600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Metro | *Agenda*

Meeting: Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)
Date: Thursday, December 9, 2010
Time: 7:30 to 9 a.m.
Place: Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

7:30 AM	1.		**CALL TO ORDER & DECLARATION OF A QUORUM**	**Carlotta Collette, Chair**
7:32 AM	2.		**INTRODUCTIONS**	**Carlotta Collette, Chair**
7:35 AM	3.		**CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**	**Carlotta Collette, Chair**
7:40 AM	4.		**COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR & COMMITTEE MEMBERS**	
		*	• ODOT State Transportation Program (STIP) Update	**Jason Tell**
			• Oregon Climate Summit Report	**Carlotta Collette, Chair**
		#	• Regional Flexible Fund Task Force and Environmental Justice Working Group Updates	**Carlotta Collette, Chair**
7:47 AM	5.	*	**Consideration of the JPACT Minutes for November 4, 2010**	
	6.		**INFORMATION / DISCUSSION ITEMS**	
7:50 AM	6.1	*	Columbia River Crossing Project Update – INFORMATION / DISCUSSION • Review conclusions reached in August by the Project Sponsors Council • Status report on conditions adopted with the Locally Preferred Alternative approval • Status report on analysis by Plaid Pantry • JPACT support for state and federal legislative action	**Richard Brandman, CRC** **Andy Cotugno**
8:30 AM	6.2	*	Legislative Transportation Update – INFORMATION / DIRECTION • State • Federal	 **Randy Tucker** **Andy Cotugno**
9 AM	7.		**ADJOURN**	**Carlotta Collette, Chair**

* Material available electronically.
** Materials will be distributed at prior to the meeting.
# Materials will be distributed at the meeting.

For agenda and schedule information, call Kelsey Newell at 503-797-1916, e-mail: kelsey.newell@oregonmetro.gov.
To check on closure or cancellations during inclement weather please call 503-797-1700#.

2010-11 JPACT Work Program
12/1/10

November 4, 2010 – Regular Meeting • MTIP amendment Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail Final Design Application – Action • MTIP Amendment to Transfer Funds from the Greenberg Rd.: Tiedeman to Hwy 217 Project to the Walnut St.: Tiedeman to 116th Project – Action • MTIP Amendment to Delete the Washington Square Regional Center Trail: Hall to Greenberg Project and Substitute the Fanno Creek Trail: Main to Hall Project – Action • Region wide Flexible Funds (Step 1) Review: Regional Planning – Information • STIP: Recommended Draft for Public Comment – Information • Oregon Transportation Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Planning – Information	**December 9, 2010 – Regular Meeting** • ODOT STIP Update • Regional Flexible Fund Task Force and Environmental Justice Group Update • Columbia River Crossing Project – Information/Discussion • Legislative Transportation Update – Information/Direction
January 13, 2011 – Regular Meeting • Region wide Flexible Funds (Step 1) Review: Transit Oriented Development – Information • Intertwine- Information • Climate Smart Communities Scenarios – Information/Discussion • RFFA Task Force Strategy Recommendation – Briefing and Discussion • Global Warming Commission 2020 Roadmap – Information • FY12 Federal Appropriations and Authorization – Action	**February 10, 2011 – Regular Meeting** • Climate Smart Communities Scenarios – Discussion on Policy Options and Evaluation Framework • Climate Adaptation Framework – Information/Discussion • Lake Oswego to Portland Transit Project Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) Briefing – Information • Region wide Flexible Funds (Step 1) Review: Transportation System Management & Operations (TSMO) and Regional Transit Options (RTO)
March 10, 2011 – Regular Meeting • Climate Smart Communities Scenarios – Discussion on Policy Options to Test • Lake Oswego to Portland Transit Project Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) – Action • Oregon Transportation Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Planning and Draft Metro Region Targets Monday, Feb, 28, 5 p.m.: DC Trip Prep Meeting March 9-10: Annual JPACT Washington, DC Trip (Tentitive)	**April 14, 2011 – Regular Meeting** • 2011 – 2012 UPWP and Annual MPO Self-Certification – Action • Climate Smart Communities Scenarios – Discussion **Hold: April 1 Joint JPACT/MPAC Meeting** Climate Smart Communities • Public Opinion Research Findings • Policy Options to Test

May 12, 2011 – Regular Meeting • Climate Smart Communities Scenarios – Action on Policy Options to Test	**June 9, 2011 – Regular Meeting**
July 14, 2011 – Regular Meeting	**August 11, 2011 – Regular Meeting** • 2014-15 Regional Flexible Fund Allocation – Action
September 8, 2011 – Regular Meeting **Hold: Joint JPACT/MPAC Meeting** Climate Smart Communities Results and Recommendations	**October 13, 2011 – Regular Meeting**
November 10, 2011 – Regular Meeting • Climate Smart Communities Scenarios – Action on Findings to be Submitted to 2012 Legislature and Recommendations	**December 8, 2011 – Regular Meeting** • 2012-15 MTIP/STIP Approval and Air Quality Conformity – Action

Parking Lot:

- Update and discussion on Electric Vehicles and ETEC charging station project
- Discussion of subcommittees for JPACT – equity, economy and climate change response
- Regional Flexible Fund Allocation, Step 2 fund project priority recommendations by spring 2011
- RTP amendment for CRC.
- CRC LUFO.
- Regional Indicators briefing in early 2011.
- Statewide Transportation GHG Reduction Strategy project update in late 2010 or early 2011.

Oregon
Theodore R. Kulongoski, Governor

Department of Transportation
Region 1 Headquarters
123 NW Flanders Street
Portland, Oregon 97209
(503) 731.8200
FAX (503) 731.8531

Date: October 21, 2010

To: Region 1 STIP Stakeholders

From: Jeff Flowers
Region 1, Program and Funding Services Manager

Subject: 2014-15 Draft STIP Update

This memo is to follow up and provide additional information on the process for developing the 2014-2015 STIP update. A few months ago, Region 1 presented the 150%-200% draft project for scoping for Preservation, Safety and Operations. I am attaching the following documents for your review:

1. Draft 100% project list: the list of projects is Region's suggested projects for your consideration to meet the following funding levels for the 2014-2015 STIP update.
    a. Preservation - $21.6 million
    b. Safety - $18.5 million
    c. Operations - $9.5 million

2. Timelines: an updated timeline with more information on the upcoming action items for developing the 2014-2015 Draft STIP until adoption of the STIP, which is currently estimated in spring of 2012.

3. Program Descriptions: these documents will help illustrate how projects are determined for the Preservation, Safety and Operations programs.

4. Project map: illustrates the locations for the draft 100% project list and will be distributed at the meeting.

The Draft STIP is slated to be printed and available in March of 2011, with public outreach starting in April 2011.

If you have any questions, you can contact me at Jeffrey.A.FLOWERS@odot.state.or.us, or via phone at (503) 731.8235.

Thank you

Updated 2014-2015 Draft STIP scoping and project selection process timeline

October 2010
- Region proposes draft 100% list to TPAC – October 29
- Final *Draft* project selection occurs

November 2010
- Region proposes draft 100% list to JPACT – November 4
- Region proposes draft 100% list to NWACT – November 4
- Region proposes draft 100% list to other stakeholders
- Draft 100% list approval at TPAC – November

December 2010
- Draft 100% list approval at JPACT – December
- Region 1 to complete the Draft STIP project and programming information

January - February 2011
- Region 1 to review final Draft STIP with stakeholders

March 2011
- Draft STIP provided to Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC)
- Draft STIP provided to local stakeholders for review

April - May 2011
- Public meetings for the Draft STIP

June 2011
- Public comments reviewed by OTC and local stakeholders

July 2011
- If needed, adjustments to the draft STIP will be completed based on OTC direction and funding allocations

August – November 2011
- Air Quality conformity determinations and modeling

December 2011
- MTIP information for draft STIP to be finalized

January 2012
- Final STIP review with local stakeholders

February 2012
- Approval of the 2012-2015 STIP by the OTC
- Submit STIP and MTIP to Federal Highways

March 2012
- Federal approval of the 2012-2015 STIP

DRAFT 2014-2015 STIP PRESERVATION PROJECTS

What is the Preservation Program?
The Preservation Program funds paving projects – projects that extend the service life of existing highways without increasing capacity. The Preservation Program typically focuses on high volume roads of statewide significance, maximizing pavement condition on the most critical routes while providing serviceable condition on lower volume roads of regional significance. Highways that average less than 5,000 vehicles per day are maintained under a separate program and are typically not prioritized for receiving preservation funds.

How do projects become eligible for preservation funds?
Preservation projects are identified through ODOT's Pavement Management System (PMS), which consists of two components:

1) A database containing current and historical information on pavement condition, pavement structure, and traffic, and
2) A set of tools that allows us to determine existing and future pavement conditions (which is used to determine the level of work needed, i.e. rebuild, inlay, overlay, etc), predict financial estimates, and identify and prioritize preservation projects.

For each STIP cycle, Region 1 receives a report of potential preservation projects, which is based on pavement conditions and estimated costs. This report represents approximately 200-300% of available funding, which means that it must be condensed to a prioritized list of projects.

How does ODOT prioritize preservation projects for funding?
In ODOT Region 1, a team of staff reviews the PMS report and assesses which projects should be considered for scoping. The scoping process includes developing the extent of work, refining cost estimates, identifying other elements that could be included with the project, and identifying potential issues (environmental, access management, land use, safety, bicycle/pedestrian enhancements, etc.) that will be addressed as part of the normal project development process. Projects are also prioritized based on lane miles. Each STIP cycle, the Region is provided lane mile targets for paving.

In addition, during the project scoping process, each preservation project is evaluated and analyzed for opportunities to leverage funds from local jurisdictions or other STIP Programs (Safety, Operations, Bicycle/Pedestrian, and Bridge). Public comments also provide Region 1 with information to better coordinate timing and funding of the proposed preservation projects.

Prioritization is also based on projects that support three Oregon Highway Plan policies. This includes:

- Projects that support freight mobility
- Projects that include features and elements that improve safety
- Projects located in urban areas coupled with improved pedestrian features

The scoping effort, combined with a review of projects that support OHP policies, and local stakeholder input, provides Region 1 management with the information needed to select, prioritize and recommend projects. All projects are expected to begin construction within the timeframe of their programmed year.

DRAFT 2014-2015 STIP OPERATIONS PROJECTS

What is the Operations Program?
The Operations Program provides highway management improvements that lead to more efficient and safe travel, and greater system reliability. Program areas include:

- Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) – ITS is the application of advanced communication and computer technology to address transportation problems. ITS projects include:
  - Ramp metering (signals at entrance ramps that help control the flow of vehicles entering a freeway)
  - Emergency response/traffic management operations centers
  - Mountain pass/urban traffic cameras
  - Variable Message Signs (VMS), which are used to provide information to motorists en-route regarding delays, work zones, travel time estimates, alternative routes, amber alerts, etc.
  - Weather data collection.
- Rock-fall and slide repair – Includes repairing the most hazardous rock-fall and slide areas (not emergency repairs).
- Signals, illumination, signs, vehicle turnouts, and other operational improvements that are used to maintain operational effectiveness.

How does ODOT prioritize operation projects for funding?
Projects are prioritized using the following criteria:

- ITS – Projects are prioritized based on the ODOT Region 1 ITS plan, which is developed with the Regional TRANSPORT committee.
- Rock-fall/slide repair – Projects are prioritized based on a statewide ranking list of potential injury hazards.
- Signals, illumination, signs, etc. – Projects are prioritized based on input from ODOT maintenance crews and our partner agencies.

DRAFT 2014-2015 STIP SAFETY PROJECTS

What is the Safety Program?
The Safety Program funds projects that are designed to reduce the number of fatal and severe injury crashes in particular locations with identified safety problems. Examples of safety projects include: installing guardrail or median barrier, realigning abrupt highway curves, installing lighting, turn lanes, passing lanes and constructing bicycle lanes to address safety issues. All safety projects follow the ODOT Highway Safety Program Guide. This document can be found at:
www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/TRAFFIC-ROADWAY/highway_safety_program.shtml.

How do projects become eligible for safety funds?
Projects are eligible for safety funding if they meet one of the following criteria:

- Top 5% Safety Priority Index System (SPIS) – SPIS is a method developed by ODOT to help identify safety concerns on state highways. The system rates one-tenth mile segments of highways based on the frequency, severity and rates of crashes.
- Benefit Cost (B/C) Ratio of 1.0 or Greater – The B/C analysis provides the ratio of economic value of the long-term reduction of crashes to the estimated cost of the improvement. Projects with a high B/C ratio would provide the maximum value for our investment.
- Risk Narrative Justification – A Risk Narrative is a way to justify a project when crash trends may not be evident and/or when crash data is not available. Safety improvements justified by a Risk Narrative may not necessarily have a significant crash history, but have the potential for fatal or severe injury crashes.
- Funding eligibility – projects must be on the State Highway System to be eligible for safety funding.

How does ODOT prioritize safety projects for funding?
Safety projects are prioritized based on the following criteria:

- Economic feasibility
- Ability to reduce fatal and serious injury crashes
- High benefit to cost ratio
- Information provided by ODOT maintenance staff and our community partners to support the need for a safety project
- Information provided by local jurisdictions
- Leveraged funding opportunities

Region 1 Proposed Projects for 2014-2015 Draft STIP

PRG	PROJECT NAME	DESCRIPTION	Estimate
MOD	No 2014-2015 Mod Allocation	-	$ -
PRES	US30: Cornelius Pass Rd - NW St. Helens Rd (MP 13.12 - 17.90)	1R - 2" grind and inlay of travel lanes with 5% subrade stabilization	$ 6,500,000
PRES	OR99W: Tualatin River Br - Sherwood (MP 12.2 - 16.67)	1R - 2" inlay both west and east bound lanes with 5% subgrade stabilization	$ 5,000,000
PRES	OR213 (82nd Ave): King Rd - Lake Rd (MP 8.2 - 9.9)	1R - 2" grind and inlay of travel lanes	$ 3,500,000
PRES	US26: MP 22.5 to SE Luzon Lane	1R - 2" grind and inlay of travel lanes	$ 6,000,000
SAFE	OR99W: SW Fischer Road	Improve intersection at Fischer Rd to allow SB U-turns. Close median opening to north. Add sidewalk on NB side of 99W.	$ 1,230,000
SAFE	US30: Old Portland Road to Millard	Intersection improvements at Old Portland Rd, Bennett Rd, and Millard.	$ 3,338,000
SAFE	OR210: OR217 to Cascade Ave	Intersection improvements at Hwy 217 and Cascade Ave; adding programmed signal heads on OR210 and protected left turns at Cascade. Add sidewalks.	$ 1,375,700
SAFE	OR8: SW 185th Ave	Install Traffic separators to West and East of 185th. WB OR8 add right turn lane and advance signal head.	$ 2,228,500
SAFE	OR8: SW 192nd Ave	Install traffic separator west and east of 192nd.	$ 344,500
SAFE	OR10: SW 103rd/SW Western Ave	Install traffic separators west of Western, ped improvements, reduce crossing distance across Western by squaring up right turn slip lanes.	$ 482,500
SAFE	OR 213 (82nd Ave): Sandy Blvd	Intersection improvements including advance signal head NB, countdown Ped signals, improved signing	$ 910,500
SAFE	OR 213 (82nd Ave): SE Duke Street	Intersection improvements, signal upgrade, pedestrian and sidewalk improvements, install far side bus pull out.	$ 881,000
SAFE	OR 213 (82nd Ave): King Rd	Install traffic separator south of King Rd. Intersection improvements on King, removing bus lane, improving the bike lane and right turn lanes and adding protected left turns.	$ 303,500
SAFE	OR 213 (82nd Ave): Causey Ave	Install traffic separator provide alternative left turns	$ 176,000
SAFE	OR 213 (82nd Ave) Sunnyside Rd	Install traffic separator north of Sunnyside allow U-turns	$ 178,000
SAFE	OR 99E: Vineyard Rd	Intersection and pedestrian improvments	$ 884,000
SAFE	OR 212: 135th Ave	Intersection improvements including protected left turns on 135th.	$ 549,300
SAFE	US26 (Mt Hood Hwy): Jarl Rd	Improve signal visibility and warning, add right turn lane WB	$ 431,000
SAFE	US26 (Mt Hood Hwy): Ruben Lane	Install traffic separator	$ 101,200
SAFE	2014 Priority Safety Improvements Reserve	Safety Reserve for priority safety improvements	$ 505,800
SAFE	OR224 (Clackamas Hwy): 197th Avenue	Flatten curve, widen shoulders and add guardrail	$ 1,846,200
SAFE	OR224 (Clackamas Hwy): SE 232nd Dr	Add left and right turn lanes to 232nd	$ 2,734,300
OPS	Illumination - OR217: Hall and Scholls/Progress Interchanges	New poles and new service	$ 500,000
OPS	ITS - I-84: Frontage Rd (MP 17) EB	VMS	$ 200,000
OPS	ITS - OR99E: MP 2.14 - 12.56	CCTV & Communications -- Camera	$ 500,000
OPS	ITS - OR99E: 2nd Street	CCTV	$ 75,000
OPS	ITS - OR99E: South End Road	CCTV	$ 75,000
OPS	ITS - OR213: Spangler Hill	RWIS -- Weather Information Station	$ 150,000
OPS	ITS - OR99E: Ivy St (Canby)	CCTV	$ 75,000
OPS	ITS - I-84: MP 62	CCTV	$ 100,000
OPS	ITS - I-84: MP 35	CCTV	$ 100,000
OPS	ITS - I-84: MP 23	CCTV	$ 100,000
OPS	ITS - I-84: MP 18 EB	VMS	$ 300,000
OPS	ITS - OR173: MP 0 NB	CCTV, Temperature	$ 100,000
OPS	ITS - OR173: MP 0 SB	VMS	$ 200,000
OPS	ITS - OR35: MP 63.8	VMS	$ 200,000
OPS	ITS - OR35: MP 63.8	CCTV	$ 100,000
OPS	ITS - US26: MP 61.75	CCTV	$ 100,000
OPS	ITS - OR35: MP 80 SB	VMS	$ 200,000
OPS	Signals - OR99E: Barlow	Signal Upgrades	$ 23,000
OPS	Signals - OR99E: Concord, Oak Grove, Naef, Roethe, Jennings, Glen Echo	Signal Upgrades	$ 608,000
OPS	Signals - US30: Oak @ 9th	Signal Upgrades	$ 91,000
OPS	Signals - US26: (Proctor WB) @ Meinig	Signal Upgrades	$ 633,000
OPS	Signals - OR8: Camelot Court - Walker Road	Signal Upgrades	$ 106,000
OPS	Signals - Hwy 224 @ Hwy 211	Signal Upgrades	$ 105,000
OPS	OR217 Operational Improvements	Improvements being based on OR217 Study	$ 1,000,000
OPS	Interstate Operations Improvements	Identification and design of interstate operational improvements	$ 400,000
OPS	Slides/Rockfalls - Rockfall Investigations	Investigate Rockfall issues	$ 1,500,000

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DRAFT 2014-2015 STIP 100% Candidate List

Operations, Preservation and Safety

Operations
Preservation
Safety

District 2A
District 2B
District 2C

Interstate
U.S. Routes

Oregon Routes
Counties

DISCLAIMER: This product is for informational purposes only and may not have been prepared for or be suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. Users of this information should review or consult the primary data and information sources to ascertain the usability of the information.

October 25, 2010

ODOT REGIONS

Region 1
Region 2
Region 3
Region 4
Region 5

US 30: Old Portland Rd to Millard
US 30: Cornelius Pass Rd - NW St Helens
US 26: Jefferson St - Highland
OR 8: Camelot Ct - Walker Rd
OR 8: SW 185th Ave
OR 8: SW 192nd Ave
OR 10: SW 103rd/SW Western Ave
OR 217: OPS Improvements
OR 217: Hall
OR 217: Scholls
OR 99W: SW Fischer Rd
OR 99W: Tualatin River - Sherwood
OR 99E: Oak Grove
OR 99E: Concord
OR 99E: Vineyard Rd
OR 99E: Naef
OR 99E: Roethe
OR 99E: Glen Echo
OR 99E: Jennings
OR 99E: 2nd Street
OR 99E: S End Road
OR 99E: Ivy
OR 99E: Barlow
OR 213: Sandy Blvd
OR 99E: MP 2.14-12.56
OR 213: SE Duke St
OR 213: King Rd
OR 213: Causey Ave
OR 213: Sunnyside Rd
OR 213: King Rd - Lake Rd
OR 213: Spangler Hill
OR 212: 135th Ave
OR 224: Springwater Rd
OR 224: SE 232nd Dr
OR 224: 197th Ave
OR 224: OR 211
I-84 EB: MP 17
I-84 EB: MP 18
I-84: MP 23
I-84: MP 35
I-84: MP 62
US 26: Jarl Rd
US 26: Ruben Ln
US 26 WB: Meinig
US 26: MP 22.50 - SE Luzon Ln
US 30: 9th
OR 35: MP 80
OR 35: MP 63.8, VMS
OR 35: MP 63.8, CCTV
OR 35: MP 61.75
OR 173: MP 5.46, CCTV
OR 173: MP 5.46, VMS

Columbia County
Clark County
Skamania County
Multnomah County
Hood River County
Washington County
Yamhill County
Marion County
Clackamas County
Wasco County

St. Helens
Scappoose
North Plains
Hillsboro
Cornelius
Beaverton
Tigard
Tualatin
Sherwood
Newberg
Dundee
Dayton
St. Paul
Donald
Aurora
Hubbard
Woodburn
Wilsonville
Canby
Oregon City
Gladstone
Milwaukie
Portland
Troutdale
Fairview
Gresham
Sandy
Estacada
Molalla
Cascade Locks
Hood River

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736
www.oregonmetro.gov

Metro | *People places. Open spaces.*

JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION
November 4, 2010
Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

MEMBERS PRESENT	AFFILIATION
Carlotta Collette, Chair	Metro Council
Kathryn Harrington	Metro Council
Jack Burkman	City of Vancouver
Nina DeConcini	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Donna Jordan	City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas Co.
Deborah Kafoury	Multnomah County
Rod Park	Metro Council
Lynn Peterson	Clackamas County
Roy Rogers	Washington County
Jason Tell	Oregon Department of Transportation, Region 1
Don Wagner	Washington State Department of Transportation

MEMBERS EXCUSED	AFFILIATION
Sam Adams	City of Portland
Shane Bemis	City of Gresham, representing Cities of Multnomah Co.
Craig Dirksen	City of Tigard, representing Cities of Washington Co.
Neil McFarlane	TriMet
Steve Stuart	Clark County
Bill Wyatt	Port of Portland

ALTERNATES PRESENT	AFFILIATION
Jef Dalin	City of Cornelius, representing Cities of Washington Co.
Dave Fuller	City of Wood Village, representing Cities of Multnomah Co.
Susie Lahsene	Port of Portland
Alan Lehto	TriMet

STAFF: Kim Brown, Alison Kean Campbell, Andy Cotugno, Colin Deverell, Tom Kloster, Ted Leybold, Jim Middaugh, Kelsey Newell, Dylan Rivera, Ross Roberts, Randy Tucker, Mark Turpel.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

Chair Carlotta Collette declared a quorum and called the meeting to order at 7:33 a.m.

2. INTRODUCTIONS

There were none.

3. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were none.

4. COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Chair Collette described the first meeting of the Regional Flexible Funds (RFF) Task Force, noting that the group would provide input on projects to JPACT in April 2011, and reminded the committee of the OMPOC summit on November 19.

Mr. Andy Cotugno of Metro described the upcoming federal fiscal year appropriations process and, noting the stall in federal transportation reauthorization legislation, suggested the committee operate with the proposed list.

Mr. Jim Middaugh of Metro described Metro's hiring of an external journalist to report on various activities within the agency with the goal of improving accessibility and transparency.

Commissioner Lynn Peterson raised questions regarding the Columbia River Crossing (CRC) project, specifically related to system management and the relative roles and responsibilities going forward. Members discussed these roles, the importance of policy coordination and noted the upcoming CRC discussion during the December 9 JPACT meeting.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

- Approval of the JPACT Minutes for October 14, 2010
- Resolution No. 10-4210, "For the Purpose of Amending the 2010-12 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) to Transfer Funds from the Greenburg Road: Tiedeman to Hwy 217 Project to the Walnut Street: Tiedeman to 116th Project."
- Resolution No. 10-4211, "For the Purpose of Amending the 2010-13 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) to Delete the Washington Square Regional Center Trail: Hall to Greenburg Project and Substitute the Fanno Creek Trail: Main to Hall Project."

MOTION: Commissioner Roy Rogers moved, Councilor Jef Dalin seconded, to approve the Consent Agenda items with the following change:

- An attendance correction in the October 14 JPACT Minutes.

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

6. ACTION ITEMS

6.1 Resolution No. 10-4201, "For the Purpose of Amending the 2008-13 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) to Include Funding of Initial Land Acquisition, Construction and Related Costs for the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project."

Mr. Ross Roberts of Metro described the amendment, which would formally recognize approved funding sources for the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail (PMLR) project, allowing for the commencement of related right-of-way acquisitions and preliminary construction tasks.

MOTION: Mr. Jason Tell moved, Councilor Donna Jordan seconded, to approve Resolution No. 10-4201.

ACTION TAKEN: With sixteen in favor and one abstention (DeConcini), the motion passed.

7. INFORMATION / DISCUSSION ITEMS

7.1 Review of 2014-15 Regional Flexible Fund Step 1 Programs – Regional Planning

Mr. Tom Kloster of Metro briefed the committee on the allocation of MTIP funds for regional planning efforts. Mr. Kloster described JPACT's past decision to adopt an MTIP/STIP model in lieu of a regional dues program and requested its continuation. Mr. Kloster also described several of the areas to which MTIP funds are allocated, including regional freight planning, livable streets and local project development.

Committee members discussed Metro's Regional Planning efforts, noting the effects of the delay in federal transportation reauthorization and overhead provisions in federal grants.

7.2 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Draft for Public Comment

Mr. Jason Tell updated the committee on the STIP draft prepared by ODOT and provided a list of safety and preservation projects, noting that projects would benefit if conducted in partnership with local jurisdictions. Final approval of projects will occur in 2012.

7.3 Oregon Transportation Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Planning

Mr. Richard Whitman of the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) and Ms. Jerri Bohard from ODOT reported on the state's greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions planning efforts and their implications for the Portland metropolitan area. Mr. Whitman described the challenges ahead in addressing the state-mandated reduction in carbon emissions and the ongoing development of emissions reduction strategies. The statewide strategy will identify the combination of strategies needed to meet the state goals, with transportation-related GHG emissions reduction targets being developed for each metropolitan area. The Portland metropolitan region's scenario planning effort will be focused on identifying two different combinations of strategies to meet the region's target, tailored to address trips that begin, end or are entirely within the region's urban growth boundary.

Chair Collette noted her involvement in the Statewide Transportation Strategy Policy Committee and indicated that JPACT would receive regular progress updates as the state and regional efforts continued.

8. ADJOURN

Seeing no further business, Chair Collette adjourned the meeting at 8:59 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Colin Deverell
Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR NOVEMBER 4, 2010
The following have been included as part of the official public record:

ITEM	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT NO.
7.3	PowerPoint	n/a	HB 2001 & SB 1059: State and Metropolitan Planning for Reducing GHG Emissions	110410j-01
7.3	PowerPoint	11/4/10	State Transportation Climate Change Planning Efforts	110410j-02
	Letter	11/1/2010	Association of Oregon Rail and Transit Advocates	110410j-03

Columbia River CROSSING

700 WASHINGTON STREET
SUITE 300
VANCOUVER, WA 98660
360-737-2726 | 503-256-2726

September 13, 2010

Governor Christine Gregoire
Office of the Governor
PO Box 40002
Olympia, WA 98504-0002

Governor Theodore Kulongoski
Office of the Governor
160 State Capitol
900 Court Street
Salem, OR 97301-4047

Subject: CRC Project Sponsors Council recommendations

Dear Governor Gregoire and Governor Kulongoski:

The Columbia River Crossing Project Sponsors Council (PSC) is pleased to deliver a set of recommendations that reflect the unanimous consensus of the local project partners, the CRC staff and the Transportation Departments of both Oregon and Washington. Members of the PSC are:

Matthew Garrett, Director, Oregon Department of Transportation
Paula Hammond, Secretary, Washington Department of Transportation
Sam Adams, Mayor, City of Portland
Jeanne Harris, Council member, City of Vancouver
David Bragdon, Council President, Metro
Steve Stuart, Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council Board of Directors
Neil McFarlane, General Manager, TriMet
Tim Leavitt, C-TRAN Board of Directors

The recommendations provide the framework for further refinements to the Locally Preferred Alternative that will move the project toward submission of a Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The PSC recommendations are the result of a successful collaboration between state Departments of Transportation and local partners to resolve difficult project issues. Concurrent with the conclusions reached by the PSC, the CRC Independent Review Panel provided its assessment of the project and submitted a list of recommendations for further consideration.

In your letter dated Feb. 16, 2010, you responded to local leaders with assurances that the state Departments of Transportation would continue to work collaboratively with project partners to resolve issues of concern to the local partners. At their March 12 meeting, PSC members decided that a timely, credible, and collaborative process was needed to discuss and resolve these issues. Each PSC member, and the ports of Portland and Vancouver, appointed a staff delegate to meet

on a regular basis to produce findings and recommendations regarding certain previously made decisions as well as the issues that had been raised as concerns by PSC members.

Over a four month period the Integrated Project Sponsors Council Staff (IPS) group met twelve times and formed a number of subgroups to further define, analyze and resolve difficult and complex issues. Subgroups composed of IPS members, other project and partner agency staff and interested citizens met separately to conduct research and prepare their findings and recommendations for presentation to the IPS. IPS members participated in five public workshops with PSC members to discuss their preliminary findings and receive further direction to complete their tasks. This work was also shared with the public at a series of meetings, particularly around the exploration of alternative interchange concepts for Hayden Island.

At the Aug. 9 PSC meeting, there was unanimous consensus among the PSC members on a package of items that will move the project closer to construction by solidifying elements of the Locally Preferred Alternative for presentation in the Final EIS.

The attached report describes the recommendations of the PSC. They strengthen the CRC project design and will significantly enhance the benefits of the Columbia River Crossing project to the surrounding transportation system and to the region as a whole. As a result of the work of the PSC and the recommendations offered by the CRC Independent Review Panel, the PSC has identified several topics that may require additional study and future consideration. These topics are described in the report.

We look forward to hearing your assessment of the recommendations and are available to answer any questions you may have about the report.

Sincerely,

Henry Hewitt
Project Sponsors Council Co-Chair

Steve Horenstein
Project Sponsors Council Co-Chair

Enclosure

cc: Document Control
PSC members

PROJECT SPONSORS COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS

Final Report

September 13, 2010

Columbia River CROSSING

Title VI

The Columbia River Crossing project team ensures full compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by prohibiting discrimination against any person on the basis of race, color, national origin or sex in the provision of benefits and services resulting from its federally assisted programs and activities. For questions regarding WSDOT's Title VI Program, you may contact the Department's Title VI Coordinator at (360) 705-7098. For questions regarding ODOT's Title VI Program, you may contact the Department's Civil Rights Office at (503) 986-4350.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Information

If you would like copies of this document in an alternative format, please call the Columbia River Crossing (CRC) project office at (360) 737-2726 or (503) 256-2726. Persons who are deaf or hard of hearing may contact the CRC project through the Telecommunications Relay Service by dialing 7-1-1.

¿Habla usted español? La informacion en esta publicación se puede traducir para usted. Para solicitar los servicios de traducción favor de llamar al (503) 731-4128.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendices

This page left blank intentionally.

ACRONYMS

ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
AASHTO	American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials
CEVP	Cost Estimation and Validation Process
CRC	Columbia River Crossing
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
IPS	Integrated Project Sponsors Staff
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
GHG	Greenhouse gas emissions
HOV	High occupancy vehicles
LPA	Locally Preferred Alternative
ODOT	Oregon Department of Transportation
PSC	Project Sponsors Council
SOV	Single occupancy vehicle
TDM	Transportation demand management
WSDOT	Washington State Department of Transportation

This page left blank intentionally.

1. Background

The purpose of this report is to present a comprehensive package of Project Sponsors Council (PSC) recommendations that address several areas of interrelated work performed between April and August, 2010. These recommendations are the result of a collaborative approach that considered combined effects and benefits to the Columbia River Crossing (CRC) project, the surrounding transportation system and to the region as a whole. The PSC has the following members:

Henry Hewitt, Co-Chair
Steve Horenstein, Co-Chair
Matthew Garrett, Director, Oregon Department of Transportation
Paula Hammond, Secretary, Washington Department of Transportation
Sam Adams, Mayor, City of Portland
Jeanne Harris, Council member, City of Vancouver
David Bragdon, Council President, Metro
Steve Stuart, Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council Board of Directors
Neil McFarlane, General Manager, TriMet
Tim Leavitt, C-TRAN Board of Directors

Governor Chris Gregoire and Governor Ted Kulongoski responded to local officials in a letter dated Feb. 16, 2010, with assurances that the Oregon and Washington Departments of Transportation and the CRC project staff would continue to work collaboratively with project partners to resolve issues of concern to the local partners. At their March 12 meeting, PSC members decided that a timely, credible and collaborative process was needed to discuss and resolve outstanding issues. Each PSC member and the ports of Portland and Vancouver appointed a staff delegate to meet on a regular basis and to produce findings and recommendations regarding certain previously made decisions, as well as the issues that had been raised as concerns by PSC members. The staff organization was given the title of the Integrated Project Staff (IPS). The IPS members were the following individuals:

Henry Hewitt, Co-Chair
Steve Horenstein, Co-Chair
Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland
Katy Brooks, Port of Vancouver
Andy Cotugno, Metro
Dean Lookingbill, SW Washington Regional Transportation Council
Alan Lehto, TriMet
Jeff Hamm, C-TRAN
Paul Smith, City of Portland
Thayer Rorabaugh, City of Vancouver
Richard Brandman, ODOT
Don Wagner, WSDOT

IPS work groups were established around the following topics[1]:

[1] Adjustments were made to the list as the work evolved. The item for "Remove Vancouver City Center Access" was reported on at an April 23 workshop between PSC and IPS and subsequently dropped from consideration after PSC members agreed that findings warranted no further discussion of the concept. The presentation provided to PSC is included in Appendix B. In addition, the Managed Lanes item was merged with the Transportation Demand Management work group after it was determined there was sufficient overlap between topics for a combined effort.

- Remove Hayden Island Interchange
- Alternative Access/Redesign Hayden Island Interchange
- Remove Vancouver City Center Access
- Alternative Lane Configurations on the Bridge
- Post-Completion Transportation Demand Management
- Managed Lanes
- Performance Measures
- Metroscope Modeling

The IPS met twelve times to establish a work plan, assign elements of the work plan to IPS work groups and discuss progress made by the work groups. IPS members met jointly in public workshops with PSC members on April 23, May 14, June 11, June 25, and July 16 to report and discuss their preliminary findings. A copy of the *IPS Work Plan* is attached in *Appendix A.*

The public was involved at several points in discussion of the elements of the IPS work plan PSC meetings were open to the public and recorded for broadcast on cable television and on-demand internet streaming. Meeting summaries and materials were made available online at the CRC website for public viewing. In addition, three open house/public testimony opportunities were held on Hayden Island during process and attended by nearly 400 people.

2. Executive Summary

2.1 Collaborative Process

PSC members decided at their March 12, 2010, meeting that a timely, credible, and collaborative process was needed to discuss and resolve outstanding issues. Each PSC member and the ports of Portland and Vancouver appointed a staff delegate to meet on a regular basis to produce findings and recommendations regarding certain previously made decisions as well as the issues that had been raised as concerns by PSC members. Over four months, the IPS group met twelve times and formed a number of subgroups to research and report on several issues. The IPS work group topics and key findings are summarized below:

Remove or Redesign the Hayden Island Interchange
Seventeen concepts for the Hayden Island Interchange were proposed, developed and evaluated by the local partners, the CRC Project Staff and island stakeholders. There is now a broad consensus for the design, known as "Concept D."

Remove Vancouver City Center Access
The IPS was asked to investigate the effects of removal of interchanges in downtown Vancouver to/from I-5 and to determine whether these interchanges had any influence on the ability of the project to reconfigure the number of lanes on the bridge over the Columbia River. It was found that removal of City Center access would not affect the number of lanes on the bridge because auxiliary lanes originating further upstream were carried through the downtown segment of I-5. In addition, removal of these interchanges would create operational problems at a number of downtown Vancouver intersections.

Consider Alternative Lane Configurations on the Bridge
Operational analysis completed by URS found that 10-and 12-lane bridge facilities perform similarly and that a 10-lane facility could result in modest project savings.

Consider Post-Completion Transportation Demand Management (TDM)
Additional TDM market opportunities do exist for the project, particularly with respect to individualized marketing efforts and use of toll strategies to create incentives for use of multi-occupancy vehicles.

Develop Performance Measures
Selected performance measures found significant benefits with the project over both existing and future no-build conditions. The performance measures were informative for the decisions made by the PSC and reinforced the conclusions made around a 10-lane bridge configuration. Performance measures were found to have potential application for ongoing review of facility and related program performance after project completion.

Update Metroscope Modeling
The model run showed that the project, even as a 12-lane facility, has no significant effect on regional land use, especially with respect to "sprawl" at the fringes of the urban area.

2.2 Project Sponsors Council Recommendations

At the Aug. 9 meeting of the PSC, there was unanimous consensus among the PSC members regarding items that will move the project closer to construction by solidifying elements of the Locally Preferred Alternative for presentation in the Final EIS. More detailed discussion of each item can be found in the *Findings and Recommendations* section.

Refine the Hayden Island Interchange to narrow the footprint and improve community connectivity
A new Hayden Island interchange design incorporates elements of the LPA design while improving local access and reducing the overhead footprint on the island. After participation in the IPS process, consensus exists among residents, island business owners and local project sponsors on an interchange design that accommodates the complex movements of the area, minimizes community and environmental impacts and matches the longer-term visions for the island. “Concept D” includes access to the island from I-5 in a similar manner to the LPA. Arterial access via the Marine Drive interchange has been removed, resulting in fewer overhead ramp structures over the island and raises the elevation of the community connector street, Tomahawk Island Drive. Local access to/from the island will now be accommodated by a local bridge to the west of I-5, adjacent to the structure carrying light rail. This design also allows the Marine Drive interchange to serve freight better by accommodating a portion of the auto traffic on the local bridge.

Construct a permanent 10-lane bridge over the Columbia River with full shoulders
A 10-lane bridge performs similarly to a 12-lane configuration and meets the needs of the region today and in the future. Performance measures indicate there are very slight differences between lane configurations with respect to travel times, safety, greenhouse gas emissions and benefit-cost ratio that support a 10-lane permanent bridge design. In addition, Metroscope land use modeling shows that the project will not induce travel demand at the fringes of the region, confirming that the project’s added lanes will not exacerbate existing downstream bottlenecks in Portland. The 10-lane design will utilize the 10-lane lane configuration proposed for the Phase I LPA in the northbound and southbound directions, as well as 12-foot safety shoulders on the bridge.

Expand CRC’s long-term regional travel demand management program
A regional collaboration on both employer demand and corridor travel demand efforts could lead to a national model for reducing peak hour congestion and extending the lifespan of infrastructure investments. For CRC, it is anticipated that up to an additional 11 percent of peak period trips could be shifted from single-occupancy vehicles, beyond the numbers expected from transit and other proposed TDM measures published in the Draft EIS.

Use performance measures to inform future recommendations
Performance measures used to support the PSC recommendations emphasize the importance of making decisions based on data. Indicators for mobility, safety, greenhouse gas emissions and benefit-cost ratio will help guide future recommendations through remaining project development, construction and eventual traffic management in the corridor.

2.3 Issues Identified Needing Further Study

PSC members raised additional questions about aspects of project delivery and management. These identified issues are consistent with recommendations recently provided by the CRC Independent Review Panel. The CRC work plan from this point forward should build on the work of the IPS and PSC, while addressing the Panel's recommendations. Specific issues raised by the PSC for additional study and future consideration include the following:

- Governance (project delivery and post construction operations management)
- Projected cost, finance plan and tolling
- Environmental review and documentation
- Project phasing
- Bridge type and engineering design
- Other recommendations of the IRP

This page left blank intentionally.

3. Findings and Recommendations

The PSC has reached agreement on the following package of recommendations related to the several tasks outlined in the IPS work plan. Future work for each of the work plan items is outlined in the *Next Steps* section, below. In addition, several policy issues were identified by the PSC. Many of these additional items align with recommendations submitted to the Governors from the CRC Independent Review Panel and are discussed in the *Issues Identified Needing Further Study* section of this report.

3.1. Metroscope

PSC recommendation: Use Metroscope results to support the overall set of recommendations.

The purpose of using the Metroscope model was to expand the analysis completed by the CRC project on the potential for the project having an unintended consequence of inducing growth and determine whether the CRC project will affect the ability of the region to meet land use goals. The Metroscope land use allocation model for the seven-county region maintained by Metro provides a basis for forecasting where market trends would tend to drive household and employment growth taking into account changing demographic and economic profiles, local zoning and investment decisions, changes over time in accessibility based upon implementing long range transportation plans and the market feasibility of different types of commercial and residential development. This framework provides a platform upon which to test several scenarios relating to the CRC project to better understand the potential for growth inducing effects. The results will be used only to compare alternative Metroscope scenarios. They cannot be used to compare to previous Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) runs, as Metroscope is used primarily to inform land use impacts. The approach that holds constant all other variables around the region provides the ability to understand the effects of the change that the CRC project would produce.

PSC members agreed on a comparison of 12-lane configurations for Metroscope scenarios including no build, 12-lane full build with light rail transit and tolls and 12-lane full build with light rail transit and without tolls. Members decided that results of travel time analysis by the Performance Measures work group comparing 10-and 12-lane configurations would help inform whether a fourth scenario (10-lane without tolls) should be run. The similar nature of these results, discussed in the *Performance Measures* section below, indicated that a 10-lane scenario was unnecessary.

Metro found that the project would have negligible impact on population and employment growth in Clark County when comparing the projected growth that would occur with the project compared to no change to the existing bridge and highway. The project's most significant land use effect would be to boost North Portland employment by about 1.5 percent. This analysis takes into account the effect of tolls and light rail in reducing vehicle trips across the bridge compared with the no build scenario.

The results of the Metroscope model support other recommendations of the IPS and will also help inform a conversation between local decision makers about issues of a bi-state nature that are outside of the scope of this project.

Further discussion of the Metroscope results are included in *Appendix C.*

3.2. Hayden Island Access

PSC recommendation: Further refine Concept D as an alternative to the Hayden Island interchange design.

The original charge to IPS was to develop concepts for a refined "on-island" Hayden Island interchange and an alternative access or "off-island" interchange that would reduce impacts on Hayden Island (particularly the overhead structure and elevation at Tomahawk Island Drive) while retaining all basic traffic movements and operations presented in the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA).

Work commenced on these items in a single IPS work group. The City of Portland retained URS to develop concepts for an off-island interchange that fed into the work group. A Hayden Island Design Group (HIDG) was also convened to incorporate the perspectives of island residents and business owners; the HIDG met up to twice weekly to discuss evolving design concepts. Feedback from the HIDG was provided to the work group and IPS to inform ongoing discussions.

Off- and on-island interchange concepts (Concepts 1 and 2, respectively) were presented to PSC members at their June 11 workshop with IPS. An evaluation of these options revealed operational issues and other community impacts. A public meeting held on Hayden Island on June 14 confirmed significant community concerns with these design concepts.

The IPS work group explored several "hybrid" designs, incorporating elements of Concepts 1 and 2 and other alternatives suggested by the City of Portland, Hayden Island residents and other interested parties. The hybrid designs (Concepts A, B, C, and D) each represents a combination of access from I-5 as well as local arterial access. Concepts A and B were shared at a public meeting on June 29 where further feedback was gathered from the community. Concepts C and D also emerged as distinct designs that could address many of the concerns expressed around the other concepts. Concept D was shared with the community at a public meeting on August 5.

Concept D includes access to the island from I-5 in a similar manner to the LPA. Arterial access via the Marine Drive interchange has been removed, resulting in fewer overhead ramp structures over the island and raises the elevation of the community connector street, Tomahawk Island Drive. Local access to/from the island will instead be accommodated by a local bridge to the west of I-5, adjacent to the structure carrying light rail. This design also allows the Marine Drive interchange to serve freight better by accommodating a portion of the auto traffic on the local bridge.

An evaluation comparing these interchange concepts found that Concept D provides the best balance of access to Hayden Island, freight mobility, environmental and community benefits and project costs. Concept D carries a consensus recommendation from project partners, Hayden Island residents and other stakeholders involved throughout the process.

Design concept maps and concept evaluations are included in *Appendix D*.

3.3. Alternative Lane Configurations on the Bridge

PSC recommendation: Further refine the LPA to include a 10-lane permanent bridge with 12 foot shoulders, with northbound and southbound lane configurations according to the Phase I LPA design.

The City of Portland retained URS to conduct an evaluation of the potential to reduce the number of lanes on the I-5 bridge. CRC assisted URS in providing project traffic analyses for review and conducted additional analyses to support work on this task.

URS evaluated several scenarios relating to the number of lanes on the bridge in both the southbound and northbound directions. They found similar performance characteristics at the bridge between a 12-lane main span (Full Build) and a 10-lane main span (LPA Phase 1) if improvement elements included in the Full Build alternative, separate from the main span configuration, were added to a 10-lane main span bridge. The URS report addressing reduction in lanes is included in *Appendix E*.

URS offered methods for developing a 10-lane bridge for both northbound and southbound directions. For the northbound direction, the work group reviewed operational data and suggested that the lane configuration follow the 10-lane LPA Phase I design. A similar in-depth evaluation of traffic operations was completed for lane configuration concepts for the southbound direction.

Two 10-lane configurations for I-5 on the Washington side of the Columbia River were evaluated, including the LPA Phase I configuration and the URS “10-lane Full Build” configuration. The primary difference between the two 10-lane alternatives is the elimination of lane number four (4) in the vicinity of the Mill Plain interchange. The results of this evaluation found similar performance between the two configurations in terms of vehicle throughput and travel times within the Bridge Influence Area. However, the 10-lane Full Build configuration was found to create a slowdown and turbulence in the merging area where the number of lanes is reduced from four to three. The City of Vancouver evaluated the alternatives in terms of traffic volumes, lane capacities, add/drop/merge and weaves, truck movements, distance between interchanges and traffic safety. Their findings (also included in *Appendix E*) support the LPA Phase I 10-lane option due to its ability to minimize turbulence and permit through lanes to function as designed to accommodate upstream merging and benefit traffic flow and safety.

The URS concepts for a permanent 10-lane river crossing include 12-foot wide inside and outside shoulders in accordance with American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) standards for highways with six or more lanes carrying 250

more trucks per hour. I-5 meets this criterion and 12-foot wide shoulders may also accommodate future use by bus transit under certain conditions, an option that has been of continued interest by PSC members.

More aggressive post-construction traffic demand management (TDM) measures would improve the performance of the I-5 system with a 10-lane river crossing design and are addressed in the *Post-construction Travel Demand Management* section, below.

3.4. Performance Measures

PSC recommendation: Performance indicators for commuter, freight, and transit mobility; safety; greenhouse gas emissions; and overall benefit/cost ratio support the overall package of recommendations. The application of these measures was successful, indicating that a package of indicators to be refined over time should also be used to inform Mobility Council recommendations in the future.

The Performance Measures work group focused on travel times, safety, greenhouse gas emissions and overall benefit/cost. Several project scenarios were used in this analysis including existing conditions, a "No Build" condition, Locally Preferred Alternative and Locally Preferred Alternative Phase 1.

Travel times

Travel times were summarized for each mode along I-5 including auto/commuter, freight, transit and auto/commuter on I-205 for the most highly used routes for each specific mode. The work group found that both the LPA Full Build and LPA Phase 1 scenarios provide significant improvements over existing conditions and the No Build scenarios. General findings include the following:

- *Peak a.m. southbound* travel times on I-5 are significantly improved. Southbound traffic from connecting east/west facilities benefit from dramatically improved travel times in Washington due to reduced delays and queues on SR 500 and SR 14 entering southbound I-5. Southbound a.m. travel times are limited by downstream bottlenecks at Going Street/ I-405 and the Rose Quarter.
- *Peak p.m. northbound* travel times on I-5 are dramatically improved. The LPA Full Build is slightly faster than the LPA Phase 1 alternative due to increased operations near the I-5 Bridge.
- *Both Build scenarios* provide significant benefit to freight compared to the No Build scenario considering freight typically travels off peak and the number of hours of uncongested times increases from 9 hours under the No Build scenario to 22 hours under the Build scenarios.
- *I-205 northbound and southbound* travel times are improved with both CRC Build scenarios because the combination of improved transit, lane capacity and the DEIS level of toll keeps traffic in the I-5 corridor compared to the No Build which diverts significant I-5 traffic to I-205 because excessive I-5 No Build congestion levels.

- *Transit rider travel times benefit significantly in both CRC Build scenarios* for riders whose trips would include light rail and those who would take express buses from elsewhere in Clark County.
- *Full LPA and LPA Phase I benefits vary little between them.* Most travel times for all modes were effectively the same whether only Phase I were construction or the Full LPA as previously defined were constructed.

Safety

Project scenarios were compared with respect to the total number of accidents expected on an annual basis in the project area. Both the Full Build and LPA Phase 1 scenarios reduced the number of accidents compared with the No Build scenario. Most of the reductions in accidents were realized in the reduction of substandard merges, diverges and weaving sections and reduced congestion throughout the project area, particularly areas where heavy volumes of trucks are entering and exiting I-5.

- Existing accidents – 400/year
- 2030 No Build accidents – 750/year
- 2030 Full Build accidents – 200/year
- 2030 LPA Phase 1 accidents – 210-240/year

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Project scenarios were compared for their contributions of greenhouse gas emissions (GHG). The methodology for calculating GHG follows the same analysis peer-reviewed by the CRC Greenhouse Gas Emissions Expert Review Panel in late 2008. This methodology calculates GHG emissions based on energy consumed during construction and operation of the CRC project. Findings show the most GHG benefits for the build scenarios when compared to the No Build scenario.

GHG emissions are estimated both in the project area itself and for the region accounting for diversion to I-205 and other arterials. According to these estimates, the Full Build LPA has 0.5 percent fewer emissions region-wide and 4.4 percent fewer emissions in the project area compared to the No Build scenario. The LPA Phase 1 has the same regional emissions as the Full Build LPA. In the project area, emissions are 1.1 percent reduced from the Full Build LPA.

Benefit/Cost

A calculated benefit/cost ratio was developed for each of the scenarios to provide a basis for comparing the multiple benefits and costs associated with project performance. The analysis was conducted using methodologies and metrics recognized and championed by the US Department of Transportation, including FHWA and FTA. The principal categories of benefit considered are congestion management benefits to the area, mobility improvement benefits, economic development benefits in the region and bridge lift time savings.

CRC convened a panel of stakeholders and subject matter experts in June 2009, including practitioners and local academic experts, to scrutinize the evaluation methodology, the inputs used to conduct the evaluation and the analytic method. The stakeholder panel reviewed the calculations used in each benefit category and provided input on adjustments and refinements and suggestions on appropriate input values. The Full Build and LPA Phase 1 were assessed

using this updated methodology. Either build option demonstrates substantial benefit per cost compared to the No Build.

- Full Build benefit/cost: 1.9:1
- LPA Phase 1 benefit cost: 2.0:1
- LPA Phase 1 with Marine Dr flyover and Victory Braid: 1.9+:1

Additional materials supporting Performance Measures work group findings are attached in *Appendix F*.

3.5. Post-construction Travel Demand Management

PSC recommendation: Expanded and increased TDM measures beyond those contemplated in the Draft EIS should be implemented after bridge construction is completed. This builds on a previous recommendation to implement TDM measures pre-construction and during construction. Different TDM measures may be most effective in each phase.

The Post-construction Travel Demand Management group was charged with assessing the potential to expand TDM strategies to improve the non-single occupancy vehicle (non-SOV) mode share in the post construction period. A previous TDM group effort reported to PSC in March 2010 on the potential for use of TDM strategies in the pre-construction and construction phases of the project. PSC members were interested in the potential mode shift that could be achieved beyond project completion to further relieve congestion and extend the lifespan of the CRC facilities. The TDM work group involved local partners and transit agencies using the best information to-date to address questions about potential TDM expansion in the post-construction period.

The work group used several areas of contemporary research to estimate commute trip reduction. Specific input to the TDM predictions included the following:

- Local experience in Vancouver, Washington state (Commute Trip Reduction) and Portland (SmartTrips)
- Research related to the cost effectiveness and scalability of rideshare services
- Benchmarking comparison with Central Puget Sound and Bay Area corridors
- Research in WSDOT's SR 520 Transportation Discipline Report

Based on the opportunities researched and recognizing the differences in population and geography in the Portland-Vancouver metro area, the work group found that TDM strategies could be developed to shift an additional 11 percent of peak period person trips crossing the bridge in 2030 to non-SOV modes. This reduction is in addition to peak period mode shifts assumed in the draft EIS for pre-construction and construction TDM measures. These additional measures would also reduce 2030 vehicle bridge crossing demand by 10 percent beyond the 2030 regional travel model forecast used for the LPA.

There are several leading strategies to achieve reduced drive-alone trips. Individualized marketing would provide personalized travel option information to corridor employees and

residents. Incentives could include short-term (up to six month) financial incentives for commuters to travel by vanpool, take transit or carpool. In addition, discounted toll rates (including $0 toll) specific to shared rides is a tool being used in other parts of the country. Benefits of a post-construction TDM program for all project designs include increased efficiency by moving more people in fewer vehicles, lengthened functional lifespan, reduced costs for Clark County commuters using travel options and reduced fuel consumption and greenhouse gas emissions.

The work group identified several additional TDM strategies that were not included in their study that have potential to further reduce drive-alone behavior. These strategies requiring further study include the following:

- Increased light rail ridership
- High occupancy vehicles (HOV) / Managed lanes and/or HOV ramps
- $3 peak period toll (which may further reduce peak demand)
- Compact development financial incentives

The work group also identified several issues and potential implications of suggested TDM strategies, including increased number of C-TRAN buses in downtown Portland, increased demand for park and ride spaces in Clark County, the need for a regional coordinating or management structure and the impact of $0 toll incentive on the project's financial plan.

Additional materials supporting TDM Work Group findings are included in *Appendix G*.

3.6. Next Steps

Next steps are outlined for each of the PSC recommendations.

3.6.1. Metroscope

A final detailed report on the Metroscope analysis will be available by the end of August. The IPS Metroscope work group will be responsible for preparing the final report of this work and will ensure consistency of the travel networks on both sides of the river.

3.6.2. Hayden Island Access

Further due diligence on design, environmental and cost issues related to Concept D will be needed. The CRC project and its partners will work with community stakeholders to finalize aspects of the design. The CRC project will assess the new interchange design for purposes of documentation in the Final EIS. The results of further analysis and design will be input to further work on the 10-lane bridge design.

3.6.3. Alternative Lane Configurations on the Bridge

The selection of lane reduction configurations are influenced by the final highway design and will follow decisions and additional design work on the Hayden Island interchange. The CRC project will assess the new highway design for purposes of documentation in the Final EIS.

3.6.4. Performance Measures

Performance measures have been used to inform discussion of other IPS work items and will continue to be used to inform future decisions.

3.6.5. Post-construction Travel Demand Management

Pre-construction, construction and post-construction TDM measures will be documented in the Final EIS.

TDM measures are likely to reduce congestion and improve I-5 performance in all project phases. PSC and CRC project partners should discuss a plan and timeline to request federal, state and regional funding to implement pre-construction TDM in order to provide benefits to Interstate Bridge corridor users as soon as possible.

To prepare for funding requests, the CRC TDM Work Group should develop a proposal with specific mode share objectives, specific actions to achieve the objectives, a three-year budget, potential funding sources and a coordinating structure for consideration by the PSC and/or partner agencies.

3.7. Issues Identified Needing Further Study

Governance

PSC members have expressed support for various approaches for management of the I-5 corridor in the future, including TDM measures and tolls. Alternatives suggested have included a Regional Mobility Council, a bi-state compact or separate authority. PSC members urge the governors to work with their legislatures and transportation departments and local partners to define the bi-state governance structure for this project and request that regional and local representation be part of the process. In discussion with PSC members at their August 9 meeting, Independent Review Panel Chair Tom Warne suggested separate management considerations for the construction phase and post construction operations management. The potential future role of PSC, beyond its original charge from the Governors to advise on completion of the EIS and associated project design and finance matters, is of interest to some members.

Projected cost, finance plan and tolling

The LPA has been refined over the past months and PSC agrees with the Independent Review Panel that it is now time to revise the project cost estimates using WSDOT's Cost Estimation and Validation Process (CEVP). Revised CEVP estimates should be presented to state legislatures and the federal delegation in 2011. State and federal funding commitments should be secured as quickly as possible.

Securing funding commitments is an important step in the toll setting process. Tolls for this project will supplement other funding sources and help manage traffic. A bi-state toll setting process should be expedited to determine the policies and rates for the project.

Environmental review and documentation

Project design refinements, in particular those resulting from discussions around the Hayden Island interchange, will require additional analysis to determine the potential for environmental impacts beyond those already assessed by the project. PSC agrees that CRC staff should perform additional design and engineering of the recommended design refinements both to minimize the potential for and determine whether supplemental environmental assessment is required.

Project phasing

PSC members agree that additional discussion of the potential phasing of project elements needs to be included in the final EIS. While it is not anticipated at this point that phasing of project elements will be necessary, beyond what is described in the Draft EIS, any possible future need without discussion in the final environmental documentation may require re-opening of the NEPA process.

Bridge type and engineering design

PSC members agree that additional due diligence is needed on the CRC's unique open web box girder bridge design. The project should advance its planned testing of the design and consideration of design alternatives to raise the level of confidence that the final design will be the best solution for the project with respect to engineering, constructability, schedule and cost.

Some PSC members also expressed a continued interest in ensuring that the final bridge design is reflective of a gateway crossing between our two states. The project should pursue new ideas and leadership on an architectural design for the bridge that strives towards these ends, while continuing to recognize physical and cost constraints.

Other recommendations of the IRP

The recommendations of the IRP not specifically addressed above should also be considered.

This page left blank intentionally.

Washington State Department of Transportation
Paula J. Hammond, P.E.
Secretary of Transportation

Oregon Department of Transportation
Matthew L. Garrett
Director

September 28, 2010

Governor Christine Gregoire
Office of the Governor
PO Box 40002
Olympia, WA 98504-0002

Governor Theodore Kulongoski
Office of the Governor
160 State Capitol
900 Court Street
Salem, OR 97301-4047

Response to the Columbia River Crossing Independent Review Panel's Recommendation

Dear Governors Gregoire and Kulongoski,

The Departments of Transportation have thoroughly reviewed the recommendations and findings of the Independent Review Panel convened by your offices this summer. This letter outlines our plan for execution and implementation of the panel's recommendations. The panel's recommendations, in conjunction with ongoing work with project partners and their staffs, strengthen the project and will help us move forward in a holistic and timely manner.

The CRC Independent Review Panel report, delivered on July 30, 2010, highlighted the need for the project and stated that the "no-build" is not an option. It also contained 30 recommendations which were intended to serve as a "road map" to help complete the project. We appreciate the willingness of the panel to delve into early project development documents, cost and financial information, and project implementation plans. The panel also met with many project stakeholders as they conducted their review. Much detailed work was done to prepare the report and we are pleased that it affirms and validates that the CRC project has a solid foundation of thoughtful analysis, environmental review, and preliminary engineering.

We accept all of the recommendations and are moving to implement them. Some recommendations touched on work efforts already underway or near completion, such as the need to update the critical path project schedule. Others will require more detailed work plans which we are currently developing. The recommendations that require more detailed work plans generally fall into the six project areas listed below.

1. Review project phasing
2. Re-invigorate public involvement

3. Resolve interchange design at Marine Drive and Hayden Island
4. Review the bridge type selection
5. Establish a long-term project management/ governance plan
6. Update the cost estimate

We intend to build on the recent progress that has been made using the Integrated Project Sponsors Council's Staff (IPS) and the Project Sponsors Council (PSC), to continue to work through and build consensus on each of the these critical efforts. At this time we've identified the following preliminary next steps for each of these focus areas:

1. Review project phasing

Summary of Panel recommendations:
The project should consider developing one or more phased construction plans specifically to reflect the potential for a funding shortfall.

Response and Implementation Plan:
The CRC team, in consultation with the project stakeholders, will develop phasing options for the project. These options will be based on potential funding scenarios that could result from either a delay or a reduced amount of funding that is being sought from the different funding sources. How to manage cash flow and keep each separate funding source tied to the appropriate work will be a challenge on this project, but will be carefully monitored to ensure construction issues are minimized.

The project team has been evaluating impacts associated with several phasing options that could be included in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). These options will be reviewed with the IPS and PSC prior to submittal. Phasing will also be related to project segments that may be constructed independently and we will investigate projects that can be constructed to accommodate functional interim phases that meet anticipated cash flows. After discussions with the PSC, the project team will include phasing strategies at upcoming public outreach events.

2. Re-invigorate public involvement

Summary of Panel Recommendations:
Re-invigorate public involvement and re-engage with respective working groups that have been less active since the release of the Draft EIS. Provide more feedback about how advisory group recommendations have influenced the project.

Response and Implementation Plan:
While broad community outreach has continued throughout the CRC process and many recommendations from project working groups have been incorporated into project plans, we agree that we need to provide additional updates to the working groups and the general public and also gain further input from them on many of the topics these groups addressed.

During the months that the project team participated in the integrated project staff process, some advisory groups did not meet regularly or at all. We will be re-engaging stakeholder working groups this fall as we develop a plan for moving forward. At this time, we do not know if past groups will be reformed or if new groups will be developed as the project moves closer to construction. The project team will reassess all of the working groups to determine a structure that involves stakeholders and meets project needs as the project moves into a new phase of development.

The Final EIS includes information describing how public input and advisory group recommendations have been incorporated into project designs. This information will be widely shared. A robust outreach and notification program has always been planned to be conducted prior to the release of the Final EIS. Agency coordination will continue through the PSC and the IPS process. The project team will review all recommendations submitted by these groups to determine if feedback is missing and will loop back with the advisory groups. Public materials, including the website, will be updated to provide information about how advisory group input has been incorporated into the project.

3. Resolve interchange design at Marine Drive and Hayden Island

Summary of Panel Recommendations:
Resolve outstanding issues and determine the interchange design for Marine Drive and Hayden Island.

Response and Implementation Plan:
One of the recent success stories on which the project will build is the use of the Integrated Project Staff team to develop and review various options for the Hayden Island and Marine Drive interchanges. This has resulted in a unanimous recommendation from the CRC Project Sponsors Council to advance "Concept D" and the widespread acceptance by the public and both Ports of this alternative. This design facilitates freight movement, reduces the freeway footprint across Hayden Island, and meets the goals of the Hayden Island plan for better local access and continued retail access. Concept D will be included in the Final EIS as the preferred interchange for Hayden Island. Additional work is needed to determine if impacts can be reduced and to provide comparison to the previously identified interchange. A preliminary cost estimate was developed by CRC to support the IPS efforts to determine potential savings (or additional costs). By late October, the cost estimate will be updated to the same level as the original Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) cost estimate once the design is advanced to a similar level as the LPA.

4. Review the bridge type selection

Summary of Panel recommendations:
Review the current bridge type (open web box) to better determine possible risk to the cost and schedule related to this bridge type. Convene a panel of experts to review the constructability of the selected bridge type.

Response and Implementation Plan:
The project has conducted preliminarily analyses of several bridge types, which is documented in the Type Study Report published in October 2009. Since the recommendations from the Independent Review Panel have been received, direction has been provided to the project team to outline the future steps that the project plans to take to ensure that an appropriate bridge type is selected and can be designed and constructed to meet all standards and requirements for both Departments of Transportation as well as the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). We will revisit the analysis completed to date and engage national and international experts as we reevaluate all options with two-bridge configurations. The final determination of bridge type will be developed in concert with outside experts, project sponsor staff and PSC members, and members of the CRC Urban Design Advisory Group as final design progresses. Next steps include assembling an expert panel, revising cost estimates, and conducting appropriate structural testing. Each of these steps is briefly described below.

The expert panel will consist of people with "big bridge" experience from the United States and Europe. Potential participants in this expert panel will be solicited from UDAG to incorporate architectural perspectives. Project sponsor staff and PSC members will also be asked for input about panel scope and activities as the panel is selected. The expert panel will review the bridge type selection and focus on the constructability, cost, architectural potential and risks associated with each of the bridges listed in the CRC Type Study Report for the two bridge option. FHWA and FTA have been involved throughout the process regarding bridge type consideration for the replacement bridge over the Columbia River and both will be included in the expert panel.

The cost and risk elicitation from the group will be conducted in a Cost Estimate Validation Process (CEVP) workshop environment with a focus on quantifying the concerns and risks that the panel identifies so that a new risk model can be produced for the structure.

Next steps will continue to advance and finalize design of a temporary test pile program. The CRC will also continue to develop a connection and system testing strategy that will more specifically delineate the testing program (scope, schedule, and budget). After a bridge type has been confirmed, a constructability expert review will be conducted.

5. Establish a long-term project management/governance structure

Summary of Panel Recommendations:
The states should work to establish a long-term project management/ governance structure and consider legal expertise to assist in determining best options and structure for this bi-state project.

Response and Implementation Plan:
We agree that efficient, coordinated, and streamlined government oversight is essential. It is important, however, to differentiate between the issues of project governance and project management. Governance of the project is, as the panel points out, very complex. Both Oregon and Washington have active participation in this project from their executive and legislative branches of state government, state transportation commissions, regional planning organizations, and local transit and municipal governments. It is necessary to have these levels of government actively involved to maximize success of this project.

Today, WSDOT and ODOT jointly manage the CRC project, with oversight from the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration. WSDOT and ODOT have benefitted from the design oversight of the Project Sponsors Council, which the Governors appointed to serve as an advisory body to help facilitate resolution of difficult scope and design issues. We expect the PSC to continue through completion of the Final EIS and record of decision. Staff from each agency will also continue to work together, along with the project team, in a collaborative manner. We look forward to maintaining the positive working relationships between the various entities as the project progresses to completion.

In the future, a new (or modified) oversight body composed of leaders from the entities noted above , and charged with the responsibilities to support project funding efforts, coordinating tolling policy (initial and on-going) and holding accountable the various agencies responsible for project delivery could serve the project well.

National experience of successful mega-projects shows that a “strong owner” model for a project once it enters the final design and construction phases is essential for success. We concur with this model and will explore how it can be applied to the CRC project. We will seek input from local partners and develop options to implement a structure for on-going governance over the next few months for review and approval by each Governor. Regardless of the management and governance structure, WSDOT and ODOT will need to clarify roles and responsibilities between the departments and institute a number of interagency agreements on a wide variety of financial and managerial issues. We expect that the joint ownership team will have public accountabilities to the oversight body to ensure transparent reporting of all final scope, schedule and budget issues through project completion.

6. Update the cost estimate

Summary of Panel Recommendations:
The project should update the cost estimates and revise the cost estimates to reflect the correct bridge type and other revisions.

Response and Implementation Plan:
The current cost estimate is based on the May 2010 CEVP information. The May 2010 CEVP is derived from the cost estimate in the CRC Type Study Report for an open-web box girder bridge type as detailed in the Basis of Estimate Report that was updated in September 2009. The cost estimates for all bridge types that were analyzed in the type study report were quite detailed "bid estimates" developed by engineers with construction experience.

The overall cost estimate for the project will be updated in conjunction with the expert bridge type review process in November 2010. The results of this analysis will be used to update the financial plan and cost estimate.

In addition to an update of the cost estimate, the project has performed a detailed evaluation of the schedule and has concluded that while right of way purchase could begin in 2011, construction is now anticipated to start in 2013. The schedule will continue to be evaluated as the project completes the NEPA process.

In closing, we are eager to develop these six topic-specific work plans and will also continue to address other recommendations that fall outside of these areas. As more detailed implementation plans are developed with our project partners, schedule and cost updates will be completed accordingly. We look forward to continued work with the Project Sponsors Council, the Integrated Project Sponsors Staff, and your offices on the completion of this critical project.

Sincerely,

Paula Hammond, Secretary
Washington State Department of Transportation

Matt Garrett, Director
Oregon Department of Transportation

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736
503-797-1700
503-797-1804 TDD
503-797-1797 fax

www.oregonmetro.gov

Metro | *Memo*

Date: Wednesday, December 01, 2010
To: JPACT
From: Randy Tucker, Metro
Subject: Regional transportation agenda for 2011 legislative session

At the October JPACT meeting, three representatives from the regional public lobby joined you for a preview of the 2011 legislative session and a discussion of how the region would like to position itself. Since then, the transportation staff of the region's public agencies has collaborated on a "straw man" legislative agenda for your review and discussion. (While this draft is intended to reflect the input I have received from my colleagues, all errors or omissions of substance, emphasis, or tone are mine alone.)

As you consider this proposed agenda, here are several considerations to keep in mind; I have also flagged a couple of larger items for discussion.

GENERAL

- **Length of list:** The list of recommendations in Exhibit A includes everything that has been suggested for inclusion. Many of these items would have costs to the state ranging from minimal (e.g., funding a high speed rail task force) to limited (e.g., allocating dollars to the Urban Trail Fund) to substantial (e.g., making another round of investments through the *ConnectOregon* program or providing the state's portion of funding for the Columbia River Crossing).

  Question for discussion: You might consider whether it makes sense to include all of these items in order to communicate the region's priorities irrespective of the state's budget situation, or if instead it makes sense to pare this down to a few key priorities. (This conversation is analogous to the one you will be having about federal priorities.)

- **Categories:** Many of the recommendations in Exhibit A reflect more than one of the principles in the "Be it resolved" section of the resolution (e.g., *ConnectOregon* supports both jobs/economic recovery and multimodal investment). Hence the tabular format indicating which recommendations reflect which principles. This is merely for your consideration prior to adoption and would not appear in a final version. It also reflects one person's attempt at categorization and may not be completely accurate or universally agreed upon.

- **Policy vs. funding:** Given the state's budgetary situation and the likely climate of the session, it seems helpful to indicate which of these items involve costs to the state and which are purely policy proposals. This is easier said than done; however, I have tried to identify the central element of the proposal. In some cases, the proposal merely recommends maintaining existing funding or reallocating moneys that have already been dedicated to another transportation purpose, but if money is the main focus, I have labeled these as funding proposals.

SPECIFIC: Comments, explanations, and issues for consideration related to specific issues identified in Exhibit A

- **HB 2001:** FYI, Sen. Bruce Starr is expected to introduce legislation establishing a process to reallocate unused funds from earmarked HB 2001 projects that come in under budget or do not get built. Specifics remain unknown but Sen. Starr's intent is for these decisions to be directed by the Legislature.

- **CRC:** Legislators from other parts of Oregon who are looking for transportation dollars might be tempted to label this as a project that primarily benefits the Portland region rather than one that benefits the whole state. This could have implications for how the Legislature chooses to support not only the CRC, but also other regional transportation projects.

  Question for discussion: If JPACT chooses to support CRC funding in 2011, a key question is whether (a) to generally urge the Legislature to pony up the state's share of the project cost, or (b) to further specify that any funding strategy should be based on the premise that this is a statewide/national project, and that the region is already expected carry a significant portion of its total cost through tolling.

- **Transportation Planning Rule:** The intent of this item is to note that while problems with the TPR need to be addressed, the proper venue for this discussion is the upcoming rulemaking process rather than the Legislature.

- **High-speed rail:** While this is identified as having funding implications, it should be noted that the funding in question would be for project development, not construction. The mention of alignment refers to the question of whether HSR should follow the UP or Oregon Electric route.

- **High-capacity transit:** You might consider how (or whether) to ask the state to partner with the region on these projects in 2011.

- **Dedicated transit funding:** This refers to the Oregon Transit Association's potential effort to reduce or eliminate the senior medical deduction and dedicate the revenues to transit.

- **Climate:** The Oregon Global Warming Commission unanimously adopted its "Roadmap to 2020" on October 28 but has not yet indicated whether any specific legislation will be forthcoming.[1]

[1] For the Roadmap's recommendations on land use and transportation, see page 28 of http://www.keeporegoncool.org/sites/default/files/Integrated_OGWC_Interim_Roadmap_to_2020_Oct29.pdf.

DRAFT 12/1/10

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORSING REGIONAL POLICY AND FUNDING PRIORITIES FOR 2011 STATE TRANSPORTATION LEGISLATION	))))	RESOLUTION NO. 11-XXXX Introduced by Councilor Carlotta Collette

WHEREAS, the passage of House Bill 2001, the Jobs and Transportation Act of 2009, represents a milestone for both the Portland metropolitan region and the state of Oregon; and

WHEREAS, the region applauds the work of the Legislature to pass this landmark legislation, which includes both critically needed funding and innovative policies; and

WHEREAS, the governments of the region recognize the importance of continuing to invest strategically in public infrastructure, particularly transportation infrastructure, as a way to support private investment and economic recovery in these difficult economic times; and

WHEREAS, transportation investments that contribute to economic recovery also bring increased revenues to local and state governments, thereby helping to ease the crisis in public budgets; and

WHEREAS, our region has a track record of creatively financing forward-looking transportation investments that address the needs of both the present and the future, and of combining smart investment with policy innovations that support good jobs, livable communities and a sustainable environment; and

WHEREAS, a combination of careful planning and strategic investments supported by local, regional, state and federal resources has helped to make this region the economic engine of the state and an example to the nation; and

WHEREAS, in the face of today's challenges, we need to extend this tradition of leadership by pursuing supportive policy and funding proposals in the 2011 legislative session; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That the Metro Council and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) adopt the following principles to guide the region's approach to transportation issues in the 2011 legislative session:

   - Jobs and Economic Recovery: The local governments of the Portland metropolitan are committed to partnering with others to support economic recovery through the creation and efficient operation of a robust transportation system.

   - Preserve and Expand Local Options: The transportation challenge will require innovative policy and new funding commitments at all levels of government. Accordingly, the Legislature should remove existing restrictions on local and regional revenue-raising authority; avoid enacting new limitations or pre-emptions; and explore new structures and authorities that give local governments the flexibility to build, operate and fund transportation systems that support prosperity, livability and sustainability.

   - Support Multimodal Investment: Oregon should continue its lottery-backed program of investment in multimodal projects that support freight mobility and transit; identify new, ongoing state funding to support transit, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities; and make a financial commitment to high speed rail project development.

2. That the Metro Council and JPACT endorse transportation funding and policy priorities for the 2011 legislative session as reflected in Exhibit A to this resolution.

2011 Regional Transportation Agenda: Specific Recommendations

Jobs/Economy	Local Options	Multimodal	Policy/$	Issue
●	●	●	P/$	HB 2001 – Defend against any efforts to modify in ways that reverse policy direction or reduce local and regional funding or authority.
●		●	$	Columbia River Crossing – Support state funding approach that recognizes statewide importance of this project.
●		●	$	*ConnectOregon* 4 – Support a fourth round of *ConnectOregon* funding.
●		●	P/$	High-speed rail – Establish a transparent and accountable decision making process that includes regional representation. Appropriate funds to facilitate project development of high speed rail upgrades, including analysis of preferred alignment.
●	●		P	Transportation Planning Rule – Support rulemaking to remove barriers to implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept.
●		●	$	High-capacity transit –Support state funding to match regional contributions to Southwest Corridor and Lake Oswego Streetcar projects.
●		●	$	Dedicated transit funding – Support efforts to identify dedicated funding for public transit.
		●	$	Active transportation – Continue investment of state transportation funds to bicycle and pedestrian facilities outside the road right-of-way by allocating $2 million to Urban Trail Fund to be distributed through a competitive process.
	●	●	P	Recreational immunity – Extend legal immunity to property owners who allow the use of trails on their land for transportation purposes.
	●	●	P	Low-speed greenways – Authorize local governments to facilitate safer walking and cycling by reducing speed limits on low-volume, low-speed neighborhood streets.
	●	●	P/$	Climate – Monitor, and support as appropriate, legislation related to the Oregon Sustainable Transportation Initiative, proposals of the Oregon Global Warming Commission related to transportation, and other statewide efforts.
	●	●	$	Business Energy Tax Credit – Oppose efforts to reduce or curtail use of the BETC for transportation-related conservation measures.

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736
www.oregonmetro.gov

Metro | *Memo*

Date: Tuesday, Nov. 30, 2010
To: JPACT
From: Andy Cotugno
Subject: 2011 Regional Priorities for Federal Transportation Legislation

2011 Regional Priorities for Federal Transportation Legislation

- **Six-year Authorization Bill**
- **FY 2012 Appropriations**

Federal investment in transportation can play a key role in supporting the nation's economic recovery by putting people back to work, facilitating commerce, addressing environmental goals, improving the nation's energy security and restoring the condition of critical infrastructure. However, despite the obvious importance of transportation to the economy, the federal environment for transportation policy and appropriations is shifting and the potential direction is not clear at this time. As a result, the region should prepare for opportunity by defining its priority interests but be nimble in reacting to a changing environment.

From a policy perspective, in January 2009 the region adopted a comprehensive set of priorities for policy making in the reauthorization bill by Resolution No, 09-4016 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORSING A REGIONAL POSITION ON REAUTHORIZATION OF THE SAFE, ACCOUNTABLE, FLEXIBLE, EFFICIENT, TRANSPORTATION ACT: A LEGACY FOR USERS (SAFETEA-LU). Later in 2009, the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Subcommittee on Highways and Transit passed the bill THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2009 (STAA) incorporating most of the policy priorities of the Portland region. In January 2010, the region endorsed as priorities key elements of the STAA by Resolution No. 10-4124. However, the STAA will die at the end of 2010. The region should continue to urge Congress to pass a strong six-year authorization bill that supports economic recovery, cost- and energy-efficient transportation and livable communities.

From a project perspective, the prospect for earmarking is also unclear with the likelihood that there will be fewer opportunities. However, as demonstrated by recent grant solicitations, there appears to be a trend toward more competitive grant opportunities. The region has a list of possible project earmarks in the event there is an authorization bill that includes earmarks. However, an overall strategy for federal transportation funding is needed to provide a framework to guide the region's advocacy in the context of a changing environment.

Attachment "A" summarizes the authorization bill policy priorities of the Portland region.
Attachment "B" is a strategic approach for federal project funding.
Attachment "C" (in progress) is the specific authorization project earmark requests.
Attachment "D" (in progress) is the specific FY 2012 appropriations project earmark requests.

Strategic Policy Direction: Invest boldly in transportation to spur economic recovery

America's transportation system is running on fumes. It is time for Congress and the Administration to stop limping along, act boldly and adopt a new transportation authorization bill.

Investing in transportation is a key strategy for stimulating economic recovery and will produce both short-term construction jobs and long-term prosperity. This, in turn, will contribute to deficit reduction as economic growth generates healthier tax revenues at both the federal and state levels. Since economic conditions continue to languish at levels not seen since the Great Depression, a strong transportation initiative is called for as a means of creating economic recovery rather than waiting around for the recession to play itself out. While a continued general fund subsidy to the highway trust fund may be a possible short-term action, it is only a stop-gap measure; a real six-year bill should be adopted with increased funding levels to address the nation's extensive immediate needs and build a solid foundation for long-term prosperity.

- **Adopt a six-year Authorization Bill**

  The new authorization bill is now two years overdue and, at best, will be three years overdue before a new bill is enacted. It is essential that the Congress prioritize adoption of an authorization bill because all aspects of transportation, including planning, programming of funds, construction and reconstruction and operations and management, are long-term initiatives and require more funding stability. It often takes many years to plan, engineer and assemble funds for projects. This is much more difficult and expensive to plan and schedule without funding stability at the federal level.

  In addition, the six-year authorization bill plays an important role in setting national transportation policy. Congress must clarify key aspects of policy direction to enable states, regions and local governments to take the necessary steps to implement.

- **Increase the program in the next six-year authorization bill**

  There is a clear need to increase the level of funding in the next authorization bill. In the past two years, the level of appropriations has not been supported by Highway Trust Fund receipts and the General Fund has been used to backfill. In addition, there is a clear need to meet increasing multi-modal demands and address a backlog of projects needed to reach a state of good repair. The President's Deficit Reduction Commission has recommended a $.25 gas tax increase with $.15 dedicated to the highway trust fund. This is a level sufficient to fully fund existing programs without a general fund subsidy.

- **Protect key existing policy interests**

  The past three authorization bills have significantly advanced the region's agenda, particularly with the flexibility provided through the Surface Transportation Program (STP), the Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Program (CMAQ), the Transportation Enhancement Program and the New Starts Program. Through these programs the region has been able to advance an impressive array of projects and programs across all modes in support of the region's 2040 Growth Concept. In the current political climate, it is possible that these or other key programs could be put on the table. Of particular concern is the region's commitment of STP and CMAQ funds through 2027 for construction of the Portland to Milwaukie light rail and project development for Portland to Lake Oswego and the Southwest Corridor. Similarly, the Oregon Transportation Investment Act was

predicated on long-term commitments of federal Highway Bridge Repair and Replacement Program funds. It is important that these programs be retained and, if possible, expanded rather than reduced or eliminated in the name of narrowing the scope of national interest.

There is some talk of reducing the federal transportation program down to the funding level supportable by the existing highway trust fund focused on aspects of the bill that are of clear national interest, such as the Interstate system. However, defining this narrow a policy direction in a new authorization bill is misguided since the intercity/interstate components of the system are built and the big demand for expansion are within metropolitan areas. The region should strongly advocate for ensuring the federal program supports a multi-modal urban transportation system and not return to the bias toward funding urban highway expansion.

- **Priority authorization bill policy/program direction**

  While the Surface Transportation Act of 2009 will die as the 111th Congress adjourns, it provides a template for a new authorization bill to be taken up by the 112th Congress. Programs of interest to the Portland region are:

  - Creation of a new Metropolitan Mobility and Access Program
  - Significant program improvements and substantial increased funding in the New Starts and Small Starts Programs
  - Creation of a new competitive "Projects of National Significance" Program from which the region would seek the federal share supporting the highway elements of the Columbia River Crossing Project
  - Strong linkage to a climate change policy direction
  - Incorporation of a "practical design" directive
  - Consolidation of the current Interstate, National Highway System (NHS) and Highway Bridge Repair and Replacement Program (HBRR) into a program to maintain a "Good State of Highway Repair"
  - Creation of a new Freight Improvement Program
  - Consolidation of several smaller programs into a new Critical Access (transit) Program
  - Consolidation of several smaller programs into a comprehensive Safety Program

- **Other supportive legislative proposals**

  Related proposals with strong ties to federal transportation policy and funding should also be supported either through separate legislation, through linkages in the transportation authorization bill, or both. Of particular interest are:

  - The Livable Communities Act of 2010, which would formalize the partnership between HUD, DOT and the EPA and support projects that integrate transportation, economic development, housing affordability and environmental concerns.
  - The Active Communities Transportation Act (The ACT Act), which would create a competitive funding for more aggressive investment in bike and pedestrian facilities.
  - Climate change legislation recognizing the component related to transportation emissions and reconciling transportation and energy policy.

Strategic Project Direction: Focus on broadly supported high-priority projects

The environment for successfully earmarking transportation projects in Congress has deteriorated in recent years and it appears it will deteriorate further in the coming year. Furthermore, in this environment, the region's approach of providing a long list of undistinguished priorities has not proven successful. The strategy described below calls out those projects/program areas that involve a much broader regional approach, requiring action through both the authorization bill (for both programmatic eligibility and project earmarking) and the appropriations bill. Finally, these projects/programs involve significant activity to develop the projects, are dependent upon broad regional support from stakeholders and are based upon leveraging the federal funding request with state, regional and local funding commitments (including commitments of regionally allocated federal funds such as STP and CMAQ). Since it is not clear what direction the Congress intends to pursue regarding earmarks, it is important that the region finalize its project-specific earmark requests as supplemental requests in the event earmarks are considered.

1. **Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail and the HCT Pipeline**

The Portland region has aggressively implemented a regional high capacity transit system and the role of the federal government has been very significant to this success. To carry this out, the region has generally followed the approach of keeping a series of projects moving through the "pipeline" from planning to engineering to construction. As one project is built, another can move into the construction phase. In turn, as one moves from engineering to construction, another can move from planning to engineering. By following this "Pipeline" approach, the region has been able to maximize the receipt of federal funds. This has required the region to be disciplined in clearly defining priority corridors, recognizing the system has to be implemented one corridor at a time.

In the authorization bill, it is important that the New Starts program be retained, expanded in funding in recognition of the increased need nationally, and improved in its administration to ensure it recognizes the full array of benefits to mobility, land use, economic vitality, air quality and social equity. In the appropriations bills, incremental funding earmarks are important to match state, regional and local funds to keeping planning and engineering progressing to facilitate advancing each corridor to construction. For the next decade, the region's priorities are clear and federal assistance through earmarks in the authorization bill and appropriations bills will be needed to advance:

- Portland to Milwaukie into construction;
- The New Starts component of the Columbia River Crossing project into construction;
- Portland to Lake Oswego from planning to engineering and then to construction;
- Southwest Corridor into planning, then engineering and finally into construction.

The region's New Starts agenda is also very compatible with and should leverage the Administration's Livable Communities Partnership between USDOT, HUD and EPA and would benefit from passage of the Livable Communities Act of 2010. With this policy direction under development at the federal level, it is important that the region make every effort to demonstrate how federal investment leverages the broader interests relating to land use, the environment and livable communities.

Small Starts – The region should continue to advocate for a Small Starts program, providing a more streamlined approach to smaller, cost-effective rail and bus projects. Within this program, the

region will advance segments of streetcar and Bus Rapid Transit projects.

2. **Columbia River Crossing Project**

Implementation of the Columbia River Crossing Project is a significant undertaking involving two states, two MPOs, two transit districts and multiple units of local government. The project is comprised of an integral package of replacing the existing bridge with a new 10-lane structure, reconstructing the interchanges within a 5.5 mile bridge influence area, extending light rail from Portland to Vancouver, Washington, constructing a "world-class" bike and pedestrian system and implementing a comprehensive demand management program including peak-period pricing as both a demand management tool and a financing tool. The funding strategy for the project entails use of toll revenues, funding from the Oregon and Washington Legislatures and a federal contribution in some form.

In order to hold harmless the general federal transportation assistance to Oregon (and Washington), it is important to implement a federal legislative strategy to establish a funding program that recognizes the unique circumstances of the Columbia River Crossing. At this point three possibilities are emerging to seek a minimum of $400 million:

- Creation of a Projects of National Significance Program allowing the unique circumstances to be the basis for a competitive grant application;
- Establishment of a national infrastructure bank to take on a share of the revenue risk by providing access to low cost debt financing to be repaid through toll revenues; and/or
- Earmarking by the Oregon and Washington congressional delegations in the authorization bill and multiple appropriations bills.

3. **Sellwood Bridge**

Replacement of the Sellwood Bridge has progressed through planning and environmental studies to the point of selecting a preferred alternative and developing a financing plan. This critical project is one of the most structurally deficit bridges in the state with a rating of 2 out of 100. The proposed replacement will improve safety, provide an excellent bike/pedestrian facility, accommodate future streetcar, restore bus service and reinforce the Sellwood Main Street.

The financing plan includes substantial commitments from the State of Oregon, City of Portland and Multnomah County with funding provided through the Oregon Jobs and Transportation Act of 2009 and increased vehicle registration fees from Multnomah and Clackamas Counties. The final increment of this complex funding program is needed through federal assistance via the authorization bill, multiple appropriations bills and/or competitive grant solicitation such as the recent TIGER program.

4. **Active Transportation**

The region is pursuing a more aggressive approach to building out its planned bicycle and pedestrian system in support of providing more mobility choices, community livability and environmental sustainability through a comprehensive approach to federal, state, regional and local funding. Because of the diverse set of program objectives, funding is being pursued from sources that are provided for transportation purposes, parks and open spaces and community development. The approach is to follow the "light rail model" and define a set of large-scale increments of the system

that provide a complete traveling experience rather than the random small segment associated with a road project. Significant work has been done to define the overall system and the increments of the system that serve as a phasing strategy. This approach provides the region with the basis for a disciplined approach to moving these system increments through a planning, engineering and construction pipeline using multiple funding approaches, including through federal authorization and appropriations earmarks. At the federal level it is particularly important to the region to maintain and increase existing sources through the Surface Transportation Program (STP), the Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Program (CMAQ), and Transportation Enhancements and to expand access to federal funding through the Active Transportation Act introduced by Congressman Blumenauer.

For the next 3-5 years, priority corridors to advance through planning, engineering, permitting and construction with multiple funding sources including federal authorization and appropriations earmarks are as follows:

1. Sullivan's Gulch Corridor
2. N/NE Portland Active Transportation Network
3. Portland to Milwaukie Active Transportation Corridor
4. The Crescent Connection: Fanno Creek Regional Trail/Beaverton Creek Regional Trail
5. Lake Oswego to Portland Active Transportation Corridor

5. **6-year Authorization Bill earmarking (list in progress)**

The region has already adopted a set of project priorities that will be updated to reflect the latest cost estimates and account for other funding commitments already secured.

6. Appropriations earmarking (list in progress)

While the trend in Congress is to reduce or eliminate earmarks, the region should be prepared with a focused list of earmark priorities just in case. Criteria for establishing the priority list are as follows:

- Two requests per jurisdiction or group of jurisdictions as follows:
  - Portland
  - Multnomah County and Cities of Multnomah County
  - Clackamas County and Cities of Clackamas County
  - Washington County and Cities of Washington County
  - TriMet
  - Metro
  - ODOT
  - Port of Portland
- Requests should be of an amount consistent with what can likely be earmarked
- Consistency with interests of member of Congress
- Job creation during construction and on-going support of permanent jobs
- Project readiness – funds must be able to be obligated by the end of FY 2012; there are no significant technical, environmental, financial or political hurdles that could hold up obligating funds
- Inclusion in the financially constrained element of the new RTP
- Non-federal funds should be identified

- Ability to proceed with a partial earmark (must include a written approach to implementation with a partial earmark)
- Likelihood of proposed category to be successfully earmarked (particularly those that are not oversubscribed)
- There should be a written explanation describing how this request links to a broader strategy, including the relationship of the project to the region's broader land use and transportation improvement strategy and the relationship of these funds to other federal, state or local funds.

7. **TIGER and other grant solicitations**

There is a clear trend within USDOT toward more discretionary grant opportunities as part of a movement away from earmarking. As such, the region should evaluate these opportunities as they become available for implementing this federal strategy. To the extent the grant criteria allow for competitive project applications, JPACT and the region should endorse specific applications that further this priority direction.

AUTHORIZATION PRIORITIES

Map Number	Project Description	Funding Request ($millions)	Sponsor	Congressional District	Purpose	Program Category
Metropolitan Mobility						
	I-205/I-5 Interchange	$14.35	ODOT	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility
	OR 99W/McDonald/Gaarde Intersection	$4.50	City of Tigard	OR-1		Metropolitan Mobility
	I-205/Airport Way Interchange	$20.00	Port of Portland	OR-3	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility
	172nd Ave. Improvements (Sunnyside Rd. to 177th Ave.)	$15.00	City of Happy Valley	OR-5	ROW/PE	Metropolitan Mobility
	OR 213/Redland Road Lane Improvements	$5.40	City of Oregon City	OR-5	PE/Construction	Metropolitan Mobility
	OR 10 Farmington Rd. at Murray Blvd. Intersection Safety & Mobility Improvements	$8.00	City of Beaverton	OR-1	ROW/Construction	Metropolitan Mobility
	Hwy 26/Shute Rd. Interchange	$10.00	City of Hillsboro	OR-1	PE/ROW	Metropolitan Mobility
	Bethany Overcrossing of Hwy 26	$10.00	Washington County	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility
	OR10: Olseon/Scholls Ferry Intersection	$11.00	Washington County	OR-1	ROW	Metropolitan Mobility
	Walker Road: 158th to Murray	$10.00	Washington County	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility
	Farmington Rd.: Kinnaman to 198th	$30.00	Washington County	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility
	Hwy. 99W/Sunset/Elwert/Kruger Intersection	$2.50	City of Sherwood	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility
	72nd Ave.: Dartmouth St. to Hampton St.	$13.00	City of Tigard	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility
	Nimbus Extension from Hall Blvd. To Denney Rd.	$15.40	City of Beaverton	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility
	Union Station Rehabilitation	$24.00	City of Portland	OR-1	Construction	Metropolitan Mobility
Freight						
	I-84/257th Ave. Troutdale Interchange	$20.00	Port of Portland	OR-3	Construction	Freight
	Sunrise System Improvements	$30.00	Clackamas County	OR-3	ROW/Construction	Freight
	Kinsman Road Freight Route Extension Project, Phase I	$10.50	City of Wilsonville	OR-5		Freight
	Troutdale Reynolds Industrial Park Road Improvements	$6.00	Port of Portland	OR-3	Construction	Freight
	124th Ave. Extension: Tualatin-Sherwood to Tonquin	$4.00	Washington County	OR-1	Preliminary Engineering	Freight
Managing the Existing System						
	Regional Multi-Modal Safety Education Initiative	$4.50	Metro	OR-1,3,5	Planning/Implementation	Managing the Existing System
System Management						
	I-84/Central Multnomah County ITS	$3.00	City of Gresham	OR-3		System Management
	Regional Arterial Management Program (signal system coordination)	$12.00	Metro	OR-1,3,5	PE/Construction	System Management
Demand Management						
	Drive Less Save More Marketing Pilot Project	$4.50	Metro	OR-1,3,5	Marketing	Transportation Demand Management
Transit Oriented Development						
	College Station TOD (at PSU)	$10.00	PSU/TriMet	OR-1	Construction	Transit Oriented Development
	Gresham Civic Neighborhood Station/TOD/Parking Structure	$5.00	City of Gresham	OR-3	Acquisition	Transit Oriented Development
	Transit Station Area Connectivity Program to promote transit oriented development	$20.00	Metro	OR-1,3,5	PE/ROW/Construction	Transit Oriented Development
	Rockwood Town Center	$10.00	City of Gresham	OR-3	PE/Construction	Transit Oriented Development
Bridges						
	Sellwood Bridge on SE Tacoma St. between Hwy 43 & SE 6th Ave.	$100.00	Multnomah County	OR-3,5	Construction	Bridges
Transit and Greenhouse Gases						
	TriMet Buses ($15.4 million per year/6-years)	$92.40	TriMet	OR-1,3,5	Acquisition	Transit
	West Metro HCT Bus Rapid Transit Alternatives Analysis		Washington Co./TriMet/Metro	OR-1	AA	Transit
	Central East HCT Bus Rapid Transit Alternatives Analysis		City of Gresham/TriMet/Metro	OR-3	AA	Transit
	Prototype Diesel Multiple Unit (commuter rail vehicles)	$5.00	TriMet	OR-1,3,5	Engineer/manufacture	Transit
	Wilsonville SMART Fleet Services Facility	$7.00	City of Wilsonville/SMART	OR-5	Construction	Transit
	SMART Bus Replacements ($2.7 million per year/6-years)	$16.20	City of Wilsonville/SMART	OR-5	Acquisition	Transit
	Wilsonville SMART Offices/Administration Facility	$1.50	City of Wilsonville/SMART	OR-5	Construction	Transit
	City of Sandy Transit	$1.50	City of Sandy	OR-3	Acquisition	Transit
	Canby Area Transit	$1.25	City of Canby	OR-5	Acquisition	Transit
	South Clackamas Transit	$0.75	City of Molalla	OR-5	Acquisition	Transit

Map Number	Project Description	Funding Request ($millions)	Sponsor	Congressional District	Purpose	Program Category
New Starts/Small Starts						
	South Corridor Light Rail ($80 m. in 2010, $25 m. in 2011)	$345.40	TriMet	OR-3	Construction	New Starts
	Eastside Streetcar Loop	$75.00	City of Portland	OR-3	Construction	Small Starts
	Portland to Milwaukie - New Starts	$850.60	TriMet	OR-3	PE/Final Design/Construction	New Starts
	Portland to Lake Oswego Streetcar - New Starts or Small Starts	$237.30	City of Lake Oswego/City of Portland/TriMet	OR-5	PE/DEIS/FEIS	New or Small Starts
	Columbia River Crossing - New Starts	$750.00	ODOT/WSDOT	OR-3/WA-3	PE/Final Design/Construction	New Starts
	Portland to Tigard and Sherwood/99W/Barbur Blvd. Alternatives Analysis		City of Tigard/TriMet	OR-1	Planning/PE	New Starts
	Hillsboro to Forest Grove Alternative Analysis		City of Forest Grove/TriMet	OR-1	Planning/PE	New Starts
	East Metro North South HCT Alternative Analysis		City of Gresham/TriMet	OR-3	Planning/PE	New Starts
	Light Rail to Oregon City Alternative Analysis		Clackamas County/TriMet	OR-5	Planning/PE	New Starts
	Portland Streetcar Planning and Alternatives Analysis	$5.00	City of Portland/City of Gresham	OR-3	Planning/Alternatives Analysis	Small Starts
Walking and Cycling						
	If the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy Proposal is implemented:					
	Non-Motorized Mobility Strategy (on and off-street bike paths)	$75.00	Metro	OR-1,3,5	PE/ROW/Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Portland Citywide Bicycle Boulevard Construction	$25.00	City of Portland	OR-1,3	PE/ROW/Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	If the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy Proposal is not implemented:					
	Congressional District 1 Trails/Bikepath Program	$10.00	Washington County & Cities	OR-1	PE/ROW/Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Congressional District 3 Trails/Bikepath Program	$10.00	City of Portland/City of Gresham	OR-3	PE/ROW/Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Congressional District 5 Trails/Bikepath Program	$10.00	Clackamas County & Cities	OR-5	PE/ROW/Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Projects under consideration:					
	Multnomah County Jurisdictions					
	Gresham/Fairview Trail, Phase 4/5	$6.10	City of Gresham	OR-3		Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	SW Capitol Hwy: Multnomah to Taylors Ferry	$10.00	City of Portland	OR-1	PE/Construction	Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Clackamas County Jurisdictions					
	French Prairie Bike-Ped-Emergency Bridge Over Willamette River	$12.60	City of Wilsonville	OR-5		Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Springwater to Trolley Trail - 17th Avenue from Ochoco to McLoughlin Blvd.	$3.20	NCPRD/City of Milwaukie	OR-3		Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Mt. Scott Creek Trail - Mt. Talbert to Springwater Corridor	$4.60	NCPRD/City of Happy Valley	OR-3		Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Scouter's Mt. Trail - Springwater/Powell Butte to Springwater	$7.37	NCPRD/Happy Valley	OR-4		Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Phillips Creek Trail - I-205 Trail to N. Clackamas Greenway	$2.27	NCPRD/Clackamas County	OR-5		Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Monroe Bike Blvd.	$2.00	City of Milwaukie	OR-3		Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Iron Mtn. Bike Lanes - 10th St. to Bryant Rd.	$3.80	City of Lake Oswego	OR-3		Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Carmen Drive Sidewalk and Bike Lanes from Meadow Rd. to I-5	$1.70	City of Lake Oswego	OR-3		Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Pilkington Sidewalk and Bike Lanes from Boones Ferry to Childs Rd.	$5.25	City of Lake Oswego	OR-3		Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Washington County Jurisdictions					
	Council Creek Regional Trail: Banks to Hillsboro	$5.25	City of Forest Grove	OR-1		Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Tonquin Trail/Cedar Creek Corridor	$2.50	City of Sherwood	OR-1		Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Fanno Creek Trail Projects	$0.70	City of Tigard	OR-1		Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
	Westside Regional Trail	$12.00	Tualatin Hills Parks & Rec. Districts/Washington Co.	OR-1		Trails/Bicycle/Pedestrian
Critical Highway Corridors						
	Columbia River Crossing Project	$400.00	ODOT and WSDOT	OR-3/WA-3	Design/ROW/Construction	Project of National Significance
Boulevards/Main Streets						
	Downtown Milwaukie Station Streetscape	$5.00	City of Milwaukie	OR-3	Construction	Blvd./Main Streets
	Main Street Ped. & Streetscape Improvements (5th St. to Division)	$2.20	City of Gresham	OR-3	PE/Construction	Blvd./Main Streets
	East Burnside/Couch Couplet, NE 3rd Ave. to NE 14th Ave.	$6.00	City of Portland	OR-3	PE/Construction	Blvd./Main Streets
	102nd Ave. St. Improvement: Project Phase II - NE Glisan to SE Washington St.	$5.00	City of Portland	OR-3	Construction	Blvd./Main Streets
Parkways						
	Sunrise System: Parkway Demonstration Project	$30.00	Clackamas County	OR-3	Planning	Parkway
Green Infrastructure						
	Kellogg Creek Bridge Replacement	$4.00	City of Milwaukie	OR-3	Construction	Green Infrastructure
	Tabor to the River/SE Division St. Reconstruction, Streetscape & Green Infrastructure Project	$4.50	City of Portland	OR-3	PE/Construction	Green Infrastructure
Research						
	Oregon Transportation Research & Education Consortium (OTREC)	$16.00	PSU/UO/OSU/OIT	OR-1,2,3,4,5	Research	Research

***Note: The region is supporting the Rails-to Trails Conservancy's (RTC) proposal to establish a program to invest $50 million in each of 40 areas to substantially increase biking and walking. Both Metro and Portland have submitted a "Case Statement" to RTC to be a designated area. If this approach is successful, the $75 million Metro and $25 million Portland requests would be through this program. If this in not successful, a Bikepath & Trails earmark in each of the Congressional Districts of $10 million each is requested through the "High Priority Projects" category. The bikepaths and trails listed below are the ones under consideration to be funded depending upon funding level.**

Attachment D
November 4, 2010

DRAFT

FY 2012 APPROPRIATION REQUESTS

by proposed jurisdiction

Project Description	Funding Request ($millions)	Sponsor	Congressional District	Source of Federal Funds	Purpose
City of Portland					
NE Columbia Blvd./NE MLK Blvd. Intersection Improvement Project	$0.50	City of Portland	OR-3	FHWA - Surface Transportation Program	Construction
Multnomah County & Cities of Multnomah County					
Sellwood Bridge Replacement Project	$5.00	Multnomah County	OR-3,5	FHWA - Transportation, Community & Systems Preservation (TCSP) Program	Final Design/ROW
US 30/Sandy Blvd Improvements: 185th - 201st Aves.	$1.97	City of Gresham	OR-3	FHWA - Surface Transportation Program	PE/ROW/Construction
Clackamas County & Cities of Clackamas County					
SMART Fleet Services Facility	$1.00	SMART/City of Wilsonville	OR-5	FTA Section 5309 Bus & Bus Facilities	Design/Construction
Downtown Sidewalk and Pedestrian Improvements - Main St., 5th to 15th St.	$3.50	City of Oregon City	OR-5	FHWA - Surface Transportation Program	Construction
Lake Road (Phase 2)	$2.00	City of Milwuakie	OR-3	FHWA - Surface Transportation Program	PE/ROW/Construction
Washington County & Cities of Washington County					
HCT: Hillsboro to Forest Grove	$0.50	City of Forest Grove	OR-1	FTA - 5339 Alternatives Analysis	AA
OR 217 Improvements	$3.00	Washington County	OR-1	FHWA - Surface Transportation Program	Construction
OR 47 and Purdin Rd. Intersection Improvements	$1.50	City of Forest Grove	OR-1	FHWA - Surface Transportation Program	AA
OR 47 and Pacific Ave. Intersection Improvements	$4.10	City of Forest Grove	OR-1	FHWA - Surface Transportation Program	Construction
David Hill Road Extension	$3.00	City of Forest Grove	OR-1	FHWA - Surface Transportation Program	Construction
95th Ave/Boones Ferry Rd/Commerce Circle Intersection Improvements	$1.00	City of Wilsonville	OR-1	FHWA - Transportation, Community & Systems Preservation (TCSP) Program	Construction
U.S. 26 - Helvetia/Brookwood Parkway Interchange Improvement Project	$2.00	City of Hillsboro	OR-1	FHWA - Surface Transportation Program	Construction
TriMet					
Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project	$40.00	TriMet	OR-1,3,5	FTA - 5309 New Starts	Final Design/ROW
TriMet Bus Replacement	$1.60	TriMet	OR-1,3,5	FTA - Section 5309 Bus & Bus Facilities	Acquisition
Metro					
Southwest Transit Corridor (Barbur Blvd./99 W/I-5, Portland to Sherwood)	$2.50	Metro	OR-1,5	FTA - Section 5339 Alternatives Analysis	AA
Regional Active Transportation Project *		Metro			
ODOT					
I-5 Columbia River Crossing	$3.00	ODOT	OR-3/WA-3	FHWA - Interstate Maintenance Discretionary Program	ROW/PE
I-205 Multi-Use Path	$1.00	ODOT	OR-3	FHWA - Transportation, Community & Systems Preservation (TCSP) Program	Design/Construction
Port of Portland					
St. Johns Rail Line Relocation	$2.00	Port of Portland	OR-3	FRA - 9002 Rail Relocation & Improvement Program	Relocation

** Metro will apply for an FY12 appropriation for planning, project development, construction or programming for a regional active transportation project. Project details yet to be finalized.*