase the number and size of incubators in disadvantaged communities throughout the country.

## Labor

Obama and Biden will strengthen the ability of workers to organize unions. He will fight for passage of the Employee Free Choice Act. Obama and Biden will ensure that his labor appointees support workers' rights and will work to ban the permanent replacement of striking workers. Obama and Biden will also increase the minimum wage and index it to inflation to ensure it rises every year.

- **Ensure freedom to unionize:** Obama and Biden believe that workers should have the freedom to choose whether to join a union without harassment or intimidation from their employers. Obama cosponsored and is a strong advocate for the Employee Free Choice Act (EFCA), a bipartisan effort that makes sure workers can exercise their right to organize. They will continue to fight for EFCA's passage and Obama will sign it into law.
- **Fight attacks on workers' right to organize:** Obama has fought the Bush National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) efforts to strip workers of their right to organize. He is a cosponsor of legislation to overturn the NLRB's "Kentucky River" decisions classifying hundreds of thousands of nurses, construction workers, and professional workers as "supervisors" who are not protected by federal labor laws.
- **Protect striking workers:** Obama and Biden support the right of workers to bargain collectively and strike if necessary. They will work to ban the permanent replacement of striking workers, so workers can stand up for themselves without worrying about losing their livelihoods.
- **Raise the minimum wage:** Barack Obama and Joe Biden will raise the minimum wage, index it to inflation and increase the Earned Income Tax Credit to make sure that full-time workers earn a living wage that allows them to raise their families and pay for basic needs.

## **Mortgages, Homeownership, and Bankruptcy**

Obama and Biden will crack down on fraudulent brokers and lenders. They will also make sure homebuyers have honest and complete information about their mortgage options, they'll give a tax credit to all middle-class homeowners, and they'll reform our bankruptcy laws to protect working people.

- **Create a universal mortgage credit:** Obama and Biden will create a 10 percent universal mortgage credit to provide tax relief to homeowners who do not itemize. This credit will provide an average of \$500 to 10 million homeowners, the majority of whom earn less than \$50,000 per year.
- **Ensure more accountability in the subprime mortgage industry:** Obama has been closely monitoring the subprime mortgage situation for years, and introduced comprehensive legislation over a year ago to fight mortgage fraud and protect consumers against abusive lending practices. Obama's STOP FRAUD Act provides the first federal definition of mortgage fraud, increases

funding for federal and state law enforcement programs, creates new criminal penalties for mortgage professionals found guilty of fraud, and requires industry insiders to report suspicious activity.

- **Mandate accurate loan disclosure:** Obama and Biden will create a Homeowner Obligation Made Explicit (HOME) score, which will provide potential borrowers with a simplified, standardized borrower metric (similar to APR) for home mortgages. The HOME score will allow individuals to easily compare various mortgage products and understand the full cost of the loan.
- **Close bankruptcy loophole for mortgage companies:** Obama and Biden will work to eliminate the provision that prevents bankruptcy courts from modifying an individual's mortgage payments. They believe that the subprime mortgage industry, which has engaged in dangerous and sometimes unscrupulous business practices, should not be shielded by outdated federal law.

## Credit Cards and Lending

Obama and Biden will establish a five-star rating system so that every consumer knows the risk involved in every credit card. They also will establish a Credit Card Bill of Rights to stop credit card companies from exploiting consumers with unfair practices.

- **Create a credit card rating system to improve disclosure:** Obama and Biden will create a credit card rating system, modeled on five-star systems used for other consumer products, to provide consumers an easily identifiable ranking of credit cards, based on the card's features. Credit card companies will be required to display the rating on all application and contract materials, enabling consumers to quickly understand all of the major provisions of a credit card without having to rely exclusively on fine print in lengthy documents.
- **Establish a Credit Card Bill of Rights to protect consumers:** Obama and Biden will create a Credit Card Bill of Rights to protect consumers. The Obama-Biden plan will:
  - Ban Unilateral Changes
  - Apply Interest Rate Increases Only to Future Debt
  - Prohibit Interest on Fees
  - Prohibit "Universal Defaults"
  - Require Prompt and Fair Crediting of Cardholder Payments

**Cap outlandish interest rates on payday loans and improve disclosure:** Obama and Biden will extend a 36 percent interest cap to all Americans. They will require lenders to provide clear and simplified information about loan fees, payments and penalties, which is why they'll require lenders to provide this information during the application process.

**Encourage responsible lending institutions to make small consumer loans:** Obama and Biden will encourage banks, credit unions and Community Development Financial Institutions to provide affordable short-term and small-dollar loans and to drive unscrupulous lenders out of business.

**Reform bankruptcy laws to protect families facing a medical crisis:** Obama and Biden will create an exemption in bankruptcy law for individuals who can prove they filed for bankruptcy because of medical expenses. This exemption will create a process that forgives the debt and lets the individuals get back on their feet.

## **Work-Family Balance**

Obama and Biden will double funding for after-school programs, expand the Family Medical Leave Act, provide low-income families with a refundable tax credit to help with their child-care expenses, and encourage flexible work schedules.

- **Expand the Family and Medical Leave Act:** The FMLA covers only certain employees of employers with 50 or more employees. Obama and Biden will expand it to cover businesses with 25 or more employees. They will expand the FMLA to cover more purposes as well, including allowing workers to take leave for elder care needs; allowing parents up to 24 hours of leave each year to participate in their children's academic activities; and expanding FMLA to cover leave for employees to address domestic violence.
- **Encourage states to adopt paid leave:** As president, Obama will initiate a strategy to encourage all 50 states to adopt paid-leave systems. Obama and Biden will provide a \$1.5 billion fund to assist states with start-up costs and to help states offset the costs for employees and employers.
- **Expand high-quality afterschool opportunities:** Obama and Biden will double funding for the main federal support for afterschool programs, the 21st Century Learning Centers program, to serve a million more children. Obama and Biden will include measures to maximize performance and effectiveness across grantees nationwide.
- **Expand the child and dependent care tax credit:** The Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit provides too little relief to families that struggle to afford child care expenses. Obama and Biden

will reform the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit by making it refundable and allowing low-income families to receive up to a 50 percent credit for their child care expenses.

- **Protect against caregiver discrimination:** Workers with family obligations often are discriminated against in the workplace. Obama and Biden will enforce the recently-enacted Equal Employment Opportunity Commission guidelines on caregiver discrimination.
- **Expand flexible work arrangements:** Obama and Biden will create a program to inform businesses about the benefits of flexible work schedules; help businesses create flexible work opportunities; and increase federal incentives for telecommuting. Obama and Biden will also make the federal government a model employer in terms of adopting flexible work schedules and permitting employees to request flexible arrangements.



## Regional Priorities for Economic Stimulus Bill – JPACT Meeting 01/08/09

The Feds are getting closer to taking action on a federal stimulus bill, possibly before the end of January.

The shape of the federal government's total actions on stimulus is still developing and remains uncertain.

What we know today:

We are hearing the package may include \$85 billion for infrastructure, distributed as follows:

- A. \$30 billion for roads/highways, with a sub-allocation for large MPOs;
- B. \$12 billion for transit
- C. \$4 billion for passenger rail

The question today is:

1. Should we as a region take some steps to prepare ourselves to spend federal dollars that may come to the state and the region?

RTC has developed a list of projects that could be "conditionally" amended into their MTIP if stimulus funding becomes available.

Should we work on a similar list to be ready for either an MPO sub-allocation and a state-level process?

2. Should we develop a set of policy priorities that might guide the state and federal government in deciding how to distribute funds?

The federal stimulus bill is still a work in progress, and some have indicated that it may be just the first round. Should we develop some principles to recommend to the feds and state regarding how funds are used?