

M E M O R A N D U M

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736
TEL 503 797 1538 | FAX 503 797 1793



METRO

To: JPACT Members

From: Metro Council

Re: TPAC Memo to JPACT Concerning MTIP Policy Issues

Date: August 7, 2001

The recent memo from TPAC to JPACT entitled "MTIP Policy Questions" provides an excellent response to the policy questions raised by the Metro Council in its July 10 memo to JPACT. The Council raised these issues to generate discussion and recommendations from both TPAC and JPACT to assist the Council in its assessment of several of the projects proposed for funding through the MTIP process. The Council will actively consider these recommendations as the MTIP allocation process evolves.

The TPAC memo also raises several additional policy issues that appear to revolve around the timing of the Council's involvement in the MTIP allocation process and the development and presentation of the council's MTIP project priority list presented at the July 12 JPACT meeting. We are taking this opportunity to respond to these issues.

1. Role of the Metro Council relative to JPACT

The TPAC memo notes that "submission of a Council priority list to JPACT at their July 12 meeting was not envisioned and is a departure from past practices".

Response—The Council and JPACT are co-equal partners in the MTIP allocation process in that both must concur at the end of the process in a list of projects and programs to be funded. We believe that this joint effort will run more smoothly if there is a frequent exchange of information and ideas between the Council and JPACT throughout the process.

The Council initiated such an exchange in January when it adopted a resolution that advised both TPAC and JPACT that the Council intended to consider certain 2040-related criteria in reviewing proposed MTIP projects. These criteria were thoroughly discussed by both TPAC and JPACT.

Following the receipt of the proposed projects, a technical ranking for each project was determined and staff developed an initial "150 percent" list. The Council determined that, at this point in the allocation process, it would appropriate to assess each of the projects based on its own adopted criteria and report the results to JPACT. The resulting list of high priority projects

was finalized only two days before the July 12 JPACT meeting. However, rather than wait until the next scheduled JPACT meeting in September, the Council chose to release the list and the attached policy issues memo immediately to our JPACT partners.

At the July 12 meeting, the JPACT members from the Council noted that the intent of the policy issues memo was to solicit input from TPAC and JPACT on the identified issues. It also was explained that the project priority list should not be viewed as a static document. In fact, since the July 12 meeting, some adjustments have been made including the addition of one project and the deletion of another.

We would agree with those who are viewing the current allocation process as being different from prior processes, particularly as it relates to the role of the Metro Council. This increased level of Council involvement is being driven by the need to develop land use and transportation planning and implementation policies on a regional rather than a local level. These policies must also recognize the integral relationship between land use and transportation systems.

Federal and state law now clearly recognizes the need for regional approaches for addressing land use and transportation policy. The voters of the metro region have also recognized the need to think regionally when they approved the Metro Charter which gave Metro authority to address land use and transportation policy in a unified, regional manner.

The region now has comprehensive transportation and land use planning documents (the 2040 Growth Concept and the Regional Transportation Plan) that place great emphasis on the connection between transportation and land use at a regional level. These documents are not just compilations of local transportation and land use plans. They are developed regionally and establish regional visions and approaches. Local plans must be revised to comply with these regional policies.

It is the role of the Metro Council to develop and implement these regional policies. In this role, the Council cannot and does not represent the needs of only the central city or suburban communities. The Council must balance different interests and mold a regional approach.

Because the MTIP allocation process has significant impact on the region's transportation and land use systems, it is critical for the Council to insure that the regional elements of these systems are addressed. Local jurisdictions represented on JPACT bring a parochial perspective that is dictated by the transportation needs of their own jurisdictions. The Metro Council must balance these needs with the adopted regional policies that relate to both the transportation and land use system.

In short, the Council believes that concurrence between JPACT and the Council at the end of the MTIP process will be best achieved through an ongoing collaborative discussion of issues and an exchange of information and ideas that spans the entire length of the process. The process must address both regional and local need and the needs of different types and modes of transportation.

2. Prioritization Criteria

The TPAC memo notes that the Council's list of priority projects list did not specifically consider geographic balance, modal splits and past level of commitment.

Response—One of principal purposes of the development of the Council's priority list was to conduct an initial testing of the Council's adopted criteria against the projects that had been submitted and to examine how the use of these criteria compared with the scoring done through the staff's technical ranking process. This allowed the Council to examine projects

based on their individual technical merit and regional impact versus the merit and impact of other projects.

There are a variety of factors that effect the outcome of the allocation process that are considered at various points in the process. The Council's lack of consideration of these factors at an early stage in the process simply follows historical practice, including JPACT's own process. The active consideration of geographic balance, modal splits, and past level of commitment has generally not occurred during the initial technical ranking process. Point weightings have not been given to these factors, though past commitment is noted on the technical ranking sheet as a simple "yes" or "no" consideration. Factors such as these have generally been addressed later in the process.

It is clear from the summary data provided to TPAC entitled "JPACT Approved 150 Percent Cut List By Modal Category" and "JPACT Approved 150 Percent Cut List By Jurisdiction" that neither TPAC or JPACT have fully considered geographic or modal factors at this point in the allocation process. For example, the modal category list shows that 36% of the funding would be dedicated to road widening while only 10% would go toward transit projects and 6% to bike projects. The jurisdictional list shows 32% of the funding flowing to projects in Washington County and only 16% in Clackamas County and 11% in Multnomah County

Some could view the Metro Council list as being "anti-road", while others could view the JPACT list as being "pro-road" to the detriment of other transportation modes. Some could also view either list as favoring particular geographic area. Such characterizations would simply be wrong. These numbers will likely change as JPACT attempts to reduce its "177 Percent List" to a "100 Percent List". Likewise the geographic and modal breakdown from the Council priority list will change as the list expands from a "70 Percent List" to a "100 Percent List"

With regard to projects to which there has been a past commitment; it should be noted that there are over \$53 million in proposed projects that have had some level of past commitment. The current "177 Percent List" has already eliminated three of these projects totaling over \$2.5 million from further consideration. Clearly, with only \$38 million to allocate, JPACT and the Council will be facing many difficult decisions concerning projects that have only been partially funded.

The Council Priority List includes only five projects (102 Ave. Boulevard Project, the Park Ave. and Washington St. pedestrian projects, the South Corridor EIS project, and the Gateway Regional Center TOD project) that do have a prior funding commitment. Each of these projects is on the "177 Percent List" of projects under consideration by TPAC and JPACT.

3. Metro Council 2040 Evaluation

The TPAC memo concludes, "the evaluation of the MTIP projects by the Metro Council appears incomplete." In some sense this is self-evident, because the process is not over. This conclusion appears to be based on the belief that the Council priority list does not include several road or other modal projects that are "essential" or "supportive" of 2040. The memo also notes that "transit projects were evaluated but not included in the Council's priority list."

Response—The Council would agree that many projects that may be essential or supportive of 2040 are not included on its priority list. Unfortunately, current funding limitations restrict the number of such projects that can be funded during a single MTIP funding cycle. The Council's list should be viewed as starting point that defines those projects that are of highest priority interest to the Council. It should not be viewed as an attempt to eliminate further discussion of other projects that have not been included on the list.

We would note that most of the projects on the Council's list received at least 30 points (out of 40) related to their level of 2040 support. Among the road modernization projects, those included on the Council's list were among the highest ranking related to 2040. In contrast, the current "177 Percent List" includes eleven projects that received fewer than 20 points for 2040 support and several of the projects that were dropped from the list were higher ranked for 2040 support than several projects from the same mode that remain on the list.

The lack of transit projects on the Council's list should not be viewed as indicating a lack of interest or potential support for these projects. The Council is soliciting input from a variety of sources, including JPACT and TPAC, prior to setting policy guidelines for providing short or long-term funding of Tri-Met operational improvements. Once the Council guidelines concerning these issues have been established, the proposed transit projects will be reexamined for possible inclusion on its priority list. A similar process will be used to evaluate the proposal for a regional approach to funding pedestrian-to-transit improvements.

In many ways, both the "177 Percent List" and the Council priority list are currently "incomplete". TPAC and JPACT will now be embarking on a process to reduce the "177 Percent List" to a "100 Percent List". This will likely result in the partial or total removal of projects that some view as 2040-essential or supportive due to current funding constraints. At the same time, the Council may evaluate the possible addition of certain 2040-related projects to its list.

4. Road Reconstruction

The TPAC memo notes that the Council list does not include any road reconstruction projects, despite the Council evaluation criteria that places a high value on maintenance instead of expansion of the transportation system.

Response—As noted earlier, the development of the Council priority list is not intended to preclude further discussion of those projects that were not included on the list. The Council evaluation criterion referred to in the TPAC memo is only one of six criteria. The road reconstruction projects were not initially included on the priority list for several reasons. These included: 1) the relatively low overall technical ranking of the projects when compared with other projects, 2) the relatively low scores for most of the projects related to 2040 support.

The current Council priority list provides the needed flexibility to potentially add other projects. The Council would welcome additional discussion related to the proposed road reconstruction projects.

5. Old Federal-Aid Urban Program

The TPAC memo notes that the region has worked to support changes in federal funding programs that would permit the allocation of funds to a broad range of road and alternative mode projects. The memo then expresses concern that the Council list "appears to emphasize only non-road projects".

Response—The Council believes that both its list and the current "177 Percent List" should be viewed as works in progress. The initial Council list does contain a large number of non-road projects. At the same time, the current "177 Percent List" could be viewed as placing a great emphasis on road-related projects. A total of 36% of the funding included on this list relates to road widening projects. This total is twice as much as the combined total for all of the bike and pedestrian projects on the list. If all of the road modernization projects were funded, they would represent over 63% of the total funding available.

The relative modal emphasis of both lists will likely change as the allocation process continues to move ahead. A healthy debate over the relative merits of both road and non-road projects by both the Council and JPACT will ultimately result in the list of funded projects that address many of the most critical road and alternative mode needs of the region.

6. Funding Partial Projects

The TPAC memo asks “Is the Council’s list intended to be viewed as untouchable or will the Council consider a final list that may include some of the projects partially funded or not funded in favor of other priorities?”

Response—As was noted earlier in this memo and at the July 12 JPACT meeting, the Council list should not be viewed as a static document. As additional information becomes available and additional discussion occurs, the Council and its staff will be continually reevaluating the status of its priority list. At the present time all of the projects on the Council list are also included on the “177 Percent List”. Should the process of reducing the “177 Percent List” result in the elimination of a project included on the Council list, we would welcome the opportunity to discuss with JPACT the rationale for removing the project.

At the time the Council list was first prepared, information was not readily available concerning the potential for partially funding particular projects. As partial funding options are identified, the Council would welcome a discussion with JPACT concerning the potential for partial funding. However, we do believe that such a discussion should be tempered by the recognition that such partial funding does create an expectation that MTIP funding will continue to be made available until a project is completed. During the funding cycle currently under consideration, proposals related the projects that have received some level of prior MTIP funding already exceed the amount of available funding by about \$15 million. By adding to this list of partially funded projects we may be only creating an expectation that cannot be met through future MTIP funding allocations.

Summary

We hope that this memo will provide both JPACT and TPAC with a clearer understanding of the Council’s thinking with regard to its involvement in the MTIP allocation process and the intent of the Council’s project priority list. We look forward to a continuing dialogue and exchange of information and ideas with both JPACT and TPAC. We are also looking forward to the scheduled review of the technical ranking criteria that will occur following the completion of the current allocation process.



METRO

Date: August 1, 2001

To: JPACT

From: Mike Hogle, Director
Regional Planning Section

Re: ***Priorities 2002 MTIP Update***

The attached materials are for your information and consideration as the 2002-2005 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) allocation process heads into the recommended program phase over the next month. JPACT is scheduled to act on a recommended package of projects at the September 13, 2001 meeting. The materials include the following information.

1. A memo from TPAC to JPACT that addresses policy issues raised by the Metro Council in a July 10 memo from Councilors Rod Monroe and Rex Burkholder to the full Metro Council.
2. A copy of the July 10 memo from Councilors Monroe and Burkholder to the full Metro Council.
3. A copy of the Metro Council criteria as approved in Metro Resolution No. 01-3025. This Metro Resolution approved the complete procedures and criteria used to solicit and rank the current candidate projects. The criteria used by the Metro Council to select its proposed list were included in the February 2001 MTIP Solicitation Packet.
4. The Metro Council's proposed list of projects for funding through the 2002-2005 MTIP that reflect their adopted criteria, updated to reflect new information since July 12 JPACT meeting.
5. A survey of JPACT and Metro Council members to provide modal direction on MTIP funding priorities. The survey includes an historical context of how "regional flexible" funds (CMAQ and STP) have been allocated over the past decade to various modal categories. Similarly, it illustrates the planned allocation of projects as defined in the Financially Constrained system of the Regional Transportation Plan by mode. Please complete and return the survey to Metro by Monday, August 13, 2001. The survey results are intended for consideration by staff, TPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council as a recommended program is developed over the next month.
6. A revised summary of the projects listed on either the JPACT approved 150 Percent List or the Metro Council proposed list of projects. Projects not on either list have been dropped. As agreed at the July JPACT, any additions of projects to the current 150 percent list must be accompanied by a dollar-for-dollar elimination of projects currently on the list.
7. A summary of public comment and testimony received during the 30-day public comment period that ended July 11.

Also note that a list of those projects which remain under consideration for MTIP funding that also meet the basic criteria for seeking State Bond Program funding are included in the materials provided as part of the bond program agenda item. These projects are also noted in the Summary List described in Item 2, above.

MH/srb/ff

I:\trans\tp\share\Correspondence\JPACT\801memo.doc

I:\trans\transadm\staff\ffloyd\JPACT\2001\8-9-01\#4 Priorities 2002 MTIP Update cvrmemo.doc

Attachments

M E M O R A N D U M

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



METRO

ATTACHMENT 1

Date: July 31, 2001
To: JPACT
From: TPAC
Subject: MTIP Policy Questions

Attached is a memo outlining policy issues that the Metro Council has asked JPACT to address prior to finalizing the MTIP funding allocation. At the July 27 TPAC meeting, we developed a recommend response for JPACT's consideration. In developing these responses, however, it became evident to TPAC that there additional policy issues raised by the action of the Metro Council that should be considered by JPACT, related to both process and substantive issues. Presented below are both the original issues raised by the Metro Council, as well as additional issues raised by TPAC.

Original Issues raised by the Metro Council in their memo of July 10, 2001

1. Corridor Planning Projects

- Use of MTIP funds for corridor planning is dictated by the limited funding situation faced by all transportation agencies. Due to lack of funds, ODOT and local governments have cut-back their programs to focus principally on Maintenance and Preservation, Tri-Met is falling behind on needed service expansion and the Port of Portland has been forced to make deep cuts in their general fund. The MTIP is an appropriate place to consider funding since the issues to be addressed in corridor planning are regional priorities.
- However, this action is not intended to set a precedent for funding these types of studies. In the future, various corridor studies will be funded from various combinations of MTIP funding as well as funding from the STIP, Tri-Met, local governments, the Port of Portland and private sources.
- If these funds are allocated, it is recommended that there be a condition to seek funds from ODOT, Tri-Met, and local governments to support elements of the study scope of work, but that matching funds not be an absolute prerequisite.

2. Tri-Met

- A variety of approaches are available for how funding is provided to Tri-Met. The current commitment of \$1.4 million per year for the McLoughlin Blvd. and Barbur Blvd. Service increases could be continued as an on-going commitment. This would be consistent with historical decisions to fund the TDM program on an on-going basis. Alternatively, the current 4-year commitment could be extended for one additional 2-year

period, treating this allocation as a start-up allocation, much like the TMA start-up allocations, with the expectation that after that period of time, Tri-Met would absorb this responsibility. Similarly, the Murray Blvd. and 181st Ave. TCL applications made on behalf of Beaverton and Gresham could be funded on a start-up basis. The third option could be to allocate funds through the MTIP only to capital projects, much like the past allocations to LRT and the pending application from SMART transit in Wilsonville for funding toward a park-and-ride lot.

- In general, TPAC recommends that we use MTIP funds for transit capital and limited, start-up operational funding. However, TPAC also recognizes that on-going service costs for the McLoughlin and Barbur corridors will require a transition period for Tri-Met to absorb these costs into their budget. This MTIP process should continue to consider funding for transit. It is recommended that the MTIP process conclude with a decision to commit a certain level of MTIP funds in '04 and '05 based upon Tri-Met's application for TCL funding for the Barbur/McLoughlin service continuation and the Murray/181st service expansion. This allocation should be placed in a "Reserve" in the MTIP subject to Tri-Met completing a 5-year service improvement program with review and comment by JPACT and the Metro Council. Upon Tri-Met's adoption of such a program, these MTIP funds would be assigned to appropriate capital projects accordingly.
- The degree to which transit improvement could be funded through the farebox, the employer tax or other sources of state and federal funding is beyond the scope of the MTIP process and can be discussed further by JPACT, Tri-Met and the Metro Council at future meetings.
- TPAC has a split position on whether a regional funding pool for pedestrian-to-transit projects should be considered further. If such a program is established, they recommend that it be used to select projects on a joint basis between Tri-Met and the local governments. As such, any allocation should be subject to approval of the program of projects by JPACT and the Metro Council. However, many members of TPAC feel that MTIP funds should be allocated to discrete pedestrian projects (the current MTIP process has 8 projects under consideration). Metro staff recommends continued consideration of both types of pedestrian projects. Locally submitted projects should be considered but they don't necessarily address access to transit. The pedestrian access to transit program is intended to establish an approach to identifying deficiencies that is complete and comprehensive.

3. New State Funding Availability

- The MTIP funding process should not be delayed until the outcome of the state funding process is known but should be coordinated with the state funding process. MTIP funding decisions are scheduled for September and HB 2142 project decisions will not occur until February. However, at the August 9 meeting of the Oregon Transportation Commission, the selection criteria will be finalized thereby providing better guidance on which of the MTIP projects might be appropriately considered for HB 2142 funding. At the August 9 JPACT meeting, staff will provide an analysis of the MTIP projects and their suitability for funding through HB 2142.
- ODOT's process will ensure that an equitable distribution of HB 2142 funds is achieved because that is a provision of the legislation (see also comments to ODOT re. HB 2142 selection criteria).

4. Boeckman Road

The 2040 criteria approved by JPACT and the Metro Council distinguished between Tier 1 Design Types (Central City, Regional Centers, Industrial Areas), Tier 2 Design Types (Town Centers, Main Streets, Light Rail Station Communities and Corridors) and Tier 3 Design Types (Inner and Outer Neighborhoods and Employment Areas). However, it overlooked consideration of urban villages development types such as Dammasch (or for that matter, Fairview Village and Orenco). It is recommended that the ranking be revised to treat this area as a Tier 2 Design Type and that the rating of congestion account for the affect of this road on parallel routes.

Additional policy issues raised by TPAC

1. Role of the Metro Council relative to JPACT

- Submission of a Council priority list to JPACT at their July 12 meeting was not envisioned and is a departure from past practices and raises questions that TPAC requests clarification. According to the JPACT Bylaws, MPO actions are to be developed by JPACT and submitted to the Metro Council for concurrence. If there is not concurrence, the action is to be sent back to JPACT to develop a revised recommendation.
- It is TPAC's expectation that this process will apply to completion of this MTIP process. As such, they interpret the Metro Council's list as early input to the process, and that the final list will be developed by JPACT for concurrence by the Metro Council.

2. Prioritization Criteria

- The Metro Council's policy issues paper dated July 10, 2001 explicitly states that their list of priorities were without consideration of geographic balance, modal splits or the level of past commitment.
- These were criteria approved by JPACT and the Metro Council at the beginning of the process and TPAC recommends they be considered in the final MTIP allocation.

3. Metro Council 2040 Evaluation

- The evaluation of the MTIP projects by the Metro Council appears incomplete. Many of the road projects under consideration for funding through the MTIP are essential to support 2040, especially in relation to centers, industrial areas and newly expanded UGB areas. Similarly, a number of the alternative mode projects are 2040 supportive but were not included in the Council's priority list. Transit projects were evaluated but not included in the Council's priority list.
- TPAC recommends these projects continue to be considered in the final MTIP allocation.

4. Road Reconstruction

- The Council's prioritization criteria include maintaining the system in place as a priority over expansion, yet there were no road reconstruction projects included on the Council's priority list.

- TPAC recommends these projects continue to be considered in the final MTIP allocation.

5. Old Federal-aid Urban Program

- The STP and CMAQ funding categories are the transformation of the prior Federal-aid Urban funds, which prior to the 1991 enactment of ISTEA were aimed principally at local road projects in urban areas. The Metro region was supportive of the expanded eligibility to allow a broader range of road and alternative mode projects to be funded. The Council's priority list appears to emphasize only non-road projects, moving totally away from it's original intent.
- TPAC recommends that the final MTIP allocation consist of road and non-road projects.

6. Funding partial projects

- In the past, the final allocation has attempted to keep making progress on the broadest program possible. As such, there has been a careful attempt to fund the most critical phase of a project to allow other projects to also be funded. With the Council's priority list, it is not clear whether this flexibility remains available as we proceed to the final list. Is the Council's list intended to be viewed as untouchable or will the Council consider a final list that may include some of the projects partially funded or not funded in favor of other priorities?
- TPAC recommends developing the final MTIP allocation with partially funded projects where appropriate.

Development of a final funding allocation should proceed based upon implementation of these recommendations (subject to revision by JPACT at the August 9 meeting). This will allow TPAC to develop the final MTIP allocation at their August 31 meeting and JPACT at their September 13 meeting.

M E M O R A N D U M

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



METRO

Date: July 10, 2001

To: All Councilors

From: Councilor Rex Burkholder
Councilor Rod Monroe

Re: Proposed List of Council MTIP Priority Projects

At the June 19 meeting of the Community Planning Committee, the Chair directed that we develop an initial list of priority MTIP projects reflecting Council priorities as clarified at the committee meeting. The proposed list would be reviewed at the next committee meeting or the July 10 Council informal. A total of \$38 million is available for project funding and it is our understanding that we were to prepare a list that totaled about 50-75% of the total available funding.

The agency transportation planning staff has completed its technical ranking process for each of the proposed projects. In addition, the Council adopted Resolution No. 01-3025, which set out six additional criteria that the Council would use in its project evaluation process. A listing of these criteria is attached.

Project Review Process

The Council staff has developed a ranking matrix of all of the proposed projects to assist the Council in its evaluation process. The matrix identifies each project by type, notes the overall staff technical ranking, and the number of points received by each project for the technical ranking criteria related to 2040 implementation. The matrix then applies the Council adopted evaluation review. In some cases, individual criteria are not applicable to certain projects. The matrix then provides a "council ranking" for each project based on the number of applicable criteria the project has met.

The draft matrix is attached. If individual Councilors with knowledge of a particular project believe that changes should be made in the application of the Council evaluation criteria to the project, please bring these to our attention.

In reviewing the proposed projects, we focused exclusively on the merits of the individual projects. The overall technical ranking, the number of 2040 implementation points received, and the ranking based on the Council-adopted criteria were the sole determining factors. No consideration was given to geographic balance, modal splits or the level of past commitment. As a result of this review, we are recommending the inclusion of 26 projects or planning

activities on the Council priority project list. The cost of these projects is \$27,763,000, or 73% of the total available funds. A matrix of these recommended projects is attached.

Projects Requiring Further Policy Review

In reviewing certain of the proposed projects, we concluded that additional policy discussion should occur prior to determining whether they should be funded through the MTIP process. These include: the funding of corridor planning projects, the funding of Tri-Met service and program enhancements, and the potential effect of the newly enacted state transportation funding program.

Corridor Planning Projects. Metro has requested \$600,000 for total funding of the first of 18 potential corridor studies resulting from the nearly completed corridor initiative project. The policy issues that we believe need to be discussed are:

- if the initial study is fully funded from the MTIP process, will an expectation be created that all future corridor studies will also be funded through MTIP
- Given the potential for local benefits and state highway system improvements that might result from the studies, should there be an expectation of local or state matching funds.

Tri-Met. Tri-Met has requested continued MTIP funding for two service enhancement programs and funding for two new service enhancement programs. These requests total \$5.6 million. The policy issues related to these requests include:

- is it appropriate to use MTIP resources for initial or ongoing funding of Tri-Met service enhancements
- does funding of existing service enhancements create an expectation that MTIP funds will become the permanent funding source for such enhancements
- given the size of the pending requests and the potential for additional future requests, is there an expectation that an increasing portion of future MTIP allocations would be directed to transit service enhancements
- what is the potential for Tri-Met to fund these enhancements from other sources such as the fare box, the employer tax or other sources of state or federal funding

Tri-Met also has requested a lump sum funding amount of \$2 million for unspecified pedestrian/transit related improvements that would be identified by the agency. The policy issues that needs to be addressed are:

- whether local governments should continue to be the originator of pedestrian/transit improvements based on their assessment of local need or should a regional funding pool administered by Tri-Met be established
- should these projects continue to be reviewed on an individual basis through the MTIP process or should a collective funding approach be considered

New State Funding Availability. There are several proposals that involve projects that may be actively considered for funding through the newly enacted state transportation-bonding program. These include widening the Sunset Highway, the Sunrise Corridor and the Columbia/Killingsworth Connector. The policy issues associated with these projects include:

- should the potential allocation of MTIP funds for these projects be delayed until the outcome of the state funding process is known
- how should the region insure that it receives its fair share of the new state funding revenues
- should a dialogue be initiated with the state concerning the potential for reallocating existing state transportation resources to assist in the funding of projects proposed for MTIP funding

Boeckman Road. The technical criteria applied to determine the project ranking result in zero points because there is no existing road to rate existing congestion and safety concerns. However, it's intended to provide a new connection to Dammath State Hospital to facilitate development of an urban village within the 2040 Growth Concept. How should we rate projects such as this one based upon land use objectives rather than traffic considerations.

We look forward to discussing the projects that should be given priority for funding and the outstanding policy issues that have been noted above.

**METRO COUNCIL GUIDANCE:
2040 GROWTH CONCEPT
AND
PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE**

Previous MTIP updates have emphasized implementation of the Region 2040 Growth Concept. It is the intention of the Metro Council that this emphasis be even more firmly advanced in the current update. Forty percent of the technical ranking of all candidate projects is linked to support of 2040 concepts. However, final selection of projects for funding is based on a combination of technical and administrative factors. At its January 25 meeting, the Metro Council approved supplemental guidance regarding specific elements of the 2040 Concept Plan that should be reflected in transportation programming decisions. The Council agreed that the guidance would not be formally amended into the Metro transportation project ranking system but that it should be provided as part of the solicitation package material. Under this guidance, the final list of the projects or programs proposed for funding should facilitate implementation of:

- 1) development and redevelopment in support of the central city, regional and town centers, main streets and station areas,
- 2) development of transportation infrastructure that supports industrial centers and their inter-modal connectors,
- 3) efficient management of demand and enhancement of the operation of the existing transportation system,
- 4) development and promotion of alternatives to single occupancy vehicles,
- 5) development of a multi-modal transportation system,
- 6) projects for which there is no other readily available source of funding.

Council Recommended MTIP Project Priority List

Attachment 4

Background Information		Metro Staff Ranking		Council Project Evaluation Criteria and Ranking						COUNCIL RANKING
Project	Funds Requested	Technical Ranking	2040 Point Ranking (out of 40)	Regional/Town Center, Main Streets, Station Areas	Industrial Center/Intermodal Connectors	Existing Transportation System	Alternatives to Single Occupancy Vehicles	Multi-Modal Transportation System	No Other Readily Available Funding Sources	
Boulevard Projects										
Division Street Blvd. Phase 2 Main/Cleveland	\$989,000	97	37	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5 out of 5
102nd Ave Boulevard Project	\$700,000	92	32	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5 out of 5
Stark Street Boulevard Project	\$800,000	88	28	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5 out of 5
Pedestrian Projects										
Park Way Sidewalk Project	\$235,000	75	30	Yes	N/A		Yes	Yes	Yes	4 out of 5
Molalla Ave. Ped Project	\$500,000	75	25	Yes	N/A		Yes	Yes	Yes	4 out of 5
Butner Rd. Sidewalk Project	\$180,000	60	30	Yes	N/A		Yes	Yes	Yes	4 out of 5
Bike Improvements										
Morrison Bridge	\$1,345,000	100	40	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5 out of 6
Washington St. Bike Lanes	\$750,000	62	40	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5 out of 5
Regional Multi-Use Trails										
Eastbank Trail-OMSI/Springwater Phase 2	\$4,209,000	78	30	Yes	N/A	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	4 out of 6
Gresham/Fairview Multi-Use Path	\$1,076,000	69	30	Yes	N/A	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	4 out of 6
Fanno Creek Multi Use Path Phase 2	\$1,123,000	69	26	Yes	N/A	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	4 out of 6
TDM Improvements										
Regional Tri-Met TDM Program	\$1,400,000	92	40	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5 out of 5
TMA Assistance Program	\$500,000	86	40	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5 out of 5
ECO Information Clearinghouse	\$94,000	85	40	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5 out of 5
Wilsonville TDM Program	\$145,000	81	30	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5 out of 5
Road Modernization										
Clackamas ITS Program Phase 2	\$500,000	76	24	Yes	N/A	Yes	No	No	Yes	3 out of 5
Cornell Road Corridor ITS Project	\$375,000	75	23	Yes	N/A	Yes	No	No	Yes	3 out of 5
Gresham/Multnomah County ITS Program-Phase 3B	\$1,000,000	68	29	Yes	N/A	Yes	No	No	Yes	3 out of 5
Harmony/Linwood Railroad Intersection	\$750,000	46	29	Yes	N/A	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	4 out of 4
Road Reconstruction										
Transit Improvements										

Council Recommended MTIP Project Priority List

Attachment 4

Background Information		Metro Staff Ranking		Council Project Evaluation Criteria and Ranking							COUNCIL RANKING
Project	Funds Requested	Technical Ranking	2040 Point Ranking (out of 40)	Regional/Town Center, Main Streets, Station Areas	Industrial Center/Intermodal Connectors	Existing Transportation System	Alternatives to Single Occupancy Vehicles	Multi-Modal Transportation System	No Other Readily Available Funding Sources	COUNCIL RANKING	
South Corridor EIS	\$4,000,000	Not Ranked	Not Ranked	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5 out of 6	
Freight Improvements											
N. Lombard Railroad Overcrossing	\$2,000,000	100	40	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	1 out of 6	
TOD Improvements											
Implementation Program	\$2,100,000	96	36	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5 out of 5	
Gateway Regional Center TOD	\$892,000	85	40	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5 out of 5	
Planning Projects											
Willamette Shoreline Rail and Trail Study	\$550,000	Not Ranked	Not Ranked	Yes	N/A	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	4 out of 6	
Regional Freight Program	\$150,000	Not Ranked	Not Ranked	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	No	Yes	4 out of 5	
Metro Core Regional Planning Program	\$1,400,000	Not Ranked	Not Ranked	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	6 out of 6	
TOTAL	\$27,763,000										

I:\trans\transadm\staff\loyd\UPACT\2001\8901\#4 attachmt 4Council MTIP A List

PRIORITIES 2002: JPACT AND METRO COUNCIL MEMBER SURVEY

Member Name: _____

THE SURVEY

Table 1, below, shows the modal distribution of the \$68 million of projects approved in the JPACT 150 Percent List, calculated both as dollars and percentages. The Member Survey Form is provided so that members of JPACT and the Metro Council may indicate their modal priorities for distribution of the \$38 million available for programming in the 2002 MITP Update. The purpose of the survey is to help staff determine where agreement exists on priority projects and where a preponderance of agreement exists to help determine modal priorities. **PLEASE COMPLETE THIS SURVEY BY NOON OF MONDAY, AUGUST 13 and fax it to Francine Floyd at 503-797-1930!** For more information, please contact Terry Whisler at 503-797-1747.

TABLE 1

	JPACT APPROVED "150% LIST" AS PERCENT	JPACT APPROVED "150% LIST" AS DOLLARS
Planning	10%	\$ 6.78
Road Modernization	29%	\$ 20.37 *
Road Reconstruction	3%	\$ 2.30
Freight	5%	\$ 3.00
Boulevard	11%	\$ 7.11
Pedestrian	6%	\$ 4.30
Bike	12%	\$ 7.78
TDM	4%	\$ 2.63
TOD	4%	\$ 2.99
Transit	10%	\$ 6.53
Non-Frwy Subtotal	93%	\$ 63.80
Frwy Subtotal	7%	\$ 4.36
GRAND TOTAL	100%	\$ 68.16

MEMBER SURVEY FORM

PLEASE INDICATE DESIRED DISTRIBUTION UP TO A TOTAL OF \$38 MILLION OR 100%	
\$	-
\$	-
\$	-
\$	-
\$	-
\$	-
\$	-
\$	-
\$	-
\$	-
\$	-
\$	-
\$	-
\$	-

* The distribution summarized here includes \$750,000 for the Harmony/Linwood/Railroad Interchange project included in the Metro Council 75% List but not included in the JPACT 150% List.

(On the reverse of this form are Tables 2 and 3 that provide additional information about the historical and planned distribution of regional resources to the various modal categories.)

BACKGROUND TO MEMBER SURVEY

ATTACHMENT 5

Table 2 shows the amount of Regional Flexible Funds allocated to each transportation mode from the beginning of the Federal ISTEA funding programs in 1992, in total dollars and as a percentage of ISTEA funds. Added to this data are ODOT funds allocated to freeway modernization projects in the Metro region. The final column of Table 1 shows the percentage distribution of funds planned for in the 20-year, Financially Constrained System of the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan. This information is to provide a context for determining the current round of flexible funding modal priorities.

Table 3 shows first the percentage, then the dollar distribution of funds reflected in the current JPACT "150% List" of \$68 million of Regional Flexible Funds. The next two columns show the percentage and dollar distribution of the short list *plus* \$33.6 million of freeway funds approved by ODOT for widening of U.S. 26 from Murray Blvd. to Hwy 217 in FY 05. Though the current exercise is mostly concerned with allocation of Regional Flexible Funds, JPACT and the Metro Council also take action to approve this discretionary allocation of highway funds controlled by ODOT.

TABLE 2

Modal Share of Committed & Planned Transportation Funds: 1992-2003 (\$ millions)				
PROJECT MODE	COMMITTED FUNDS FY 92-03	% DISTRIBUTION OF FY 92-03 ALLOCATIONS	% DISTRIBUTION FY 92-03 ALLOCATIONS W/ FRWY FUNDING	% DISTRIBUTION OF RTP FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED SYSTEM
Planning	\$ 8.59	3%	2%	1%
Road Modernization	\$ 71.19	24%	13%	25%
Road Reconstruction	\$ 5.50	2%	1%	NA
Bridge	\$ 14.43	5%	3%	2%
Freight	\$ 37.65	13%	7%	1%
Boulevard	\$ 10.62	4%	2%	3%
Pedestrian	\$ 14.72	5%	3%	4%
Bike	\$ 19.96	7%	4%	4%
TDM	\$ 9.73	3%	2%	1%
TOD	\$ 9.05	3%	2%	1%
Transit LRT	\$ 95.57	32%	17%	42%
Transit				14%
Non-Frwy Subtotal	\$ 296.99	100%	53%	93%
Frwy Subtotal	\$ 259.52		47%	8%
GRAND TOTAL	\$ 556.51		100%	101%

TABLE 3

JPACT APPROVED "150% LIST" AS PERCENT	JPACT APPROVED "150% LIST" AS DOLLARS (\$68.14m)	JPACT APPROVED "150% LIST" AND ODOT FUNDS AS DOLLARS (\$98.84m)*	JPACT APPROVED "150% LIST" AND ODOT FUNDS AS PERCENT
10%	\$ 6.78	\$ 6.78	7%
29%	\$ 20.37	\$ 20.35	21%
3%	\$ 2.30	\$ 2.30	2%
0%	\$ -	\$ -	0%
5%	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.00	3%
11%	\$ 7.11	\$ 7.11	7%
6%	\$ 4.30	\$ 4.30	4%
12%	\$ 7.78	\$ 7.78	8%
4%	\$ 2.63	\$ 2.63	3%
4%	\$ 2.99	\$ 2.99	3%
0%	\$ -	\$ -	0%
10%	\$ 6.53	\$ 6.53	7%
93%	\$ 63.80	\$ 63.78	65%
7%	\$ 4.36	\$ 35.06	35%
100%	68.16 *	98.84**	100%

* Includes \$750,000 for Harmony/Linwood Railroad Interchange from Metro Council 75% list that was not included in the JPACT 150% List.

**ODOT has approved \$30.7 million for widening US 26 to three lanes from Murray Blvd to Hwy 217 in FY 05.

**PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE
PROJECT SUMMARY
Of
JPACT APPROVED
“150 PERCENT LIST”**

July 31, 2001



METRO

Code Key: (e.g., CBL1 = Clackamas County Boulevard Project #1)

C = Clackamas County
M = Multnomah County
P = City of Portland
R = Regional
W = Washington County

B = Bike
BL = Boulevard
F = Freight
M = Road Modernization
P = Pedestrian
PLNG = Planning
TDM = Transportation Demand Management
TOD = Transit Oriented Development
TR = Transit

**PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE
PROJECT SUMMARY**

Bike Projects

Project Code & Sponsor	Project Title	Federal Funds Requested
CB1 City of Portland/ Milwaukie	E. Bank Trail/Springwater Trail Connector City of Portland, City of Milwaukie joint application to link the E. Bank Trail to the Springwater Trail by construction of a traffic signal at Ochoco/17th Ave., off-street trail segments and bike/pedestrian bridge crossings of Johnson Creek, McLoughlin and UPRR tracks.	\$3,940,000
CB2 Oregon City	Washington St. Boulevard Project PE: 12th/16th Design and construction funding, with local 36 percent match, to restripe 1,300 feet of a four-lane Community Street/Transit-Mixed Use Corridor to two lanes, with turn protection and two new signals at 14th and 15th Streets. Also implements bike, transit and pedestrian amenities.	\$750,000
MB1 Gresham	Gresham-Fairview Trail Funding to construct the Gresham/Fairview bike/ped path, to match \$640,838 of City funds for design and construction, and \$224,000 of regionally allocated federal right of way funds.	\$852,000
MB2 Multnomah County	Morrison Bridge Bicycle/Pedestrian Facility Construction funds for a multi-use pathway across Morrison Bridge, to supplement \$200,000 of federal/local PE funds already awarded the project.	\$1,345,000
WB1 THPRD	Fanno Creek Trail, Phase 2 Funds to construct extension of the Fanno Creek Trail from Denney to Allen/Scholls Ferry Road.	\$888,030
Subtotal		\$7,775,030

PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE PROJECT SUMMARY

Pedestrian Projects

Project Code & Sponsor	Project Title	Federal Funds Requested
CP2 Oregon City	Molalla Ave. Boulevard Project – Willamette/Pearl & Mountain View/Holmes Construction funds for Boulevard treatment of Molalla Ave: restripe to two lanes w/turn protection from Division to Hwy. 213; provide street amenities along two four-block segments in downtown Oregon City.	\$500,000
MP1 Troutdale	257th Ave. Pedestrian Improvements Funding to design and construct pedestrian improvement of 257th, a Major Arterial and Transit/Mixed Use Corridor. REDUCED FROM \$1.3 MILLION TO \$700,000.	\$700,000
RP1 Tri-Met	FY04/05 Regional Pedestrian Access to Transit Program Regional program to IDENTIFY, PRIORITIZE AND COMPETITIVELY SELECT PROJECTS TO infill sidewalks and pedestrian amenities along high quality BUS transit routes IN MOSTLY TIER 2 2040 LAND USE TYPES.	\$2,000,000
WP1 Washington County	Park Way Sidewalk Project: SW Marlow Ave./ SW Parkwood Dr. Construct approximately 2,000 linear feet of sidewalks linking Sunset Transit Center and other pedestrian attractors to surrounding mulit- and single-family housing within the Sunset Station Community.	\$235,000
WP2 Washington County	198th Avenue Sidewalk: TV Highway/SW Trelane St. Design, acquire and construct half-street sidewalk/bikelane improvements along 850 ft. of 198th to provide bike/ped access to transit and mixed use commercial district.	\$170,000
WP3 Washington County	Butner Rd. Sidewalk Project – SW Marlow Avenue/ SW Wood Way Design, acquire and construct half-street sidewalk/bikelane improvements along 900 ft. of Butner Rd. to provide bike/ped access to Sunset Transit Center pedestrian skybridge.	\$180,000
WP6 Washington County	Murray Blvd Sidewalk Project: Farmington Rd./675 ft Design, acquire and construct 675 ft. of 6 foot-wide sidewalks and street lighting on west side of Murray, north of Farmington Rd. to improve pedestrian transit access.	\$119,000

**PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE
PROJECT SUMMARY**

**Pedestrian Projects
(continued)**

Project Code & Sponsor	Project Title	Federal Funds Requested
WP7 City of Forest Grove	Forest Grove Town Center Pedestrian Improvements Funding to design and construct pedestrian amenities in a six-block area of the Forest Grove downtown bounded by 21st, 19th, "B" St. and Council St./College Way.	\$400,000
	Subtotal	\$4,304,000

**PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE
PROJECT SUMMARY**

Boulevard Projects

Project Code & Sponsor	Project Title	Federal Funds Requested
CBL3 Oregon City	McLoughlin Boulevard Project PE: I-205/Railroad Tunnel Regional preliminary engineering funds to design Boulevard treatment of McLoughlin/99E as a riverfront promenade through downtown Oregon City.	\$625,000
MBL1 Gresham	Division St. Boulevard, Phase 2: Main/Cleveland Design, acquire, and construct a half mile second phase extension of the Division St. Boulevard project from Main St. to Cleveland, linking the Gresham Civic Neighborhood district to Downtown Gresham.	\$989,000
MBL2 Gresham	Stark St. Boulevard Project: 190th/197th Design, acquire, and construct a seven block, second phase extension of the Stark St. Boulevard project, from 190th to 197th, including the 190th/Stark/Burnside/Light rail intersection in the Rockwood Station Community.	\$800,000
PBL1 City of Portland	102nd Ave Boulevard Project: Hancock/Main Funds to design boulevard treatment of 102nd Ave. for a length of approximately 1.3 miles in the Gateway Regional Center district, including Gateway Transit Center, and provision of parallel bike facilities on 99th.	\$700,000
WBL1 Washington County	Cornell Rd. Boulevard Project – Murray Blvd./Saltzman Rd. Regional funding to add Boulevard design elements to locally funded widening project through Cedar Mill Town Center (regional funds are 49 percent of total project cost). COULD FUND A \$2.0 MILLION ROW PHASE.	\$3,500,000
Subtotal		\$7,114,000

**PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE
PROJECT SUMMARY**

Road Modernization Projects

Project Code & Sponsor	Project Title	Federal Funds Requested
CM1 Clackamas County	Clackamas ITS Program Phase 2 Implementation funds for signal equipment and timing plans for corridors to be determined by funded ITS Master Plan.	\$500,000
CM2 Clackamas County	Sunnyside Rd. PE – 122nd/132nd Request for 63 percent of funds for Final Design of four-lane widening from terminus of current I-205/122nd widening project. STATE BOND PROGRAM ELIGIBLE.	\$625,000
CM3 Clackamas County/ Milwaukie	Harmony/Linwood/Railroad Intersection Final design funding for intersection improvement and grade separated rail crossing; design improvements to accommodate future High Capacity Transit alignment through Milwaukie. SELECTED BY COUNCIL BUT NOT BY JPACT.	\$750,000
CM4 Wilsonville	Boeckman Rd. Extension (Dammach Urban Village): 95th Ave./Graham's Ferry Rd. Regional preliminary engineering funds (supplements \$12.5 million of local/private right of way and construction dollars) to extend Boeckman Rd. from present terminus at 95th, west of I-5, across wetlands to a junction with Graham's Ferry Rd. The project would access the planned Dammach Urban Village development. MAY OFFSET DELAY ON WILSONVILLE ROAD.	\$1,000,000
CM5 Clackamas County/ Happy Valley	Sunrise Corridor Phase 1 PE: I-205/Rock Creek Jnct. Funding through Final Design for first phase of Sunrise Corridor limited access improvement of 212/224 Corridor from I-205 to Rock Creek Junction.	\$4,000,000
MM1 Gresham	Gresham/Mult. Co. ITS Program, Phase 3B Implement additional phase of Gresham/Mult. Co. ITS Master Plan to provide traffic adaptive signal timing of the 181st and Burnside corridors, including one-time costs needed for adoption of adaptive signal timing technology in comparable corridors throughout the region.	\$1,000,000
MM2 Multnomah County	223rd Ave. Railroad Overcrossing Right of Way funds, for widening of the railroad bridge crossing of 223rd, that would supplement previously awarded federal PE funds.	\$149,000

**PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE
PROJECT SUMMARY**

Road Modernization Projects
(continued)

Project Code & Sponsor	Project Title	Federal Funds Requested
PM1 City of Portland	SE Foster Rd. at SE 162nd Ave. Request for 30 percent of funds, matched by other committed local/private/previously allocated regional dollars, needed to design, acquire and construct widening and realignment of Foster Rd. and 162nd Ave., install a signal, bike path and sidewalks, and provide BRIDGE X'ING (NO culvert) at Kelley Creek.	\$1,500,000
WM1 Washington County	U.S. 26 Widening PE – Murray/Cornell Preliminary Engineering to widen US 26 to three lanes in each direction from the Murray Blvd. Interchange to the Cornell Rd. Interchange. PROJECT NOT FROM FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED NETWORK AND WILL TRIGGER TECHNICAL CONFORMITY ANALYSIS. PE ONLY REQUEST AND NOT ELIGIBLE FOR STATE BOND PROGRAM.	\$359,000
WM2 Washington County	Cornell Rd. Corridor ITS Project – Cornell Rd.: Main/10th to County Line Regional funding to supplement County funds (50/50 ratio) for improvement of corridor monitoring and signal operations.	\$375,000
WM3 Washington County	Cedar Hills Blvd./Barnes Rd. Intersection Improvement Design, acquire and construct additional right/left/through lanes at this intersection, and provide significant multi-modal amenities. STATE BOND PROGRAM ELIGIBLE.	\$1,980,000
WM4 City of Tigard	SW Greenburg Rd.: Washington Square Dr./Tiedeman Right of way and partial construction funding, (supplements previous regional design funds), to widen Greenburg Rd. from three to five lanes, modify one signal and signing, striping and transitional road segments between Tiedeman and Washington. COULD BE SPLIT TO \$390,000 ROW PHASE. STATE BOND PROGRAM ELIGIBLE.	\$774,000
WM6 City of Tualatin	I-5/Nyberg Interchange Widening Right of Way and construction funds to widen Nyberg O'Xing of I-5 from two to four lanes, improve signal operations at the interchange, widen ramp structures in tandem with separate ODOT project and provide bike and ped facilities. STATE BOND PROGRAM ELIGIBLE.	\$3,507,270
WM7 City of Beaverton	Farmington Rd.: Hocken Ave./Murray Blvd. Right of way and construction funding, (supplements previously allocated regional design funds), to widen Farmington Rd. at the Murray intersection to accommodate double left turn bays and to provide appropriate Boulevard amenities at the Farmington/Murray intersection	\$8,210,000

**PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE
PROJECT SUMMARY**

Road Modernization Projects
(continued)

Project Code & Sponsor	Project Title	Federal Funds Requested
---	----------------------	--

per regional design guidelines, upgrade signals, address significant safety issues and integrate multimodal facilities at the Farmington /Murray and Farmington/Hocken intersections. COULD BE SPLIT TO \$4.3 MILLION ROW PHASE. SOME CONCERN ABOUT BOULEVARD DESIGN CONSISTENCY. STATE BOND PROGRAM ELIGIBLE.

	Subtotal	\$23,957,000
--	-----------------	---------------------

**PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE
PROJECT SUMMARY**

Road Reconstruction Projects

Project Code & Sponsor	Project Title	Federal Funds Requested
CR1 Milwaukie/ Portland	Johnson Creek Blvd. – 36th to 45th, Phase 3 Construction funds (supplements \$1.364 million of previously committed federal/local funds) to complete the third, final phase of a multi-modal retrofit of Johnson Creek Blvd. through Milwaukie. The entire project accommodates multiple travel modes in a highly constrained corridor and provides storm-water retention/treatment facilities adjacent to lower reaches of Johnson Creek.	\$800,000
PR3 City of Portland	Naito Parkway: NW Davis/SW Market St. Construction funding to supplement previously allocated regional funds for reconstruction of Naito Parkway, with two onstreet bikelanes.	\$1,500,000
	Subtotal	\$2,300,000

**PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE
PROJECT SUMMARY**

Freight Projects

Project Code & Sponsor	Project Title	Federal Funds Requested
PF1 Port/ Portland/ ODOT	Columbia/Killingsworth East End Connector Thirty-three percent of design funds, to augment Port overmatch, for new, \$34 million, grade-separated Columbia/Killingsworth intersection and rail crossing. STATE BOND PROGRAM ELIGIBLE.	\$1,000,000
PF2 Port of Portland	N. Lombard RR O'Xing: N. Burgard Ave./N. Rivergate Blvd. Supplemental construction funds to cover design changes for habitat protection needs of this otherwise fully funded project to widen N. Lombard from two to four lanes, add five foot bike lanes, a four foot median and one seven foot sidewalk, and to grade separate the street crossing of the BN and SP rail lines. STATE BOND PROGRAM ELIGIBLE.	\$2,000,000
Subtotal		\$3,000,000

**PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE
PROJECT SUMMARY**

Transit Projects

Project Code & Sponsor	Project Title	Federal Funds Requested
CTR1 Wilsonville	Smart Transit Center Park & Ride Right of Way funds to acquire 2.5 acres for a 250 space Park & Ride/Transit Center at Boberg Rd. and Barber St. in Wilsonville. Project is adjacent to the proposed Wilsonville/Beaverton Commuter Rail and supplements \$1.924 million of appropriated FTA/local match construction funds.	\$1,172,000
MTR1 Tri-Met	FY04/05 Gresham TCL Service Increases Biennial regional share of funds to consolidate Lines 82 and 87 in Gresham to begin 15 minute service during weekdays, weekends and evenings on a new Line 181st running on 181st between Powell and Sandy during FY 04 and 05. Service is provided in exchange for regional purchase of 10 Tri-Met service expansion buses; matched 100 percent by Tri-Met funds.	\$1,794,000
RTR1 Tri-Met	FY04/05 McLoughlin/Barbur Transit Service Continuation Biennial regional share of funds to continue 15 minute service during weekdays, weekends and evenings on new McLoughlin and Barbur Blvd. transit lines during FY 04 and 05. Service is provided in exchange for regional purchase of 10 Tri-Met service expansion buses; matched 100 percent by Tri-Met funds.	\$2,850,000
WTR1 Tri-Met	FY04/05 Beaverton/Tigard TCL Service Increases Biennial regional share of funds to begin 15 minute service during weekdays, weekends and evenings on slightly redefined #62 Line between Sunset Transit Center, Beaverton Regional Center, Murray Scholls Town Center and Washington Square during FY 04 and 05. Service is provided in exchange for regional purchase of 10 Tri-Met service expansion buses; matched 100 percent by Tri-Met funds.	\$718,000
Subtotal		\$7,607,600

NOTE: NO COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION ABOUT TRANSIT FUNDING PENDING.
COUNCIL EXPRESSED CONCERN ABOUT ESTABLISHING PRECEDENT FOR
FUNDING ON-GOING TRI-MET OPERATIONS.

**PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE
PROJECT SUMMARY**

Transportation Demand Management Projects

Project Code & Sponsor	Project Title	Federal Funds Requested
RTDM1 Tri-Met	FY04/05 TMA Assistance – TDM Program Two-year funding for continuation of revamped TMA assistance program to provide locally based TDM services at key regional locations.	\$500,000
RTDM2 Tri-Met	FY04/05 Regional Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program Two-year continuation funding for Regional TDM program housed at Tri-Met.	\$1,400,000
RTDM3 Tri-Met	FY04/05 Region 2040 Initiatives – TDM Program Two-year funding to implement non-Tri-Met transit services and other innovative SOV reduction projects.	\$495,000
RTDM4 DEQ	FY 04/05 ECO Information Clearinghouse DEQ Program that complements the regional TDM program housed at Tri-Met.	\$188,000
RTDM5 SMART	FY 04/05 SMART TDM Program Regional support for Wilsonville SMART component of the Regional TDM program.	\$145,000
Subtotal		\$2,728,000

**PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE
PROJECT SUMMARY**

Transit Oriented Development Projects

Project Code & Sponsor	Project Title	Federal Funds Requested
PTOD1 City of Portland	Gateway Regional Center TOD Project Funds to acquire a 1 acre replacement parcel for relocation of 140 Park & Ride Spaces from Gateway to 122nd Ave. MAX Station that is needed to leverage construction of a TOD containing 67,000 sq. ft. of commercial retail, 107 units of housing and a publicly accessible esplanade.	\$800,000
RTOD1 Metro	Transit-Oriented Development Implementation Program Regional funds to leverage privately financed construction of transit oriented commercial/retail/residential development in Regional and Town Centers adjacent to light rail.	\$2,100,000
	Subtotal	\$2,900,000

**PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE
PROJECT SUMMARY**

Transit Projects

Project Code & Sponsor	Project Title	Federal Funds Requested
CTR1 Wilsonville	Smart Transit Center Park & Ride Right of Way funds to acquire 2.5 acres for a 250 space Park & Ride/Transit Center at Boberg Rd. and Barber St. in Wilsonville. Project is adjacent to the proposed Wilsonville/Beaverton Commuter Rail and supplements \$1.924 million of appropriated FTA/local match construction funds.	\$1,172,000
MTR1 Tri-Met	FY04/05 Gresham TCL Service Increases Biennial regional share of funds to consolidate Lines 82 and 87 in Gresham to begin 15 minute service during weekdays, weekends and evenings on a new Line 181st running on 181st between Powell and Sandy during FY 04 and 05. Service is provided in exchange for regional purchase of 10 Tri-Met service expansion buses; matched 100 percent by Tri-Met funds.	\$1,794,000
RTR1 Tri-Met	FY04/05 McLoughlin/Barbur Transit Service Continuation Biennial regional share of funds to continue 15 minute service during weekdays, weekends and evenings on new McLoughlin and Barbur Blvd. transit lines during FY 04 and 05. Service is provided in exchange for regional purchase of 10 Tri-Met service expansion buses; matched 100 percent by Tri-Met funds.	\$2,850,000
WTR1 Tri-Met	FY04/05 Beaverton/Tigard TCL Service Increases Biennial regional share of funds to begin 15 minute service during weekdays, weekends and evenings on slightly redefined #62 Line between Sunset Transit Center, Beaverton Regional Center, Murray Scholls Town Center and Washington Square during FY 04 and 05. Service is provided in exchange for regional purchase of 10 Tri-Met service expansion buses; matched 100 percent by Tri-Met funds.	\$718,000
Subtotal		\$6,534,000

NOTE: NO COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION ABOUT TRANSIT FUNDING. COUNCIL EXPRESSED CONCERN ABOUT PRECEDENT OF FUNDING ON-GOING TRI-MET OPERATIONS. TPAC HAS RECOMMENDED THAT OPERATIONAL SUPPORT SHOULD BE LIMITED TO START-UP SERVICE, WITH OTHER REGIONAL SUPPORT DEDICATED EVENTUALLY TO CAPITAL.

GRAND TOTAL \$ 68,160,270

Priorities 2002 MTIP

Summary of Public Comments

June 18, 2001

ATTACHMENT 7

This report provides a summary of public comments received on transportation funding priorities in the 2002-2005 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). All comments received during the public comment period, June 12 -- July 11, 2001 are included. Both oral and written comments were received during a public comment meeting held on Monday, June 18 at Metro.

The MTIP is a regional transportation funding program that identifies projects to be constructed or programs to be funded with federal transportation revenues over the next four years. Local jurisdictions submit transportation projects to Metro for funding consideration. Eligible projects range from freeways, roads and highways to buses, bicycle lanes, boulevards, pedestrian improvements and planning projects. For the first time, freeways improvements are in the proposed project list.

A public comment packet, with project descriptions and the draft project rankings, was mailed to interested parties on request and was available at the public comment meeting. The public was asked to comment on the following:

1. Of the transportation projects under consideration for funding, which do you think are most important?
2. Do you think that regional funds should begin to fund freeway improvements (work formerly paid for by the Oregon Department of Transportation)?
3. Does the recommended technical ranking seem reasonable? If not, why not?
4. Are there other project considerations that would interest decision makers?"
5. Do you have recommendations for the modal mix (freeways, roads, buses, bike lanes, sidewalks, etc.) of projects that should be included in the final package?

Most comments focused on the first and last questions regarding the most important projects for funding and the modal mix desired.

A public comment meeting was held at Metro on June 18, 2001. More than 50 oral comments were received by two panels. The panels consisted of Metro Councilors, JPACT members and Metro staff. All oral comments were summarized and may be found in Section 2. Comment cards from the meeting may be found under Section 3, Written Comments.

Comments in General

Many comments were received in favor of a balance of transportation investments, especially those that will reduce the number of cars on the road. Many of the comments requested that public transit be the top consideration, followed by bicycle and pedestrian paths. A few letters questioned the need for freeways or freeway widening.

Bicycle advocates strongly requested more bike and pedestrian paths, noting that these multi-use paths would take cars off the roads during the peak commute times, as well as provide more weekend recreation. The value of bike and pedestrian improvements on non-freeway bridges was also stressed.

Other general comments focused on the need for sidewalks in neighborhoods, and the need for more TDM projects in the region. Many comments related to safety of streets and crossings with the growth of traffic congestion.

The TOD program in general was praised for providing public/private partnerships for successful mixed-use projects in high-density town centers.

Specific Comments

Summary of comments received on projects

A total of 565 comments, oral and written, were received on specific MTIP projects in the project ranking public process.

The most support was shown for the bike projects (46 percent), road modernization (18.7 percent), boulevards (8.4 percent), and transit projects (7 percent). This represents a balance of project modes around the region, with bicycle trails (especially the *Springwater Corridor*) being the focus of this comment period.

Fewer comments were received on pedestrian projects (6 percent), freight projects (4.6 percent), TDM projects (3.7 percent), planning projects (2.5 percent), TOD projects (2 percent) and road reconstruction (.7 percent).

Specific Comments by Mode

Bike projects

A total of 259 comments (46 percent) were received on all of the bicycle projects, with the most received on the East Bank Trail/Springwater Trail.

East Bank Trail/Springwater Trail

A majority of bike comments (160) were in favor of the East Bank Trail/Springwater Trail Connector project. Of these comments, 113 were pre-printed post cards with personalized notes. It was a unified response, urging the linking of trails for bicyclists and pedestrians. Many people noted the potential to increase bicycle commuting and reduce the number of cars on the road by creating a trail to downtown Portland. The project is seen as a critical link to other regional trails, to OMSI and to the new Eastbank Esplanade.

Morrison Bridge Bicycle/Pedestrian Facility

Many comments (48) were in favor of the multi-use pathway across the Morrison Bridge. It is considered a vital link to downtown Portland for bicyclists and pedestrians traveling to work and school, as well as for recreation.

Gresham-Fairview Trail

Twenty-four comments were received in favor of constructing this bike/ped path, to help gain more access to downtown Gresham, as well as more recreational opportunity.

Fanno Creek Trail, Phase 2

Eighteen comments on the Fanno Creek Trail emphasized this trail as a critical link in the only bike path system in Washington County.

Washington Street Boulevard Project PE: 12th/16th

This project received nine comments in favor of mixed-use bike, transit and pedestrian amenities as improving livability in Oregon City.

Pedestrian Projects

Thirty-five comments (6 percent) were received on seven pedestrian projects in the ranking process.

The Jennings Avenue: 99E/Portland Ave. Ped Access Project

This project received the most comments and support (12) of all pedestrian projects.

Regional Pedestrian Access to Transit Program

Nine comments stressed the need for more access to bus lines through more sidewalks and pedestrian amenities around the region.

257th Avenue Pedestrian Improvements

Five comments were received on the need for improvements for pedestrians along this transit corridor.

Molalla Ave. Boulevard Project

Four comments stressed the need for boulevard status for Molalla Avenue.

Forest Grove Town Center Pedestrian Improvements

Three comments emphasized the need for this project for safety and to advance the town center concept in Forest Grove.

Boulevard Projects

A total of 48 comments (8.4 percent) were received on eight proposed boulevard projects.

Stark Street Boulevard Project

The construction of this extension of the Stark Street Boulevard project was requested by 11 comments, especially in concert with other Gresham area transit, trail and railroad over crossing projects to help address safety problems and help Gresham achieve its transportation goals.

Division Street Boulevard, Phase 2, Main/Cleveland

This extension was supported by seven comments, to link the Gresham Civic Neighborhood district to downtown Gresham.

McLoughlin Boulevard Project PE (Oregon City)

This project received seven comments, stressing livability and tourism in Oregon City.

Cornell Road Boulevard Project – Murray/Saltzman Road

Seven comments were received in favor of the Cornell Road Boulevard Project.

102nd Avenue Boulevard Project: Hancock/Main

Five comments were in favor of this project to support the Gateway Regional Center district.

McLoughlin Boulevard Project (Milwaukie)

This project received five comments for supplemental funds for construction.

Boones Ferry Road Boulevard: Madrone/Kruse Way

The widening of Boones Ferry Road received five comments in favor.

The remaining project, Cornelius Main Street Boulevard Project, received one comment.

Road Modernization Projects

A total of 106 comments (18.7 percent) were received on road modernization, stressing safety and traffic congestion problems.

Sunrise Corridor Phase 1 PE: 205/Rock Creek Junction

Twenty comments were received supporting the Sunrise Corridor improvement in Clackamas County and Happy Valley. One person said it was critical to enlarge Happy Valley. Most of comments came in with a group of other road improvement comments in Clackamas County. A few comments questioned the need for this project in the region.

Sunnyside Road PE –122nd/132/d

Widening of this project was supported by 16 comments, also presented in a group of road improvements for the benefit of Clackamas County residents.

Harmony/Linwood Railroad/ Intersection

Thirteen comments supported intersection improvements, including future HCT route through Milwaukie. This also came with a group of requested improvements in Clackamas County.

SE Foster Road at SE 162nd Ave.

Seventeen comments supported this project, with the stress on the need for safety. It is said to be an extremely dangerous intersection for cars, bikes and pedestrians to cross.

Clackamas ITS Program Phase 2

Eleven comments were in favor of signal equipment and timing for Clackamas corridors.

Gresham/Mult. Cty. ITS Program, Phase 3B

Nine comments supported the Gresham/Multnomah County ITS Program for adaptive signal timing in the 181st and Burnside corridors.

US 26 Widening PE – Murray/Cornell

This freeway widening project received five comments on the need for relief from traffic congestion in this corridor for cars and trucks.

Other projects received three or fewer comments

Road Reconstruction Projects

Only four comments (.7 percent) were received on the road reconstruction projects, one each on the Johnson Creek Boulevard Project and the SW 23rd Avenue Project. Two comments were received on the Naito Parkway Project, noting a multi-year struggle for a funding package.

Freight Projects

Twenty-six comments (4.6 percent) were provided on the need for freight projects.

223rd Avenue Railroad Overcrossing

Nine comments supported this rail crossing for safety and greater access to Gresham.

North Lombard RR Overcrossing: N. Burgard Ave./N. Rivergate Blvd.

Nine comments requested this project, stressing safety problems and the problem that employees are late to work if trains are running during peak morning hours.

Columbia/Killingsworth East End Connector

Eight comments were in favor of supplemental construction funds for habitat protection needs and traffic safety.

Transit Projects

Forty comments (7 percent) were received on all of the proposed transit projects, indicating an interest in improving transit access and efficiency around the region.

South Corridor Draft EIS

Fifteen comments were received on the need to continue the South Corridor Transportation Alternatives Study. Most came with unified requests for a group of road projects in Clackamas County, stressing the need for more transit options, as well.

Gresham TCL Service Increases

Ten comments supported more efficient bus service in Gresham, citing the need for more access into downtown Gresham and surrounding development.

Beaverton/Tigard TCL Service Increases

Six comments stressed the need for more transit service in Washington County.

Four comments each were in favor of the McLoughlin/Barbur Transit Service Continuation Project and the Bus-based Washington County Commuter Rail Ridership Buildup. All letters urged more transit service for these congested corridors.

Transportation Demand Management Projects

Twenty-one comments (3.7 percent) were received on all of the proposed TDM projects in the region, citing the need to reduce single-driver auto commuting.

TMA Assistance –TDM Program

This program to provide local TDM services at key regional locations was supported by seven comments. They cited the success of current commuter programs and the need to increase services.

Region 2040 Initiatives – TDM Program

Five comments were received in support of this program to supplement Tri-met transit services and innovative projects.

All other TDM projects received comments in support of access to jobs in regional and town centers and the need for alternatives to commuting.

Transit Oriented Development Projects

Twelve comments (2 percent) were received in support of TOD projects in the MTIP ranking process.

Transit-Oriented Development Implementation Program

Eleven comments supported the TOD program at Metro, asking that this program continue to provide public/private partnerships for successful mixed-use developments near transit stations.

Planning Projects

Fourteen comments (2.5 percent) were received on three proposed planning projects.

Willamette Shoreline Rail and Trail Study

Eight comments stressed the need for a rail and bike corridor from Macadam District to Lake Oswego, stating the need for more non-auto commuting options.

Regional Freight Program

Four comments were received on the Regional Freight Program, citing the need to study freight movement for future improvements to the transportation system.

I:\trans\transadm\staff\floyd\TPAC\2001\7-27-01\W6a 2002 – 2005 A MTIP report summary.doc

I:\trans\transadm\staff\floyd\JPACT\2001\8-9-01\W4 attachmt 7 2002 – 2005 A MTIP report summary Attachmt B.doc

**PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE
PROJECT SUMMARY**

Transit Projects

Project Code & Sponsor	Project Title	Federal Funds Requested
CTR1 Wilsonville	Smart Transit Center Park & Ride Right of Way funds to acquire 2.5 acres for a 250 space Park & Ride/Transit Center at Boberg Rd. and Barber St. in Wilsonville. Project is adjacent to the proposed Wilsonville/Beaverton Commuter Rail and supplements \$1.924 million of appropriated FTA/local match construction funds.	\$1,172,000
MTR1 Tri-Met	FY04/05 Gresham TCL Service Increases Biennial regional share of funds to consolidate Lines 82 and 87 in Gresham to begin 15 minute service during weekdays, weekends and evenings on a new Line 181st running on 181st between Powell and Sandy during FY 04 and 05. Service is provided in exchange for regional purchase of 10 Tri-Met service expansion buses; matched 100 percent by Tri-Met funds.	\$1,794,000
RTR1 Tri-Met	FY04/05 McLoughlin/Barbur Transit Service Continuation Biennial regional share of funds to continue 15 minute service during weekdays, weekends and evenings on new McLoughlin and Barbur Blvd. transit lines during FY 04 and 05. Service is provided in exchange for regional purchase of 10 Tri-Met service expansion buses; matched 100 percent by Tri-Met funds.	\$2,850,000
WTR1 Tri-Met	FY04/05 Beaverton/Tigard TCL Service Increases Biennial regional share of funds to begin 15 minute service during weekdays, weekends and evenings on slightly redefined #62 Line between Sunset Transit Center, Beaverton Regional Center, Murray Scholls Town Center and Washington Square during FY 04 and 05. Service is provided in exchange for regional purchase of 10 Tri-Met service expansion buses; matched 100 percent by Tri-Met funds.	\$718,000
Subtotal		\$6,534,000

NOTE: NO COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION ABOUT TRANSIT FUNDING. COUNCIL EXPRESSED CONCERN ABOUT PRECEDENT OF FUNDING ON-GOING TRI-MET OPERATIONS. TPAC HAS RECOMMENDED THAT OPERATIONAL SUPPORT SHOULD BE LIMITED TO START-UP SERVICE, WITH OTHER REGIONAL SUPPORT DEDICATED EVENTUALLY TO CAPITAL.

GRAND TOTAL \$ 68,160,270

Priorities 2002 MTIP

Summary of Public Comments

June 18, 2001

ATTACHMENT 7

This report provides a summary of public comments received on transportation funding priorities in the 2002-2005 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). All comments received during the public comment period, June 12 – July 11, 2001 are included. Both oral and written comments were received during a public comment meeting held on Monday, June 18 at Metro.

The MTIP is a regional transportation funding program that identifies projects to be constructed or programs to be funded with federal transportation revenues over the next four years. Local jurisdictions submit transportation projects to Metro for funding consideration. Eligible projects range from freeways, roads and highways to buses, bicycle lanes, boulevards, pedestrian improvements and planning projects. For the first time, freeways improvements are in the proposed project list.

A public comment packet, with project descriptions and the draft project rankings, was mailed to interested parties on request and was available at the public comment meeting. The public was asked to comment on the following:

1. Of the transportation projects under consideration for funding, which do you think are most important?
2. Do you think that regional funds should begin to fund freeway improvements (work formerly paid for by the Oregon Department of Transportation)?
3. Does the recommended technical ranking seem reasonable? If not, why not?
4. Are there other project considerations that would interest decision makers?"
5. Do you have recommendations for the modal mix (freeways, roads, buses, bike lanes, sidewalks, etc.) of projects that should be included in the final package?

Most comments focused on the first and last questions regarding the most important projects for funding and the modal mix desired.

A public comment meeting was held at Metro on June 18, 2001. More than 50 oral comments were received by two panels. The panels consisted of Metro Councilors, JPACT members and Metro staff. All oral comments were summarized and may be found in Section 2. Comment cards from the meeting may be found under Section 3, Written Comments.

Comments in General

Many comments were received in favor of a balance of transportation investments, especially those that will reduce the number of cars on the road. Many of the comments requested that public transit be the top consideration, followed by bicycle and pedestrian paths. A few letters questioned the need for freeways or freeway widening.

Bicycle advocates strongly requested more bike and pedestrian paths, noting that these multi-use paths would take cars off the roads during the peak commute times, as well as provide more weekend recreation. The value of bike and pedestrian improvements on non-freeway bridges was also stressed.

Other general comments focused on the need for sidewalks in neighborhoods, and the need for more TDM projects in the region. Many comments related to safety of streets and crossings with the growth of traffic congestion.

The TOD program in general was praised for providing public/private partnerships for successful mixed-use projects in high-density town centers.

Specific Comments

Summary of comments received on projects

A total of 565 comments, oral and written, were received on specific MTIP projects in the project ranking public process.

The most support was shown for the bike projects (46 percent), road modernization (18.7 percent), boulevards (8.4 percent), and transit projects (7 percent). This represents a balance of project modes around the region, with bicycle trails (especially the Springwater Corridor) being the focus of this comment period.

Fewer comments were received on pedestrian projects (6 percent), freight projects (4.6 percent), TDM projects (3.7 percent), planning projects (2.5 percent), TOD projects (2 percent) and road reconstruction (.7 percent).

Specific Comments by Mode

Bike projects

A total of 259 comments (46 percent) were received on all of the bicycle projects, with the most received on the East Bank Trail/Springwater Trail.

East Bank Trail/Springwater Trail

A majority of bike comments (160) were in favor of the East Bank Trail/Springwater Trail Connector project. Of these comments, 113 were pre-printed post cards with personalized notes. It was a unified response, urging the linking of trails for bicyclists and pedestrians. Many people noted the potential to increase bicycle commuting and reduce the number of cars on the road by creating a trail to downtown Portland. The project is seen as a critical link to other regional trails, to OMSI and to the new Eastbank Esplanade.

Morrison Bridge Bicycle/Pedestrian Facility

Many comments (48) were in favor of the multi-use pathway across the Morrison Bridge. It is considered a vital link to downtown Portland for bicyclists and pedestrians traveling to work and school, as well as for recreation.

Gresham-Fairview Trail

Twenty-four comments were received in favor of constructing this bike/ped path, to help gain more access to downtown Gresham, as well as more recreational opportunity.

Fanno Creek Trail, Phase 2

Eighteen comments on the Fanno Creek Trail emphasized this trail as a critical link in the only bike path system in Washington County.

Washington Street Boulevard Project PE: 12th/16th

This project received nine comments in favor of mixed-use bike, transit and pedestrian amenities as improving livability in Oregon City.

Pedestrian Projects

Thirty-five comments (6 percent) were received on seven pedestrian projects in the ranking process.

The Jennings Avenue: 99E/Portland Ave. Ped Access Project

This project received the most comments and support (12) of all pedestrian projects.

Regional Pedestrian Access to Transit Program

Nine comments stressed the need for more access to bus lines through more sidewalks and pedestrian amenities around the region.

257th Avenue Pedestrian Improvements

Five comments were received on the need for improvements for pedestrians along this transit corridor.

Molalla Ave. Boulevard Project

Four comments stressed the need for boulevard status for Molalla Avenue.

Forest Grove Town Center Pedestrian Improvements

Three comments emphasized the need for this project for safety and to advance the town center concept in Forest Grove.

Boulevard Projects

A total of 48 comments (8.4 percent) were received on eight proposed boulevard projects.

Stark Street Boulevard Project

The construction of this extension of the Stark Street Boulevard project was requested by 11 comments, especially in concert with other Gresham area transit, trail and railroad over crossing projects to help address safety problems and help Gresham achieve its transportation goals.

Division Street Boulevard, Phase 2, Main/Cleveland

This extension was supported by seven comments, to link the Gresham Civic Neighborhood district to downtown Gresham.

McLoughlin Boulevard Project PE (Oregon City)

This project received seven comments, stressing livability and tourism in Oregon City.

Cornell Road Boulevard Project – Murray/Saltzman Road

Seven comments were received in favor of the Cornell Road Boulevard Project.

102nd Avenue Boulevard Project: Hancock/Main

Five comments were in favor of this project to support the Gateway Regional Center district.

McLoughlin Boulevard Project (Milwaukie)

This project received five comments for supplemental funds for construction.

Boones Ferry Road Boulevard: Madrone/Kruse Way

The widening of Boones Ferry Road received five comments in favor.

The remaining project, Cornelius Main Street Boulevard Project, received one comment.

Road Modernization Projects

A total of 106 comments (18.7 percent) were received on road modernization, stressing safety and traffic congestion problems.

Sunrise Corridor Phase 1 PE: 205/Rock Creek Junction

Twenty comments were received supporting the Sunrise Corridor improvement in Clackamas County and Happy Valley. One person said it was critical to enlarge Happy Valley. Most of comments came in with a group of other road improvement comments in Clackamas County. A few comments questioned the need for this project in the region.

Sunnyside Road PE –122nd/132/d

Widening of this project was supported by 16 comments, also presented in a group of road improvements for the benefit of Clackamas County residents.

Harmony/Linwood Railroad/ Intersection

Thirteen comments supported intersection improvements, including future HCT route through Milwaukie. This also came with a group of requested improvements in Clackamas County.

SE Foster Road at SE 162nd Ave.

Seventeen comments supported this project, with the stress on the need for safety. It is said to be an extremely dangerous intersection for cars, bikes and pedestrians to cross.

Clackamas ITS Program Phase 2

Eleven comments were in favor of signal equipment and timing for Clackamas corridors.

Gresham/Mult. Cty. ITS Program, Phase 3B

Nine comments supported the Gresham/Multnomah County ITS Program for adaptive signal timing in the 181st and Burnside corridors.

US 26 Widening PE – Murray/Cornell

This freeway widening project received five comments on the need for relief from traffic congestion in this corridor for cars and trucks.

Other projects received three or fewer comments

Road Reconstruction Projects

Only four comments (.7 percent) were received on the road reconstruction projects, one each on the Johnson Creek Boulevard Project and the SW 23rd Avenue Project. Two comments were received on the Naito Parkway Project, noting a multi-year struggle for a funding package.

Freight Projects

Twenty-six comments (4.6 percent) were provided on the need for freight projects.

223rd Avenue Railroad Overcrossing

Nine comments supported this rail crossing for safety and greater access to Gresham.

North Lombard RR Overcrossing: N. Burgard Ave./N. Rivergate Blvd.

Nine comments requested this project, stressing safety problems and the problem that employees are late to work if trains are running during peak morning hours.

Columbia/Killingsworth East End Connector

Eight comments were in favor of supplemental construction funds for habitat protection needs and traffic safety.

Transit Projects

Forty comments (7 percent) were received on all of the proposed transit projects, indicating an interest in improving transit access and efficiency around the region.

South Corridor Draft EIS

Fifteen comments were received on the need to continue the South Corridor Transportation Alternatives Study. Most came with unified requests for a group of road projects in Clackamas County, stressing the need for more transit options, as well.

Gresham TCL Service Increases

Ten comments supported more efficient bus service in Gresham, citing the need for more access into downtown Gresham and surrounding development.

Beaverton/Tigard TCL Service Increases

Six comments stressed the need for more transit service in Washington County.

Four comments each were in favor of the McLoughlin/Barbur Transit Service Continuation Project and the Bus-based Washington County Commuter Rail Ridership Buildup. All letters urged more transit service for these congested corridors.

Transportation Demand Management Projects

Twenty-one comments (3.7 percent) were received on all of the proposed TDM projects in the region, citing the need to reduce single-driver auto commuting.

TMA Assistance –TDM Program

This program to provide local TDM services at key regional locations was supported by seven comments. They cited the success of current commuter programs and the need to increase services.

Region 2040 Initiatives – TDM Program

Five comments were received in support of this program to supplement Tri-met transit services and innovative projects.

All other TDM projects received comments in support of access to jobs in regional and town centers and the need for alternatives to commuting.

Transit Oriented Development Projects

Twelve comments (2 percent) were received in support of TOD projects in the MTIP ranking process.

Transit-Oriented Development Implementation Program

Eleven comments supported the TOD program at Metro, asking that this program continue to provide public/private partnerships for successful mixed-use developments near transit stations.

Planning Projects

Fourteen comments (2.5 percent) were received on three proposed planning projects.

Willamette Shoreline Rail and Trail Study

Eight comments stressed the need for a rail and bike corridor from Macadam District to Lake Oswego, stating the need for more non-auto commuting options.

Regional Freight Program

Four comments were received on the Regional Freight Program, citing the need to study freight movement for future improvements to the transportation system.

M E M O R A N D U M

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



METRO

Date: August 1, 2001
To: JPACT
From: Mike Hoggund, Director
Regional Planning Section
Re: ***Priorities 2002 MTIP Update***

The attached materials are for your information and consideration as the 2002-2005 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) allocation process heads into the recommended program phase over the next month. JPACT is scheduled to act on a recommended package of projects at the September 13, 2001 meeting. The materials include the following information.

1. A memo from TPAC to JPACT that addresses policy issues raised by the Metro Council in a July 10 memo from Councilors Rod Monroe and Rex Burkholder to the full Metro Council.
2. A copy of the July 10 memo from Councilors Monroe and Burkholder to the full Metro Council.
3. A copy of the Metro Council criteria as approved in Metro Resolution No. 01-3025. This Metro Resolution approved the complete procedures and criteria used to solicit and rank the current candidate projects. The criteria used by the Metro Council to select its proposed list were included in the February 2001 MTIP Solicitation Packet.
4. The Metro Council's proposed list of projects for funding through the 2002-2005 MTIP that reflect their adopted criteria, updated to reflect new information since July 12 JPACT meeting.
5. A survey of JPACT and Metro Council members to provide modal direction on MTIP funding priorities. The survey includes an historical context of how "regional flexible" funds (CMAQ and STP) have been allocated over the past decade to various modal categories. Similarly, it illustrates the planned allocation of projects as defined in the Financially Constrained system of the Regional Transportation Plan by mode. Please complete and return the survey to Metro by Monday, August 13, 2001. The survey results are intended for consideration by staff, TPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council as a recommended program is developed over the next month.
6. A revised summary of the projects listed on either the JPACT approved 150 Percent List or the Metro Council proposed list of projects. Projects not on either list have been dropped. As agreed at the July JPACT, any additions of projects to the current 150 percent list must be accompanied by a dollar-for-dollar elimination of projects currently on the list.
7. A summary of public comment and testimony received during the 30-day public comment period that ended July 11.

Also note that a list of those projects which remain under consideration for MTIP funding that also meet the basic criteria for seeking State Bond Program funding are included in the materials provided as part of the bond program agenda item. These projects are also noted in the Summary List described in Item 2, above.

MH/srb/ff

I:\trans\p\share\Correspondence\JPACT801memo.doc
I:\trans\transadm\staff\floyd\JPACT\2001\8-9-01\#4 Priorities 2002 MTIP Update cvrmemo.doc

Attachments

M E M O R A N D U M

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



METRO

ATTACHMENT 1

Date: July 31, 2001
To: JPACT
From: TPAC
Subject: MTIP Policy Questions

Attached is a memo outlining policy issues that the Metro Council has asked JPACT to address prior to finalizing the MTIP funding allocation. At the July 27 TPAC meeting, we developed a recommend response for JPACT's consideration. In developing these responses, however, it became evident to TPAC that there additional policy issues raised by the action of the Metro Council that should be considered by JPACT, related to both process and substantive issues. Presented below are both the original issues raised by the Metro Council, as well as additional issues raised by TPAC.

Original Issues raised by the Metro Council in their memo of July 10, 2001

1. Corridor Planning Projects

- Use of MTIP funds for corridor planning is dictated by the limited funding situation faced by all transportation agencies. Due to lack of funds, ODOT and local governments have cut-back their programs to focus principally on Maintenance and Preservation, Tri-Met is falling behind on needed service expansion and the Port of Portland has been forced to make deep cuts in their general fund. The MTIP is an appropriate place to consider funding since the issues to be addressed in corridor planning are regional priorities.
- However, this action is not intended to set a precedent for funding these types of studies. In the future, various corridor studies will be funded from various combinations of MTIP funding as well as funding from the STIP, Tri-Met, local governments, the Port of Portland and private sources.
- If these funds are allocated, it is recommended that there be a condition to seek funds from ODOT, Tri-Met, and local governments to support elements of the study scope of work, but that matching funds not be an absolute prerequisite.

2. Tri-Met

- A variety of approaches are available for how funding is provided to Tri-Met. The current commitment of \$1.4 million per year for the McLoughlin Blvd. and Barbur Blvd. Service increases could be continued as an on-going commitment. This would be consistent with historical decisions to fund the TDM program on an on-going basis. Alternatively, the current 4-year commitment could be extended for one additional 2-year

period, treating this allocation as a start-up allocation, much like the TMA start-up allocations, with the expectation that after that period of time, Tri-Met would absorb this responsibility. Similarly, the Murray Blvd. and 181st Ave. TCL applications made on behalf of Beaverton and Gresham could be funded on a start-up basis. The third option could be to allocate funds through the MTIP only to capital projects, much like the past allocations to LRT and the pending application from SMART transit in Wilsonville for funding toward a park-and-ride lot.

- In general, TPAC recommends that we use MTIP funds for transit capital and limited, start-up operational funding. However, TPAC also recognizes that on-going service costs for the McLoughlin and Barbur corridors will require a transition period for Tri-Met to absorb these costs into their budget. This MTIP process should continue to consider funding for transit. It is recommended that the MTIP process conclude with a decision to commit a certain level of MTIP funds in '04 and '05 based upon Tri-Met's application for TCL funding for the Barbur/McLoughlin service continuation and the Murray/181st service expansion. This allocation should be placed in a "Reserve" in the MTIP subject to Tri-Met completing a 5-year service improvement program with review and comment by JPACT and the Metro Council. Upon Tri-Met's adoption of such a program, these MTIP funds would be assigned to appropriate capital projects accordingly.
- The degree to which transit improvement could be funded through the farebox, the employer tax or other sources of state and federal funding is beyond the scope of the MTIP process and can be discussed further by JPACT, Tri-Met and the Metro Council at future meetings.
- TPAC has a split position on whether a regional funding pool for pedestrian-to-transit projects should be considered further. If such a program is established, they recommend that it be used to select projects on a joint basis between Tri-Met and the local governments. As such, any allocation should be subject to approval of the program of projects by JPACT and the Metro Council. However, many members of TPAC feel that MTIP funds should be allocated to discrete pedestrian projects (the current MTIP process has 8 projects under consideration). Metro staff recommends continued consideration of both types of pedestrian projects. Locally submitted projects should be considered but they don't necessarily address access to transit. The pedestrian access to transit program is intended to establish an approach to identifying deficiencies that is complete and comprehensive.

3. New State Funding Availability

- The MTIP funding process should not be delayed until the outcome of the state funding process is known but should be coordinated with the state funding process. MTIP funding decisions are scheduled for September and HB 2142 project decisions will not occur until February. However, at the August 9 meeting of the Oregon Transportation Commission, the selection criteria will be finalized thereby providing better guidance on which of the MTIP projects might be appropriately considered for HB 2142 funding. At the August 9 JPACT meeting, staff will provide an analysis of the MTIP projects and their suitability for funding through HB 2142.
- ODOT's process will ensure that an equitable distribution of HB 2142 funds is achieved because that is a provision of the legislation (see also comments to ODOT re. HB 2142 selection criteria).

4. Boeckman Road

The 2040 criteria approved by JPACT and the Metro Council distinguished between Tier 1 Design Types (Central City, Regional Centers, Industrial Areas), Tier 2 Design Types (Town Centers, Main Streets, Light Rail Station Communities and Corridors) and Tier 3 Design Types (Inner and Outer Neighborhoods and Employment Areas). However, it overlooked consideration of urban villages development types such as Dammasch (or for that matter, Fairview Village and Orenco). It is recommended that the ranking be revised to treat this area as a Tier 2 Design Type and that the rating of congestion account for the affect of this road on parallel routes.

Additional policy issues raised by TPAC

1. Role of the Metro Council relative to JPACT

- Submission of a Council priority list to JPACT at their July 12 meeting was not envisioned and is a departure from past practices and raises questions that TPAC requests clarification. According to the JPACT Bylaws, MPO actions are to be developed by JPACT and submitted to the Metro Council for concurrence. If there is not concurrence, the action is to be sent back to JPACT to develop a revised recommendation.
- It is TPAC's expectation that this process will apply to completion of this MTIP process. As such, they interpret the Metro Council's list as early input to the process, and that the final list will be developed by JPACT for concurrence by the Metro Council.

2. Prioritization Criteria

- The Metro Council's policy issues paper dated July 10, 2001 explicitly states that their list of priorities were without consideration of geographic balance, modal splits or the level of past commitment.
- These were criteria approved by JPACT and the Metro Council at the beginning of the process and TPAC recommends they be considered in the final MTIP allocation.

3. Metro Council 2040 Evaluation

- The evaluation of the MTIP projects by the Metro Council appears incomplete. Many of the road projects under consideration for funding through the MTIP are essential to support 2040, especially in relation to centers, industrial areas and newly expanded UGB areas. Similarly, a number of the alternative mode projects are 2040 supportive but were not included in the Council's priority list. Transit projects were evaluated but not included in the Council's priority list.
- TPAC recommends these projects continue to be considered in the final MTIP allocation.

4. Road Reconstruction

- The Council's prioritization criteria include maintaining the system in place as a priority over expansion, yet there were no road reconstruction projects included on the Council's priority list.

- TPAC recommends these projects continue to be considered in the final MTIP allocation.

5. Old Federal-aid Urban Program

- The STP and CMAQ funding categories are the transformation of the prior Federal-aid Urban funds, which prior to the 1991 enactment of ISTEA were aimed principally at local road projects in urban areas. The Metro region was supportive of the expanded eligibility to allow a broader range of road and alternative mode projects to be funded. The Council's priority list appears to emphasize only non-road projects, moving totally away from it's original intent.
- TPAC recommends that the final MTIP allocation consist of road and non-road projects.

6. Funding partial projects

- In the past, the final allocation has attempted to keep making progress on the broadest program possible. As such, there has been a careful attempt to fund the most critical phase of a project to allow other projects to also be funded. With the Council's priority list, it is not clear whether this flexibility remains available as we proceed to the final list. Is the Council's list intended to be viewed as untouchable or will the Council consider a final list that may include some of the projects partially funded or not funded in favor of other priorities?
- TPAC recommends developing the final MTIP allocation with partially funded projects where appropriate.

Development of a final funding allocation should proceed based upon implementation of these recommendations (subject to revision by JPACT at the August 9 meeting). This will allow TPAC to develop the final MTIP allocation at their August 31 meeting and JPACT at their September 13 meeting.

M E M O R A N D U M

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



Date: July 10, 2001

To: All Councilors

From: Councilor Rex Burkholder
Councilor Rod Monroe

Re: Proposed List of Council MTIP Priority Projects

At the June 19 meeting of the Community Planning Committee, the Chair directed that we develop an initial list of priority MTIP projects reflecting Council priorities as clarified at the committee meeting. The proposed list would be reviewed at the next committee meeting or the July 10 Council informal. A total of \$38 million is available for project funding and it is our understanding that we were to prepare a list that totaled about 50-75% of the total available funding.

The agency transportation planning staff has completed its technical ranking process for each of the proposed projects. In addition, the Council adopted Resolution No. 01-3025, which set out six additional criteria that the Council would use in its project evaluation process. A listing of these criteria is attached.

Project Review Process

The Council staff has developed a ranking matrix of all of the proposed projects to assist the Council in its evaluation process. The matrix identifies each project by type, notes the overall staff technical ranking, and the number of points received by each project for the technical ranking criteria related to 2040 implementation. The matrix then applies the Council adopted evaluation review. In some cases, individual criteria are not applicable to certain projects. The matrix then provides a "council ranking" for each project based on the number of applicable criteria the project has met.

The draft matrix is attached. If individual Councilors with knowledge of a particular project believe that changes should be made in the application of the Council evaluation criteria to the project, please bring these to our attention.

In reviewing the proposed projects, we focused exclusively on the merits of the individual projects. The overall technical ranking, the number of 2040 implementation points received, and the ranking based on the Council-adopted criteria were the sole determining factors. No consideration was given to geographic balance, modal splits or the level of past commitment. As a result of this review, we are recommending the inclusion of 26 projects or planning

activities on the Council priority project list. The cost of these projects is \$27,763,000, or 73% of the total available funds. A matrix of these recommended projects is attached.

Projects Requiring Further Policy Review

In reviewing certain of the proposed projects, we concluded that additional policy discussion should occur prior to determining whether they should be funded through the MTIP process. These include: the funding of corridor planning projects, the funding of Tri-Met service and program enhancements, and the potential effect of the newly enacted state transportation funding program.

Corridor Planning Projects. Metro has requested \$600,000 for total funding of the first of 18 potential corridor studies resulting from the nearly completed corridor initiative project. The policy issues that we believe need to be discussed are:

- if the initial study is fully funded from the MTIP process, will an expectation be created that all future corridor studies will also be funded through MTIP
- Given the potential for local benefits and state highway system improvements that might result from the studies, should there be an expectation of local or state matching funds.

Tri-Met. Tri-Met has requested continued MTIP funding for two service enhancement programs and funding for two new service enhancement programs. These requests total \$5.6 million. The policy issues related to these requests include:

- is it appropriate to use MTIP resources for initial or ongoing funding of Tri-Met service enhancements
- does funding of existing service enhancements create an expectation that MTIP funds will become the permanent funding source for such enhancements
- given the size of the pending requests and the potential for additional future requests, is there an expectation that an increasing portion of future MTIP allocations would be directed to transit service enhancements
- what is the potential for Tri-Met to fund these enhancements from other sources such as the fare box, the employer tax or other sources of state or federal funding

Tri-Met also has requested a lump sum funding amount of \$2 million for unspecified pedestrian/transit related improvements that would be identified by the agency. The policy issues that needs to be addressed are:

- whether local governments should continue to be the originator of pedestrian/transit improvements based on their assessment of local need or should a regional funding pool administered by Tri-Met be established
- should these projects continue to be reviewed on an individual basis through the MTIP process or should a collective funding approach be considered

New State Funding Availability. There are several proposals that involve projects that may be actively considered for funding through the newly enacted state transportation-bonding program. These include widening the Sunset Highway, the Sunrise Corridor and the Columbia/Killingsworth Connector. The policy issues associated with these projects include:

- should the potential allocation of MTIP funds for these projects be delayed until the outcome of the state funding process is known
- how should the region insure that it receives its fair share of the new state funding revenues
- should a dialogue be initiated with the state concerning the potential for reallocating existing state transportation resources to assist in the funding of projects proposed for MTIP funding

Boeckman Road. The technical criteria applied to determine the project ranking result in zero points because there is no existing road to rate existing congestion and safety concerns. However, it's intended to provide a new connection to Dammash State Hospital to facilitate development of an urban village within the 2040 Growth Concept. How should we rate projects such as this one based upon land use objectives rather than traffic considerations.

We look forward to discussing the projects that should be given priority for funding and the outstanding policy issues that have been noted above.

**METRO COUNCIL GUIDANCE:
2040 GROWTH CONCEPT
AND
PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE**

Previous MTIP updates have emphasized implementation of the Region 2040 Growth Concept. It is the intention of the Metro Council that this emphasis be even more firmly advanced in the current update. Forty percent of the technical ranking of all candidate projects is linked to support of 2040 concepts. However, final selection of projects for funding is based on a combination of technical and administrative factors. At its January 25 meeting, the Metro Council approved supplemental guidance regarding specific elements of the 2040 Concept Plan that should be reflected in transportation programming decisions. The Council agreed that the guidance would not be formally amended into the Metro transportation project ranking system but that it should be provided as part of the solicitation package material. Under this guidance, the final list of the projects or programs proposed for funding should facilitate implementation of:

- 1) development and redevelopment in support of the central city, regional and town centers, main streets and station areas,
- 2) development of transportation infrastructure that supports industrial centers and their inter-modal connectors,
- 3) efficient management of demand and enhancement of the operation of the existing transportation system,
- 4) development and promotion of alternatives to single occupancy vehicles,
- 5) development of a multi-modal transportation system,
- 6) projects for which there is no other readily available source of funding.

Council Recommended MTIP Project Priority List

Attachment 4

Background Information		Metro Staff Ranking		Council Project Evaluation Criteria and Ranking						COUNCIL RANKING
Project	Funds Requested	Technical Ranking	2040 Point Ranking (out of 40)	Regional/Town Center, Main Streets, Station Areas	Industrial Center/Intermodal Connectors	Existing Transportation System	Alternatives to Single Occupancy Vehicles	Multi-Modal Transportation System	No Other Readily Available Funding Sources	
Boulevard Projects										
Division Street Blvd. Phase 2 Main/Cleveland	\$989,000	97	37	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5 out of 5
102nd Ave Boulevard Project	\$700,000	92	32	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5 out of 5
Stark Street Boulevard Project	\$800,000	88	28	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5 out of 5
Pedestrian Projects										
Park Way Sidewalk Project	\$235,000	75	30	Yes	N/A		Yes	Yes	Yes	4 out of 5
Molalla Ave. Ped Project	\$500,000	75	25	Yes	N/A		Yes	Yes	Yes	4 out of 5
Butner Rd. Sidewalk Project	\$180,000	60	30	Yes	N/A		Yes	Yes	Yes	4 out of 5
Bike Improvements										
Morrison Bridge	\$1,345,000	100	40	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5 out of 6
Washington St. Bike Lanes	\$750,000	62	40	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5 out of 5
Regional Multi-Use Trails										
Eastbank Trail-OMSI/Springwater Phase 2	\$4,209,000	78	30	Yes	N/A	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	4 out of 6
Gresham/Fairview Multi-Use Path	\$1,076,000	69	30	Yes	N/A	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	4 out of 6
Fanno Creek Multi Use Path Phase 2	\$1,123,000	69	26	Yes	N/A	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	4 out of 6
TDM Improvements										
Regional Tri-Met TDM Program	\$1,400,000	92	40	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5 out of 5
TMA Assistance Program	\$500,000	86	40	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5 out of 5
ECO Information Clearinghouse	\$94,000	85	40	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5 out of 5
Wilsonville TDM Program	\$145,000	81	30	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5 out of 5
Road Modernization										
Clackamas ITS Program Phase 2	\$500,000	76	24	Yes	N/A	Yes	No	No	Yes	3 out of 5
Cornell Road Corridor ITS Project	\$375,000	75	23	Yes	N/A	Yes	No	No	Yes	3 out of 5
Gresham/Multnomah County ITS Program-Phase 3B	\$1,000,000	68	29	Yes	N/A	Yes	No	No	Yes	3 out of 5
Harmony/Linwood Railroad Intersection	\$750,000	46	29	Yes	N/A	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	4 out of 4
Road Reconstruction										
Transit Improvements										

Council Recommended MTIP Project Priority List

Attachment 4

Background Information		Metro Staff Ranking		Council Project Evaluation Criteria and Ranking							COUNCIL RANKING
Project	Funds Requested	Technical Ranking	2040 Point Ranking (out of 40)	Regional/Town Center, Main Streets, Station Areas	Industrial Center/Intermodal Connectors	Existing Transportation System	Alternatives to Single Occupancy Vehicles	Multi-Modal Transportation System	No Other Readily Available Funding Sources		
South Corridor EIS	\$4,000,000	Not Ranked	Not Ranked	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5 out of 6	
Freight Improvements											
N. Lombard Railroad Overcrossing	\$2,000,000	100	40	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	1 out of 6	
TOD Improvements											
Implementation Program	\$2,100,000	96	36	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5 out of 5	
Gateway Regional Center TOD	\$892,000	85	40	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5 out of 5	
Planning Projects											
Willamette Shoreline Rail and Trail Study	\$550,000	Not Ranked	Not Ranked	Yes	N/A	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	4 out of 6	
Regional Freight Program	\$150,000	Not Ranked	Not Ranked	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	No	Yes	4 out of 5	
Metro Core Regional Planning Program	\$1,400,000	Not Ranked	Not Ranked	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	6 out of 6	
TOTAL	\$27,763,000										

I:\trans\transadm\staff\jfoyd\UPACT2001\8901\#4 attachmt 4Council MTIP A List

PRIORITIES 2002: JPACT AND METRO COUNCIL MEMBER SURVEY

Member Name: _____

THE SURVEY

Table 1, below, shows the modal distribution of the \$68 million of projects approved in the JPACT 150 Percent List, calculated both as dollars and percentages. The Member Survey Form is provided so that members of JPACT and the Metro Council may indicate their modal priorities for distribution of the \$38 million available for programming in the 2002 MITP Update. The purpose of the survey is to help staff determine where agreement exists on priority projects and where a preponderance of agreement exists to help determine modal priorities. **PLEASE COMPLETE THIS SURVEY BY NOON OF MONDAY, AUGUST 13 and fax it to Francine Floyd at 503-797-1930!** For more information, please contact Terry Whisler at 503-797-1747.

TABLE 1

	JPACT APPROVED "150% LIST" AS PERCENT	JPACT APPROVED "150% LIST" AS DOLLARS
Planning	10%	\$ 6.78
Road Modernization	29%	\$ 20.37 *
Road Reconstruction	3%	\$ 2.30
Freight	5%	\$ 3.00
Boulevard	11%	\$ 7.11
Pedestrian	6%	\$ 4.30
Bike	12%	\$ 7.78
TDM	4%	\$ 2.63
TOD	4%	\$ 2.99
Transit	10%	\$ 6.53
Non-Frwy Subtotal	93%	\$ 63.80
Frwy Subtotal	7%	\$ 4.36
GRAND TOTAL	100%	\$ 68.16

MEMBER SURVEY FORM

PLEASE INDICATE DESIRED DISTRIBUTION UP TO A TOTAL OF \$38 MILLION OR 100%	
\$	-
\$	-
\$	-
\$	-
\$	-
\$	-
\$	-
\$	-
\$	-
\$	-
\$	-
\$	-
\$	-

* The distribution summarized here includes \$750,000 for the Harmony/Linwood/Railroad Interchange project included in the Metro Council 75% List but not included in the JPACT 150% List.

(On the reverse of this form are Tables 2 and 3 that provide additional information about the historical and planned distribution of regional resources to the various modal categories.)

BACKGROUND TO MEMBER SURVEY

ATTACHMENT 5

Table 2 shows the amount of Regional Flexible Funds allocated to each transportation mode from the beginning of the Federal ISTEA funding programs in 1992, in total dollars and as a percentage of ISTEA funds. Added to this data are ODOT funds allocated to freeway modernization projects in the Metro region. The final column of Table 1 shows the percentage distribution of funds planned for in the 20-year, Financially Constrained System of the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan. This information is to provide a context for determining the current round of flexible funding modal priorities.

Table 3 shows first the percentage, then the dollar distribution of funds reflected in the current JPACT "150% List" of \$68 million of Regional Flexible Funds. The next two columns show the percentage and dollar distribution of the short list *plus* \$33.6 million of freeway funds approved by ODOT for widening of U.S. 26 from Murray Blvd. to Hwy 217 in FY 05. Though the current exercise is mostly concerned with allocation of Regional Flexible Funds, JPACT and the Metro Council also take action to approve this discretionary allocation of highway funds controlled by ODOT.

TABLE 2

Modal Share of Committed & Planned Transportation Funds: 1992-2003 (\$ millions)				
PROJECT MODE	COMMITTED FUNDS FY 92-03	% DISTRIBUTION OF FY 92-03 ALLOCATIONS	% DISTRIBUTION FY 92-03 ALLOCATIONS W/ FRWY FUNDING	% DISTRIBUTION OF RTP FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED SYSTEM
Planning	\$ 8.59	3%	2%	1%
Road Modernization	\$ 71.19	24%	13%	25%
Road Reconstruction	\$ 5.50	2%	1%	NA
Bridge	\$ 14.43	5%	3%	2%
Freight	\$ 37.65	13%	7%	1%
Boulevard	\$ 10.62	4%	2%	3%
Pedestrian	\$ 14.72	5%	3%	4%
Bike	\$ 19.96	7%	4%	4%
TDM	\$ 9.73	3%	2%	1%
TOD	\$ 9.05	3%	2%	1%
Transit LRT	\$ 95.57	32%	17%	42%
Transit				14%
Non-Frwy Subtotal	\$ 296.99	100%	53%	93%
Frwy Subtotal	\$ 259.52		47%	8%
GRAND TOTAL	\$ 556.51		100%	101%

TABLE 3

JPACT APPROVED "150% LIST" AS PERCENT	JPACT APPROVED "150% LIST" AS DOLLARS (\$68.14m)	JPACT APPROVED "150% LIST" AND ODOT FUNDS AS DOLLARS (\$98.84m)*	JPACT APPROVED "150% LIST" AND ODOT FUNDS AS PERCENT
10%	\$ 6.78	\$ 6.78	7%
29%	\$ 20.37	\$ 20.35	21%
3%	\$ 2.30	\$ 2.30	2%
0%	\$ -	\$ -	0%
5%	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.00	3%
11%	\$ 7.11	\$ 7.11	7%
6%	\$ 4.30	\$ 4.30	4%
12%	\$ 7.78	\$ 7.78	8%
4%	\$ 2.63	\$ 2.63	3%
4%	\$ 2.99	\$ 2.99	3%
0%	\$ -	\$ -	0%
10%	\$ 6.53	\$ 6.53	7%
93%	\$ 63.80	\$ 63.78	65%
7%	\$ 4.36	\$ 35.06	35%
100%	68.16 *	98.84**	100%

* Includes \$750,000 for Harmony/Linwood Railroad Interchange from Metro Council 75% list that was not included in the JPACT 150% List.

**ODOT has approved \$30.7 million for widening US 26 to three lanes from Murray Blvd to Hwy 217 in FY 05.

**PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE
PROJECT SUMMARY
Of
JPACT APPROVED
"150 PERCENT LIST"**

• Planning Projects - Add.

July 31, 2001



METRO

Code Key: (e.g., CBL1 = Clackamas County Boulevard Project #1)

C = Clackamas County
M = Multnomah County
P = City of Portland
R = Regional
W = Washington County

B = Bike
BL = Boulevard
F = Freight
M = Road Modernization
P = Pedestrian
PLNG = Planning
TDM = Transportation Demand Management
TOD = Transit Oriented Development
TR = Transit

**PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE
PROJECT SUMMARY**

Bike Projects

Project Code & Sponsor	Project Title	Federal Funds Requested
CB1 City of Portland/ Milwaukie	E. Bank Trail/Springwater Trail Connector City of Portland, City of Milwaukie joint application to link the E. Bank Trail to the Springwater Trail by construction of a traffic signal at Ochoco/17th Ave., off-street trail segments and bike/pedestrian bridge crossings of Johnson Creek, McLoughlin and UPRR tracks.	\$3,940,000
CB2 Oregon City	Washington St. Boulevard Project PE: 12th/16th Design and construction funding, with local 36 percent match, to restripe 1,300 feet of a four-lane Community Street/Transit-Mixed Use Corridor to two lanes, with turn protection and two new signals at 14th and 15th Streets. Also implements bike, transit and pedestrian amenities.	\$750,000
MB1 Gresham	Gresham-Fairview Trail Funding to construct the Gresham/Fairview bike/ped path, to match \$640,838 of City funds for design and construction, and \$224,000 of regionally allocated federal right of way funds.	\$852,000
MB2 Multnomah County	Morrison Bridge Bicycle/Pedestrian Facility Construction funds for a multi-use pathway across Morrison Bridge, to supplement \$200,000 of federal/local PE funds already awarded the project.	\$1,345,000
WB1 THPRD	Fanno Creek Trail, Phase 2 Funds to construct extension of the Fanno Creek Trail from Denney to Allen/Scholls Ferry Road.	\$888,030
	Subtotal	\$7,775,030

PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE PROJECT SUMMARY

Pedestrian Projects

Project Code & Sponsor	Project Title	Federal Funds Requested
CP2 Oregon City	Molalla Ave. Boulevard Project – Willamette/Pearl & Mountain View/Holmes Construction funds for Boulevard treatment of Molalla Ave: restripe to two lanes w/turn protection from Division to Hwy. 213; provide street amenities along two four-block segments in downtown Oregon City.	\$500,000
MP1 Troutdale	257th Ave. Pedestrian Improvements Funding to design and construct pedestrian improvement of 257th, a Major Arterial and Transit/Mixed Use Corridor. REDUCED FROM \$1.3 MILLION TO \$700,000.	\$700,000
RP1 Tri-Met	FY04/05 Regional Pedestrian Access to Transit Program Regional program to IDENTIFY, PRIORITIZE AND COMPETITIVELY SELECT PROJECTS TO infill sidewalks and pedestrian amenities along high quality BUS transit routes IN MOSTLY TIER 2 2040 LAND USE TYPES.	\$2,000,000
WP1 Washington County	Park Way Sidewalk Project: SW Marlow Ave./ SW Parkwood Dr. Construct approximately 2,000 linear feet of sidewalks linking Sunset Transit Center and other pedestrian attractors to surrounding mulit- and single-family housing within the Sunset Station Community.	\$235,000
WP2 Washington County	198th Avenue Sidewalk: TV Highway/SW Trelane St. Design, acquire and construct half-street sidewalk/bikelane improvements along 850 ft. of 198th to provide bike/ped access to transit and mixed use commercial district.	\$170,000
WP3 Washington County	Butner Rd. Sidewalk Project – SW Marlow Avenue/ SW Wood Way Design, acquire and construct half-street sidewalk/bikelane improvements along 900 ft. of Butner Rd. to provide bike/ped access to Sunset Transit Center pedestrian skybridge.	\$180,000
WP6 Washington County	Murray Blvd Sidewalk Project: Farmington Rd./675 ft Design, acquire and construct 675 ft. of 6 foot-wide sidewalks and street lighting on west side of Murray, north of Farmington Rd. to improve pedestrian transit access.	\$119,000

**PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE
PROJECT SUMMARY**

**Pedestrian Projects
(continued)**

Project Code & Sponsor	Project Title	Federal Funds Requested
WP7 City of Forest Grove	Forest Grove Town Center Pedestrian Improvements Funding to design and construct pedestrian amenities in a six-block area of the Forest Grove downtown bounded by 21st, 19th, "B" St. and Council St./College Way.	\$400,000
	Subtotal	\$4,304,000

**PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE
PROJECT SUMMARY**

Boulevard Projects

Project Code & Sponsor	Project Title	Federal Funds Requested
CBL3 Oregon City	McLoughlin Boulevard Project PE: I-205/Railroad Tunnel Regional preliminary engineering funds to design Boulevard treatment of McLoughlin/99E as a riverfront promenade through downtown Oregon City.	\$625,000
MBL1 Gresham	Division St. Boulevard, Phase 2: Main/Cleveland Design, acquire, and construct a half mile second phase extension of the Division St. Boulevard project from Main St. to Cleveland, linking the Gresham Civic Neighborhood district to Downtown Gresham.	\$989,000
MBL2 Gresham	Stark St. Boulevard Project: 190th/197th Design, acquire, and construct a seven block, second phase extension of the Stark St. Boulevard project, from 190th to 197th, including the 190th/Stark/Burnside/Light rail intersection in the Rockwood Station Community.	\$800,000
PBL1 City of Portland	102nd Ave Boulevard Project: Hancock/Main Funds to design boulevard treatment of 102nd Ave. for a length of approximately 1.3 miles in the Gateway Regional Center district, including Gateway Transit Center, and provision of parallel bike facilities on 99th.	\$700,000
WBL1 Washington County	Cornell Rd. Boulevard Project – Murray Blvd./Saltzman Rd. Regional funding to add Boulevard design elements to locally funded widening project through Cedar Mill Town Center (regional funds are 49 percent of total project cost). COULD FUND A \$2.0 MILLION ROW PHASE.	\$3,500,000
	Subtotal	\$7,114,000

PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE PROJECT SUMMARY

Road Modernization Projects

Project Code & Sponsor	Project Title	Federal Funds Requested
CM1 Clackamas County	Clackamas ITS Program Phase 2 Implementation funds for signal equipment and timing plans for corridors to be determined by funded ITS Master Plan.	\$500,000
CM2 Clackamas County	Sunnyside Rd. PE – 122nd/132nd Request for 63 percent of funds for Final Design of four-lane widening from terminus of current I-205/122nd widening project. STATE BOND PROGRAM ELIGIBLE.	\$625,000
CM3 Clackamas County/ Milwaukie	Harmony/Linwood/Railroad Intersection Final design funding for intersection improvement and grade separated rail crossing; design improvements to accommodate future High Capacity Transit alignment through Milwaukie. SELECTED BY COUNCIL BUT NOT BY JPACT.	\$750,000
CM4 Wilsonville	Boeckman Rd. Extension (Dammach Urban Village): 95th Ave./Graham's Ferry Rd. Regional preliminary engineering funds (supplements \$12.5 million of local/private right of way and construction dollars) to extend Boeckman Rd. from present terminus at 95th, west of I-5, across wetlands to a junction with Graham's Ferry Rd. The project would access the planned Dammach Urban Village development. MAY OFFSET DELAY ON WILSONVILLE ROAD.	\$1,000,000
CM5 Clackamas County/ Happy Valley	Sunrise Corridor Phase 1 PE: I-205/Rock Creek Jct. Funding through Final Design for first phase of Sunrise Corridor limited access improvement of 212/224 Corridor from I-205 to Rock Creek Junction.	\$4,000,000
MM1 Gresham	Gresham/Mult. Co. ITS Program, Phase 3B Implement additional phase of Gresham/Mult. Co. ITS Master Plan to provide traffic adaptive signal timing of the 181st and Burnside corridors, including one-time costs needed for adoption of adaptive signal timing technology in comparable corridors throughout the region.	\$1,000,000
MM2 Multnomah County	223rd Ave. Railroad Overcrossing Right of Way funds, for widening of the railroad bridge crossing of 223rd, that would supplement previously awarded federal PE funds.	\$149,000

**PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE
PROJECT SUMMARY**

Road Modernization Projects
(continued)

Project Code & Sponsor	Project Title	Federal Funds Requested
PM1 City of Portland	SE Foster Rd. at SE 162nd Ave. Request for 30 percent of funds, matched by other committed local/private/previously allocated regional dollars, needed to design, acquire and construct widening and realignment of Foster Rd. and 162nd Ave., install a signal, bike path and sidewalks, and provide BRIDGE X'ING (NO culvert) at Kelley Creek.	\$1,500,000
WM1 Washington County	U.S. 26 Widening PE – Murray/Cornell Preliminary Engineering to widen US 26 to three lanes in each direction from the Murray Blvd. Interchange to the Cornell Rd. Interchange. PROJECT NOT FROM FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED NETWORK AND WILL TRIGGER TECHNICAL CONFORMITY ANALYSIS. PE ONLY REQUEST AND NOT ELIGIBLE FOR STATE BOND PROGRAM.	\$359,000
WM2 Washington County	Cornell Rd. Corridor ITS Project – Cornell Rd.: Main/10th to County Line Regional funding to supplement County funds (50/50 ratio) for improvement of corridor monitoring and signal operations.	\$375,000
WM3 Washington County	Cedar Hills Blvd./Barnes Rd. Intersection Improvement Design, acquire and construct additional right/left/through lanes at this intersection, and provide significant mulit-modal amenities. STATE BOND PROGRAM ELIGIBLE.	\$1,980,000
WM4 City of Tigard	SW Greenburg Rd.: Washington Square Dr./Tiedeman Right of way and partial construction funding, (supplements previous regional design funds), to widen Greenburg Rd. from three to five lanes, modify one signal and signing, striping and transitional road segments between Tiedeman and Washington. COULD BE SPLIT TO \$390,000 ROW PHASE. STATE BOND PROGRAM ELIGIBLE.	\$774,000
WM6 City of Tualatin	I-5/Nyberg Interchange Widening Right of Way and construction funds to widen Nyberg O'Xing of I-5 from two to four lanes, improve signal operations at the interchange, widen ramp structures in tandem with separate ODOT project and provide bike and ped facilities. STATE BOND PROGRAM ELIGIBLE.	\$3,507,270
WM7 City of Beaverton	Farmington Rd.: Hocken Ave./Murray Blvd. Right of way and construction funding, (supplements previously allocated regional design funds), to widen Farmington Rd. at the Murray intersection to accommodate double left turn bays and to provide appropriate Boulevard amenities at the Farmington/Murray intersection	\$8,210,000

**PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE
PROJECT SUMMARY**

Road Modernization Projects
(continued)

Project Code & Sponsor	Project Title	Federal Funds Requested
---	----------------------	--

per regional design guidelines, upgrade signals, address significant safety issues and integrate multimodal facilities at the Farmington /Murray and Farmington/Hocken intersections. COULD BE SPLIT TO \$4.3 MILLION ROW PHASE. SOME CONCERN ABOUT BOULEVARD DESIGN CONSISTENCY. STATE BOND PROGRAM ELIGIBLE.

	Subtotal	\$23,957,000
--	-----------------	---------------------

**PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE
PROJECT SUMMARY**

Road Reconstruction Projects

Project Code & Sponsor	Project Title	Federal Funds Requested
CR1 Milwaukie/ Portland	Johnson Creek Blvd. – 36th to 45th, Phase 3 Construction funds (supplements \$1.364 million of previously committed federal/local funds) to complete the third, final phase of a multi-modal retrofit of Johnson Creek Blvd. through Milwaukie. The entire project accommodates multiple travel modes in a highly constrained corridor and provides storm-water retention/treatment facilities adjacent to lower reaches of Johnson Creek.	\$800,000
PR3 City of Portland	Naito Parkway: NW Davis/SW Market St. Construction funding to supplement previously allocated regional funds for reconstruction of Naito Parkway, with two onstreet bikelanes.	\$1,500,000
	Subtotal	\$2,300,000

**PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE
PROJECT SUMMARY**

Freight Projects

Project Code & Sponsor	Project Title	Federal Funds Requested
PF1 Port/ Portland/ ODOT	Columbia/Killingsworth East End Connector Thirty-three percent of design funds, to augment Port overmatch, for new, \$34 million, grade-separated Columbia/Killingsworth intersection and rail crossing. STATE BOND PROGRAM ELIGIBLE.	\$1,000,000
PF2 Port of Portland	N. Lombard RR O'Xing: N. Burgard Ave./N. Rivergate Blvd. Supplemental construction funds to cover design changes for habitat protection needs of this otherwise fully funded project to widen N. Lombard from two to four lanes, add five foot bike lanes, a four foot median and one seven foot sidewalk, and to grade separate the street crossing of the BN and SP rail lines. STATE BOND PROGRAM ELIGIBLE.	\$2,000,000
	Subtotal	\$3,000,000

**PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE
PROJECT SUMMARY**

Transit Projects

Project Code & Sponsor	Project Title	Federal Funds Requested
CTR1 Wilsonville	Smart Transit Center Park & Ride Right of Way funds to acquire 2.5 acres for a 250 space Park & Ride/Transit Center at Boberg Rd. and Barber St. in Wilsonville. Project is adjacent to the proposed Wilsonville/Beaverton Commuter Rail and supplements \$1.924 million of appropriated FTA/local match construction funds.	\$1,172,000
MTR1 Tri-Met	FY04/05 Gresham TCL Service Increases Biennial regional share of funds to consolidate Lines 82 and 87 in Gresham to begin 15 minute service during weekdays, weekends and evenings on a new Line 181st running on 181st between Powell and Sandy during FY 04 and 05. Service is provided in exchange for regional purchase of 10 Tri-Met service expansion buses; matched 100 percent by Tri-Met funds.	\$1,794,000
RTR1 Tri-Met	FY04/05 McLoughlin/Barbur Transit Service Continuation Biennial regional share of funds to continue 15 minute service during weekdays, weekends and evenings on new McLoughlin and Barbur Blvd. transit lines during FY 04 and 05. Service is provided in exchange for regional purchase of 10 Tri-Met service expansion buses; matched 100 percent by Tri-Met funds.	\$2,850,000
WTR1 Tri-Met	FY04/05 Beaverton/Tigard TCL Service Increases Biennial regional share of funds to begin 15 minute service during weekdays, weekends and evenings on slightly redefined #62 Line between Sunset Transit Center, Beaverton Regional Center, Murray Scholls Town Center and Washington Square during FY 04 and 05. Service is provided in exchange for regional purchase of 10 Tri-Met service expansion buses; matched 100 percent by Tri-Met funds.	\$718,000
Subtotal		\$7,607,600

NOTE: NO COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION ABOUT TRANSIT FUNDING PENDING.
COUNCIL EXPRESSED CONCERN ABOUT ESTABLISHING PRECEDENT FOR
FUNDING ON-GOING TRI-MET OPERATIONS.

**PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE
PROJECT SUMMARY**

Transportation Demand Management Projects

Project Code & Sponsor	Project Title	Federal Funds Requested
RTDM1 Tri-Met	FY04/05 TMA Assistance – TDM Program Two-year funding for continuation of revamped TMA assistance program to provide locally based TDM services at key regional locations.	\$500,000
RTDM2 Tri-Met	FY04/05 Regional Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program Two-year continuation funding for Regional TDM program housed at Tri-Met.	\$1,400,000
RTDM3 Tri-Met	FY04/05 Region 2040 Initiatives – TDM Program Two-year funding to implement non-Tri-Met transit services and other innovative SOV reduction projects.	\$495,000
RTDM4 DEQ	FY 04/05 ECO Information Clearinghouse DEQ Program that complements the regional TDM program housed at Tri-Met.	\$188,000
RTDM5 SMART	FY 04/05 SMART TDM Program Regional support for Wilsonville SMART component of the Regional TDM program.	\$145,000
Subtotal		\$2,728,000

**PRIORITIES 2002 MTIP UPDATE
PROJECT SUMMARY**

Transit Oriented Development Projects

Project Code & Sponsor	Project Title	Federal Funds Requested
PTOD1 City of Portland	Gateway Regional Center TOD Project Funds to acquire a 1 acre replacement parcel for relocation of 140 Park & Ride Spaces from Gateway to 122nd Ave. MAX Station that is needed to leverage construction of a TOD containing 67,000 sq. ft. of commercial retail, 107 units of housing and a publicly accessible esplanade.	\$800,000
RTOD1 Metro	Transit-Oriented Development Implementation Program Regional funds to leverage privately financed construction of transit oriented commercial/retail/residential development in Regional and Town Centers adjacent to light rail.	\$2,100,000
	Subtotal	\$2,900,000

HB 2142 Candidate Projects

A. Increase Lane Capacity/Interchanges

1. Accelerate current JPACT priorities – Over the past several years, JPACT has adopted a limited set of project priorities to be implemented through ODOT's State Transportation Improvement Program funding. The current status of these priorities is as follows:

- a) Sunset Highway – The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Westside Light Rail project was a joint highway/LRT EIS and included improvements to Sunset Highway from the Vista Ridge Tunnels to Murray Blvd. and on Hwy. 217 from Canyon to Sunset Highway. When the highway elements were delayed by JPACT action, completion of the delayed portions were declared the top regional priority. Implementation of this priority has been through a series of phases due to limited resources. The components are as follows:
- Sylvan Interchange, westbound climbing lane, zoo interchange and westbound lane addition from Sylvan to Hwy. 217 – These phases are complete, under construction or scheduled for construction within the next year.
 - Sunset Highway from Hwy 217 to Murray – In the current '04/'05 update to the STIP, ODOT has proposed this project as their sole addition scheduled for construction.
 - Sunset Highway eastbound climbing lane from Hwy. 217 to Sylvan – This phase is currently unfunded and is a prime candidate for the HB 2142 Bond Program.
 - Hwy. 217 from Canyon to Sunset - This phase is currently unfunded and is a prime candidate for the HB 2142 Bond Program.

In addition to the priority highway projects in the Sunset Highway Corridor, associated with the Westside LRT project, the following Sunset Highway projects are also under consideration:

- Sunset Highway from Murray to 185th Avenue – This is the next segment west from the project originally tied to the Westside LRT project. An application for Preliminary Engineering funds is pending through the MTIP process. Partial funding is expected to be committed by Washington County through the extension of their MSTIP. The project is not currently on the financially constrained RTP (as required by HB 2142) but could be added if MSTIP and/or ODOT funds are committed to the project and air quality conformity can be demonstrated. Partial funding (to match the MSTIP funds) is a candidate for HB 2142 bond funds but the above uncertainties suggest it may not meet ODOT's "project readiness" criteria.
- Sunset Highway/Cornelius Pass Interchange – Added ramps to provide an eastbound on-ramp and a westbound off-ramp. The City of Hillsboro is proposing to provide local matching funds in support of this project.

- b) Lombard/Killingsworth Connector – The Port of Portland initiated an EIS for this project using they're funding. Construction is currently unfunded and is a prime candidate for the HB 2142 Bond Program.
 - c) I-5/Kruse Way Interchange - Phase 1 of this project is nearly complete; phase 2 is not a critical need at this time.
 - d) I-5/Delta Park widening – The region was successful in getting federal discretionary funds for the I-5 Trade Corridor Study to develop an overall corridor improvement strategy and for preliminary engineering and EIS work for the I-5/Delta Park widening. These studies are underway and await a conclusion.
2. Sunset Highway/Jackson School Interchange – This project is outside Metro's jurisdiction but is consistent with the US 26 Corridor Plan developed by ODOT and supported by Metro several years ago. Construction is currently unfunded and is a prime candidate for the HB 2142 Bond Program.
 3. Sunrise Corridor/Unit 1/Phase 1 – Unit 1 of the Sunrise Corridor is proposed as a new road from I-205 at the Hwy 224 interchange to Rock Creek Junction where Hwy 212 and 224 split (east to Damascus and south to Estacada). Unit 1/Phase 1 is proposed as a limited connector within the Unit 1 right-of-way to connect from I-205 in to the Clackamas Industrial District. Many unresolved issues as well as the likely cost of this project suggest that ODOT's criteria for "project readiness" make this a poor candidate for HB 2142 bond funds.
 4. Sunnyside Road widening – Serving a corridor parallel to the Sunrise Corridor is Sunnyside Road. Preliminary Engineering and EIS work is complete from 122nd to 172nd, funded through MTIP and Clackamas County funds. Partial funding to allow Phase 1 to begin construction this year is committed, also from MTIP and Clackamas County. Funding for additional segments along Sunnyside Road is a candidate for HB 2142 bond funds.
 5. I-5/Nyberg Interchange – The City of Tualatin has applied through the MTIP allocation process for \$3.5 million to widen the bridge over I-5. This project is eligible for HB 2142 funding.
 6. Tri-Met Streamline improvements – Tri-Met and the City of Portland are implementing improvements within the City of Portland on Barbur Blvd. (99W), Powell Blvd. (US 26) and Tualatin-Valley Highway (Hwy 8). Funding to extend these projects beyond the Portland City Limits would be eligible for HB 2142 bond funding for elements that increase lane capacity.

B. Bridge Projects – HB 2142 provides eligibility for state and local load limited bridge projects and state and local bridge projects generally. ODOT will select the most critical state bridges on a statewide basis. Local bridges will be considered on a competitive basis using the state bridge rating system and other criteria. Candidates in this region are:

1. Broadway Bridge – Electric/mechanical upgrade, deck replacement, painting – This project is partially funded through federal bridge and “demo” funds and Multnomah County funding. However, the full cost of painting is currently unfunded and is a prime candidate for the HB 2142 Bond Program.
2. Burnside Bridge – Electric/mechanical upgrade, seismic retrofit - This project is partially funded through federal bridge and “demo” funds and Multnomah County funding. However, the project is currently partially funded and the balance is a prime candidate for the HB 2142 Bond Program.

C. District Highway Preservation Projects – HB 2142 provides eligibility for pavement rehabilitation for load limited highways and ODOT highways classified as “District Highways” with priority for District Highway projects that result in transfer of jurisdiction from ODOT to a local government. Candidates in this region are:

1. Sandy Blvd. – The City of Portland is considering taking ownership of Sandy Blvd. from SE 7th Ave. to NE 57th Ave. if ODOT rehabilitates the pavement. This is a candidate for the HB 2142 Bond Program if the pavement condition is sufficiently deteriorated.
2. Sandy Blvd. - Multnomah County is considering taking ownership of Sandy Blvd. from NE 172nd to NE 207th. if ODOT rehabilitates the pavement. This is a candidate for the HB 2142 Bond Program if the pavement is sufficiently deteriorated.
3. Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway – Washington County is considering taking over ownership of Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway if ODOT participates with the County’s MSTIP funded improvement at the Scholls/Oleson/Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway intersection. This is a candidate for the HB 2142 Bond Program if the pavement is sufficiently deteriorated.
4. Farmington Rd. – Washington County is considering taking over Farmington Rd. if ODOT participates with the County’s MSTIP and MTIP funded Farmington Rd. project. This is a candidate for the HB 2142 Bond Program if the pavement condition is sufficiently deteriorated.
5. Boones Ferry Rd./Hall Blvd. – Washington County is considering taking over Boones Ferry Rd. and Hall Blvd. in the Tualatin/Tigard area if ODOT participates with the County in building a new connection between Hall and Boones Ferry Rd. across the Tualatin River.
6. McLoughlin Blvd. through Milwaukie – The City of Milwaukie has received a partial allocation for a “Boulevard” improvement through the core of their downtown area from the past MTIP process. Funding to complete the project may be eligible for HB 2142 funding if the pavement condition is sufficiently deteriorated to qualify.
7. Powell Blvd. 175th to Mt. Hood Highway – Multnomah County and Gresham are considering taking over this segment US 26 if ODOT decides to fund a pavement preservation project. This is a candidate for the HB 2142 Bond Program if the pavement condition is sufficiently deteriorated.

Planning Projects

Project Code & Sponsor	Project Title	Federal Funds Requested
RPLNG1 Consortium	Willamette Shoreline Rail and Trail Study Planning work to determine mode and alignment of a dual rail and bike corridor from Macadam District to Lake Oswego.	\$550,000
RPLNG2 Metro	Regional Freight Program Planning funds to continue collection of freight related data for modeling purposes and to expand survey data for further model refinement.	\$150,000
RPLNG3 Metro	RTP Corridor Project Supplemental funding to complete one corridor alternatives analysis upon its selection during the current Corridor Initiatives evaluation process. COUNCIL EXPRESSED CONCERN ABOUT ESTABLISHING PRECEDENT FOR 100% REGIONAL FUNDING OF CORRIDOR STUDIES RATHER THAN SHARING COSTS WITH LOCAL AGENCIES.	\$600,000
RPLNG4 Metro	Metro Core Regional Planning Program Core regional planning program support for maintenance of regional transportation model, TIP management, RTP update, corridor analyses and high capacity transit planning.	\$1,480,000
RPLNG5 Region	South Corridor Draft EIS Funding to conduct a Draft EIS for analysis of mode choice and alignment of transportation improvements in the McLoughlin Corridor from Downtown Portland to Oregon City. Alternatives to be considered include traffic lanes, dedicated transit lanes, HOV lanes and potentially a light rail alignment, consistent with the 2000 RTP. The Draft EIS is intended to support a request to FTA for negotiation of a Full Funding Grant Agreement. COUNCIL EXPRESSED CONCERN ABOUT ESTABLISHING PRECEDENT FOR 100% REGIONAL FUNDING OF CORRIDOR STUDIES RATHER THAN SHARING COSTS WITH LOCAL AGENCIES.	\$4,000,000
Subtotal		\$6,780,000