BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECOMMENDING)	RESOLUTION NO. 04-3419
FREIGHT PROJECT PRIORITIES TO THE)	
OREGON FREIGHT ADVISORY COMMITTEE)	Introduced by Councilor Rod Park

WHEREAS, House Bill 3364 from the 2001 Oregon Legislative session calls for the Freight Advisory Committee to advise the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) and regionally based advisory groups about the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program and its consideration and inclusion of high priority freight mobility projects in each Oregon Department of Transportation region, and

WHEREAS, House Bill 2041 from the 2003 Legislative session expands on House Bill 3364 by authorizing \$100 million in bonding for projects that: a) are recommended by the Freight Advisory Committee, b) provide or improve access to industrial land sites, or c) provide or improve access to sites where jobs can be created, and

WHEREAS, in September 2003 the Oregon Freight Advisory Committee (OFAC) approved a set of eligibility criteria, prioritization factors and a process for evaluating candidate projects, and

WHEREAS, at its October 9, 2003 meeting, JPACT reviewed the legislation, proposed OFAC eligibility criteria and prioritization factors and approved a process for developing regional recommendations to be submitted to OFAC, and

WHEREAS, information on this issue was reviewed by the Metro Council at a November 25, 2003 work session on freight, and

WHEREAS, the process approved by JPACT called for a public comment solicitation and review by the Regional Freight Committee, and

WHEREAS, the Regional Freight Committee is chaired by Metro and includes representatives from Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties, the cities of Gresham, Tualatin, Wilsonville and Portland, the Port of Portland and the Oregon Department of Transportation, and

WHEREAS, on November 28, 2003 OFAC sent a letter to Area Commissions on Transportation, the Association of Oregon Counties, the League of Oregon Cities and Metropolitan Planning Organizations advertising the freight project prioritization criteria and preliminary list of candidate high priority freight mobility projects and requesting comments by March 1, 2004, and

WHEREAS, Metro has solicited public comments and information on potential freight project priorities between December 1 and January 5, 2004, and

WHEREAS, the Regional Freight Committee has provided recommendations to TPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council on a proposed prioritized list of freight mobility projects based on the eligibility criteria and prioritization factors developed by OFAC and in accordance with policy direction set by JPACT at its October 9, 2003 meeting, and

WHEREAS, TPAC and JPACT have acted on the recommendations of the Regional Freight Advisory Committee and recommended that the prioritized list of projects in Exhibit A be submitted as the region's priorities for consideration by OFAC;

WHEREAS, the region has significant modernization needs and these needs are disproportionate to the rest of the state. And, JPACT believes a significant portion of OTIA III should be used to address these modernization needs; and

WHEREAS, JPACT recognizes that the \$100 million set aside for freight will likely not significantly address modernization needs in the region; and

WHEREAS, JPACT recognizes and supports the fact that five of the eight projects of statewide significance are located in Region 1; and

WHEREAS, JPACT believes the five projects of statewide significance should get consideration for funding as part of future OTIA III allocations; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council adopt the recommendation of JPACT on the regional freight mobility project priorities as shown in Exhibit A.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that consistent with the JPACT recommendation, the Metro Council forward to OFAC the prioritized list of regional freight projects as shown in Exhibit A; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Metro Council shall forward a letter to OFAC and the OTC. The letter shall include, at a minimum, the following points:

- A) The region has significant modernization needs and these needs are disproportionate to the rest of the state. And, the Metro Council believes a significant portion of OTIA III should be used to address these modernization needs;
- B) The Metro Council recongizes that the \$100 million set aside for freight will likely not significantly address modernization needs in the region;
- C) The Metro Council recognizes and supports the fact that five of the eight projects of statewide significance are located in Region 1; and
- D) The Metro Council believes that the five projects of statewide significance in the Metropolitan region should be addressed for funding in OTIA III.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this

day of

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

Resolution No. 04-3419

Page 2 of 2

Exhibit A

Regio	onal Freight Advisory Committe	e Recomi	mended	Freight P	roject Prior	ities		
Project Name	Description	Requested Amount (in \$ millions) ¹	Average Score	Potentially Regional Significant Industrial Areas	State Opportunity Sites or Proposed Shovel Ready Sites	Local/ Private Leverage	Potential Other Funding Sources ²	Freight Route Designation
Leadbetter Extension Overcossing RTP 4087	Extend Leadbetter to Terminal 6/Marine Drive, including a rail overcrossing.	\$6	7.6	✓	ОР	✓	√	RTP/TSP/ OHP
East End Connector RTP 4022	Provide a free-flow connection from Columbia Boulevard/SE 82nd Avenue to US 30 Bypass/I-205 interchange, and widen the southbound I-205 on-ramp at Columbia Boulevard.	\$3.5	7.4			✓		NHS/ RTP
North Lombard Access Improvements RTP 4063	Improve access and mobility of freight to Rivergate intermodal facilities and industrial areas.	\$3.6	7.3	✓	ОР	✓	✓	NHS/RTP/ TSP
I-5 North Improvements RTP 4005	Widen to six lanes between Lombard and the Expo Center.	\$41	7.2	✓	ОР	✓	✓	NHS/RTP/ OHP/TSP
I-5/Columbia Boulevard Improvements RTP 4006	Construct full direction access interchange based on recommendations from the I-5 Trade and Transportation Partnership Study.	\$56	7.1	✓	ОР	✓	✓	NHS/RTP/ OHP/TSP
Lake Yard, BNSF Hub Facility Access Not in RTP	Provide access road/drive and new signalization to relieve conflicts with US 30 traffic.	\$2	7.1			✓	✓	NHS/ RTP
Alderwood Air Cargo Access Improvements RTP 4041 & 4038	Widen/Channelize/signalize intersections @ NE Alderwood Rd./NE Columbia Blvd. and NE Alderwood Rd./SE 82nd Avenue.	\$2.1	7.0			✓		NHS/RTP/ TSP
Cornfoot Air Cargo Access Improvements RTP 4042 & 4055	Widen/channelize/signalize intersections at NE Airtans Way/NE Cornfoot Rd., and NE Alderwood Rd./NE Cornfoot Blvd.	\$1	7.0			✓		NHS/TSP/ RTP
NE 47th Intersection and Roadway Improvements RTP 4040	Widen and channelize NW 47th Avenue/ NE Columbia Boulevard.	\$3.3	7.0			✓		RTP/TSP
NE Columbia Boulevard/SE 82nd Avenue RTP 4044	Signalize ramps and provide additional capacity.	\$1.1	6.9			✓		RTP
Sunrise Highway (Phase I of Unit One) RTP 5003	Construct new four-lane facility and interchanges (I-205 to SE 135th Ave.).	\$85	6.7	✓	PSR	✓	✓	OHP/RTP

¹ Total project cost may exceed Requested Amount

² Funding in whole or in part

Regional Freight Advisory Committee Recommended Freight Project Priorities								
Project Name	Description	Requested Amount (millions) ¹	Average Score	Potentially Regional Significant Industrial Areas	State Opportunity Sites or Proposed Shovel Ready Sites	Local/ Private Leverage	Potential Other Funding Sources ²	Freight Route Designation
NE 257th Ave. (Division St. To Powell Valley Road) RTP 2041	Construct two travel lanes in each direction, center turn lane/median, sidewalks, bike lanes, drainage and street lighting.	\$4.8	6.7					*
Wilsonville/I-5 Interchange Improvements (Phase 1 and 2) RTP 6138 & 6139	Construct ramp improvements Town Center to Boones Ferry Road.	14.5	6.4	✓		✓	✓	NHS/RTP/ OHP/TSP
OR 217 Improvements RTP 3001	Widen northbound OR 217 to three lanes between OR 8 and US 26 and make ramp improvements.	\$33	6.2			✓	✓	NHS/OHP RTP
I-205 Auxiliary Lanes, I-5 to Stafford Rd. RTP 5199	Construct permanent auxiliary lanes as part of I-5 to Willamette River Preservation project.	\$8	5.9			√	✓	OHP/RTP
SE 172nd Ave. Improvement RTP 7000	Extend to Hwy 212 and signalize intersection. Widen to 4 lanes with turn lanes from Hwy 212 to SE Sunnyside Road	\$15	5.9	✓	PSR	✓	✓	**
US 26 (Sunset Highway) Improvements RTP 3009	Widen US 26 to six lanes from Cornell Rd. to NW 185th Avenue.	\$13	5.6	✓	OP/PSR	√		NHS/OHP RTP
Terminal 4 Driveway Consolidation RTP 4088	Consolidate driveways.	\$1	5.6		ОР			RTP/TSP
I-5/99W Connection (Tualatin - Sherwood Hwy Phase I Arterial Connection) RTP 6141	Construct arterial connection From I-5 to 99W that protects through traffic movements between these state hwys, and that would provide for future expansion to Expressway or freeway.	\$53	5.5	✓		✓	✓	NHS/TSP/ RTP
US 26 (Mt.Hood Hwy) Springwater Corridor Interchange (Hogan Corridor Improvements) RTP 2051	Element of Hogan Corridor Improvements. New interchange on US 26 proposed to access industrial lands in Springwater Corridor.		5.4	✓		✓	✓	NHS/RTP/ TSP

^{*} NHS Route is currently 181st Ave./Burnside Road. 242nd Ave. is proposed as NHS route in RTP upon completion of improvements in the corridor. Completion of 242nd Ave. will be difficult ** Clackamas Co. has identified as SE 172nd Ave. as a major industrial area and and expensive. Multnomah Co. recognized the need for a freight route connecting I-84 and US 26 and will recommend the designation of 257th Ave. as an RTP freight route.

will request freight designation in the next RTP.

¹ Total project cost may exceed Requested Amount 2 Funding in whole or in part

Regional Freight Advisory Committee Recommended Freight Project Priorities

Project Name	Description	Requested Amount (millions) ¹	Average Score	Potentially Regional Significant Industrial Areas	State Opportunity Sites or Proposed Shovel Ready Sites	Local/ Private Leverage	Potential Other Funding Sources ²	Freight Route Designation
Sandy Boulevard Widening Revised RTP 2074	Widen to five lanes between NE 162nd to NE 238th Avenues.	\$11.8	5.2			✓		RTP/TSP
OR 217 Interchange Improvements RTP 3023	Improve the highest priority interchange that comes out of the Hwy217 Corridor study.		5.2	✓		✓	✓	NHS/OHP RTP
Belmont Ramp Reconstruction RTP 1039	Reconstruct ramp to provide better access to the Central Eastside.	\$1.5	4.9			✓		RTP/TSP
I-5/North Macadam Access Improvements RTP 1025	Construct new off-ramp from I-5 northbound to Macadam Avenue northbound.	\$25	4.3		PSR	✓	√	NHS/RTP/ OHP/TSP

Total Estimated Cost

\$400.2

1 Total project cost may exceed Requested Amount 2 Funding in whole or in part

STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 04-3419, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECOMMENDING FREIGHT PROJECT PRIORITIES TO THE OREGON FREIGHT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Date: January 28, 2004 Prepared by: Andrew C. Cotugno

BACKGROUND

House Bill 3364 from the 2001 legislative session required the Oregon Freight Advisory Committee to advise the Oregon Transportation Commission on high priority freight mobility projects in each Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) region.

House Bill 2041, known as OTIA III, from the 2003 Legislative session expanded on HB 3364 by authorizing \$100 million in bonding for projects that a) are recommended by the Freight Advisory Committee, b) provides or improve access to industrial land sites, or c) provide or improve access to sites where jobs can be created. HB 2041 provides for another \$400 million in funding for modernization projects, some of which could also be used for projects that support freight mobility.

The Oregon Freight Advisory Committee developed a set of eligibility criteria and prioritization factors to screen more than 200 projects statewide. During the summer and fall of 2003, OFAC worked with the various ODOT regions throughout the state to identify potentially high priority freight projects that met the eligibility criteria.

To assess priority, OFAC established four factors. The prioritization factors are: 1) the project would remove identified barriers to the safe, reliable, and efficient movement of goods; 2) the project would facilitate public and private investment that creates or sustains jobs; 3) the project would support multimodal freight transportation movements and 4) the project is likely to be constructed within the time frame contemplated (project readiness). The complete eligibility criteria and prioritization factors are set forth in Attachment 1 to this staff report.

On November 28, 2003 OFAC distributed information about the prioritization process to regional and local jurisdictions and asked for comments on a preliminary list of priorities by March 1, 2004. In December and early January, Metro solicited comments and recommendations from interested parties. More than 50 pieces of correspondence were received.

In mid-January, the Regional Freight Committee reviewed all materials received, evaluated projects for which information was submitted and developed a proposed prioritized list of projects (Exhibit A to this resolution). The Regional Freight Committee is composed of representatives from Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties, the cities of Gresham, Portland, Wilsonville, Vancouver and Tualatin, the Ports of Portland and Vancouver and the Oregon Department of Transportation. Vancouver representatives did not participate in this prioritization process.

Each member of the Regional Freight Committee evaluated each project based on the four prioritization factors. In accordance with direction provided by JPACT, Committee members were asked to give additional consideration to projects located within Regionally Significant Industrial Areas and intermodal

facilities. Projects are listed in order of their total average score by committee members. The highest ranking projects represent the priority freight mobility projects for funding in the near term.

All projects for which information was submitted are listed in Exhibit A, with three exceptions. The replacement of the swing span with a lift span on the Columbia River rail bridge is not eligible for funding as part of OTIA III because the funds are limited to roadway improvements by the state constitution. Information was submitted both on the Going Street Overcrossing and the Going/Greeley Climbing lanes. Those projects had been reviewed by the Regional Freight Committee earlier and ranked as lower priorities. The additional information was submitted too late or was insufficient for the Regional Freight Committee to re-evaluate these projects in the available timeframe. Although the City of Portland has not requested that the Going Street Overcrossing be included in the regional priority list, it will be submitting it separately to OFAC.

The Regional Freight Committee recommended prioritized list of high priority freight mobility projects is attached as Exhibit A.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

- 1. **Known Opposition** None known at this time.
- **2. Legal Antecedents** This resolution provides input to the Oregon Freight Advisory Committee, which was established by HB 3364 and directed to recommend freight priorities to the Oregon Transportation Commission as part of HB 2041. (See Background).
- 3. Anticipated Effects Adoption of this resolution would provide input to a State committee, which has been charged with establishing freight priorities for use by the Oregon Transportation Commission in making funding decisions. It could result in funding of key freight mobility projects, which would improve the creation and retention of jobs in the region.
- 4. **Budget Impacts** Adoption of the resolution would not result in any additional requirement of Metro resources.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Approve Resolution 04-3419 as recommended.

Freight Mobility Project Eligibility Criteria and Prioritization Factors (Approved by the Freight Advisory Committee, September 9, 2003)

Eligibility Criteria	Prioritization Factors
Projects can be considered for funding if they	Priority shall be given to projects that
 Are modernization projects¹ on freight routes of statewide or regional significance, including ✓ highways on the State Highway Freight System as designated in the 1999 Oregon Highway Plan, or ✓ highways or local roads designated as National Highway System intermodal connectors, or ✓ other highways with a high volume or percentage of trucks or which are important for regional or interstate freight movements, or ✓ local freight routes designated in a regional or local transportation plan 	 Would remove identified barriers to the safe, reliable, and efficient movement of goods, Would facilitate public and private investment that creates or sustains jobs⁵ Would support multimodal freight transportation movements Are likely to be constructed within the time frame contemplated (project readiness)⁶
• Are estimated to cost \$1 million or more ²	
Have not previously been programmed for construction in a <i>Statewide Transportation Improvement Program</i> approved by the Oregon Transportation Commission ³	
Are consistent with the applicable acknowledged Transportation System Plan (TSP) or, in the absence of an applicable acknowledged TSP, the applicable acknowledged comprehensive plan and any applicable adopted TSP ⁴	
Support 1999 <i>Oregon Highway Plan</i> policies per the provisions identified in the process approved by the OTC for the selection of projects to be included in the STIP	

¹ Other types of projects (e.g., operations or safety) may be considered if they would accomplish purposes similar to those of modernization projects or would otherwise substantially support freight mobility.

Freight projects criteria approved table 09-03.doc

² A project costing less than \$1 million may be considered if it meets other eligibility criteria, is critical to removing barriers to goods movement, or would otherwise substantially support freight mobility.

³ Multi-phased projects or STIP-listed projects that have been delayed and otherwise meet the eligibility criteria may be considered. Additionally, projects that are scheduled for construction during the latter two years of an approved STIP may be considered for inclusion in future STIPs or freight mobility project listings. Costs of planning, development, and design may be included in the identification of projects eligible for funding consideration.

⁴ The FAC may consider projects that are not identified in an acknowledged or adopted plan if efforts to amend the applicable planning document are underway or expected to proceed within timelines for developing state or Metropolitan Planning Organization transportation improvement programs.

⁵ Examples of investment leveraging would include, but not be limited to, additional federal funds, local matching funds, donation of project right-of-way, or private-sector contributions.

⁶ Project readiness is dependent on an assessment of the remaining requirements that must be met before a project can be constructed, and the likelihood that the requirements can be met and construction started within the time frame anticipated. Assessment of project readiness includes assessment of the timing and likelihood of obtaining environmental approvals.