

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORSING AN) RESOLUTION NO. 05-3544
UPDATED 2005 REGIONAL POSITION ON)
REAUTHORIZATION OF THE) Introduced by Councilor Rex Burkholder
TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ACT FOR THE
21ST CENTURY (TEA-21)

WHEREAS, the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) was adopted by Congress in 1998; and

WHEREAS, TEA-21 expired at the end of federal Fiscal Year 2003 (September 30, 2003) and an extension will expire before May 2005; and

WHEREAS, Congress will be considering reauthorization of TEA-21 during 2005; and

WHEREAS, TEA-21 has a significant policy effect on transportation planning and decision-making and funding in the Portland region; and

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

WHEREAS, Resolution No. 03-3271 was adopted in January 2003 providing an analysis of possible legislative issues and options and an initial regional position on these issues; and

WHEREAS, Resolution No. 04-3409A was adopted in February 2004, providing an analysis of specific bills under consideration by the Congress; and

WHEREAS, further review of proposed legislation will lead to possible amendment and refinement to this policy position; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council:

1. Endorses the summary of regional priority policy issues on reauthorization of TEA-21 as reflected in Exhibit A.
2. Endorses the projects identified in Exhibit B as the region's priority projects for TEA-21 reauthorization earmarking.
3. Endorses the regional analysis of issues reflected in legislation under consideration in Exhibit C.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this _____ day of February 2005

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

**Portland Regional Position
On the Reauthorization of the
Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century
(TEA-21)**

Priority Policy Issues

The 109th Congress has the opportunity to take a fresh look at the reauthorization of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st century (TEA-21). At this time, it is unclear whether the work performed by the 108th Congress will be the “jumping off point” for these discussions.

Since January 2003, the Metro region, through JPACT and the Metro Council, adopted policy statements establishing priorities for the reauthorization of TEA-21 (Resolutions No. 03-3271 and 04-3409A). The region provided a detailed analysis of issues of concern to the region as well as identified the highest priorities for policy and project funding.

The Metro region then analyzed the three bills introduced in the 108th Congress and provided our Congressional delegation with a specific analysis of all three. These were:

- Senate Bill 1072 – the “Safe, Accountable, Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act of 2003” (SAFETEA);
- House Bill 3550 – The “Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users” (TEA-LU); and
- Senate Bill 3011 - The “Federal Public Transportation Act of 2004”.

Should the 109th Congress pursue the basic outline provided in these bills, we have included as Exhibit “B” our detailed analysis of these bills with specific recommendations for support, opposition or amendment as a reference. However, the situation will change and there will be a need to evaluate new proposals. It is our intent to react quickly and provide our analysis to the delegation. In the meantime, this policy position is intended to establish a short list of the major concepts to support.

HIGHEST PRIORITY ISSUES:

- 1. Increase Funding Levels**
- 2. Retain the TEA-21 Program Structure**
- 3. Support the Multi-State Corridor Program**
- 4. Support Projects of National and Regional Significance**
- 5. Retain and Improve the New Starts Program**
- 6. Support the House version of the Small Starts Program**
- 7. Support a Freight Program**
- 8. Retain Trust Funds and General Funds In the Transit Program**
- 9. Retain the CMAQ Apportionment**
- 10. Ensure federal legislation does not limit the use of toll revenues**
- 11. Support Planning Funds as provided for in the Senate Bill**

HIGHEST PRIORITY ISSUES:

- 1. Increase Funding Levels** - Both the House and Senate Bills proposed an increase in transportation funding. It is essential that the reauthorization be finalized with these increases. There is enormous demand for highway and transit investment to maintain and expand our transportation systems. Falling behind will cost our region more in the future. If the funding levels do not reach the \$299 billion mark, the Congress must consider a concomitant shortening of the lifespan of the reauthorization act. There are few infrastructure investments as important to our nation's economy and quality of life as transportation.
- 2. Retain the TEA-21 Program Structure** – In general, the Portland region supported SAFETEA and TEA-LU because the basic program structure of TEA-21 was retained. Also, in general, it is preferred by the Portland region that new discretionary programs not be created. Historically the state has fared better through formula programs than through discretionary programs (there are several very important exceptions noted below). The principal program categories in the Highway Title of Interstate Maintenance (IM), National Highway System (NHS), Highway Bridge Program (HBR), Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) and in the Transit Title of Urban Formula Grants, New Starts and the newly created Small Starts are the most important to the region and the most critical to provide at an increased funding level.
- 3. Support the Multi-State Corridor Program** – Both House and Senate bills from the last Congress provided for an expanded Corridor Program, separated from the Border Program. However, the Portland region supported both the funding level in the House Bill (@ \$5 Billion) and the 70/30 division between Corridors and Borders. This would make this a viable funding source to continue to pursue discretionary grants for the I-5 Trade and Transportation Improvement.
- 4. Support Projects of National and Regional Significance** – The Portland region supports the discretionary funding category for Projects of National and Regional Significance that was proposed in the earlier TEA-LU as long as revenue increases can accommodate the program without a negative impact on the formula programs. It is essential that the program be implemented through a rigorous evaluation process similar to the transit New Starts Program.

The region supports the efforts of **Congressman Peter DeFazio** to seek an earmark for the state's cracked bridge program under this new category. If the program is created, there are two prospects for this program as part of the next authorization: the I-5 Trade Corridor/Columbia River Crossing, which could be incorporated into the I-5 "cracked bridge" program and the Sunrise Corridor.

- 5. Retain and Improve the New Starts Program** – The New Starts Program is among the most important for the Portland region, allowing us to continue to make progress on implementing an effective regional light rail system. It is important to retain the rigorous integrity under which these funds are awarded while increasing the funds in recognition

of increased national demand. Of particular concern is that the rating process for candidate New Start projects should be transparent, should take into consideration multiple measures of effectiveness rather than a single cost-benefit type rating and should retain the evaluation factor relating to the importance of the land use affects of the project. At a minimum, the current C-E evaluation measuring should be revised to reflect the inflation that has occurred since the number was established.

- 6. Support the House Version of the Small Starts Program (with adjustments) -** The region supports the creation of a “Small Starts” category intended to provide a streamlined program for new rail and fixed-guideway transit projects under \$75 million, such as Commuter Rail and Street Car. However, it is difficult to appreciate the impact of establishing a new program on existing Section 5309 programs. If the funding levels approach those included in the earlier Senate bill, then establishing a new program will enable funding for a broader range of projects, including Small Starts. The region prefers the House version because it specifies evaluation factors appropriate to Small Starts while the Senate version is silent on these factors and delegates rulemaking to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). We would urge the Congress to direct FTA through report language to develop a simplified project rating and review process that is commensurate with the size and nature of these projects. The region also believes that Small Start investments should include a “fixed-guideway” component to ensure the permanence of the federal investment while shaping land use and economic development in a project corridor.
- 7. Support a Freight Program -** It is vital to Oregon's economic future to retain our strength as a distribution point within the global trade network. Both the earlier House and Senate Bills recognized the importance of federal programs to enhance the nation's infrastructure for freight movement. The Portland region supports funding for intermodal connectors and multi-state corridors. In addition, the region urges approval of provisions that would make publicly owned intermodal freight transportation projects eligible for Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds and TIFIA assistance.
- 8. Retain Trust Funds and General Funds in the Transit Program –** Historically, the Transit program has been funded through both Trust Funds dollars and General Fund dollars, spread across the entire program. The House Bill (TEA-LU) proposed to shift the General Fund dollars to the New Starts category and the Trust Fund dollars to the balance of the transit program. This would place New Start dollars at considerable risk and the region supports use of Trust Fund dollars. Similarly, the Senate Bill put transit funding at a significant risk due to the lack of the same “firewall” guarantees as highway funding.
- 9. Retain the CMAQ apportionment –** Of critical importance to the Portland region is to maintain apportionment of CMAQ funds to the region with the change in the standard for ozone from a 1-hour standard to an 8-hour standard (a detailed amendment is included as Attachment 1 to Exhibit “A”). Under current provisions, the Portland region would be penalized by attaining federal Clean Air standards for ozone even though CMAQ funds are needed to continue to maintain these standards.

10. Ensure federal legislation does not limit the use of toll revenue – Current legislation provides for tolling under certain circumstances of existing and proposed highways. These could take the form of new tolls to rehabilitate existing facilities or build new facilities. It could also take the form of peak period pricing to enable facilities to be better managed for their optimum use. Tolling provisions that maintain or increase flexibility are good. Any attempts to repeal existing tolling authority should be opposed.

11. Support Planning Funds as provided for in the Senate Bill – The Senate Bill provided for a funding level for planning commensurate with the mandates that are placed upon metropolitan planning organizations and in recognition of the increased number of metropolitan planning organizations that have been formed as a result of the 2000 Census.

In addition to High Priority Projects, the reauthorization of TEA-21 will include earmarking for specific transportation projects. The region hereby provides the Congressional delegation with candidate projects to select from in certain discretionary funding categories. Certainly, a very high priority for the Portland region is to authorize projects for funding through the New Starts and Small Starts Program. Whether other discretionary categories are created that could be earmarked remains to be seen, but some of these categories could be used for earmarking some of the Portland area projects. The project list reflects possible categories to be considered for earmarking, depending on the outcome of their status in the Bill. See Exhibit B for the project priorities.

Proposed CMAQ apportionment formula amendment to correct the unintended consequence of the change in the 1-hour to an 8-hour standard for ozone.

The current CMAQ apportionment formula (the excerpt below is the section of Title 23 dealing with CMAQ apportionment) provides for the distribution of CMAQ funds to states based upon the population of the areas designated as “non-attainment” and “maintenance” with a factor weighted for the severity of the pollution in the area [subsections (i) through (vii) are the weighting factors]. The Portland region historically was in “non-attainment” of the 1-hour standard for ozone and in 1996 was redesignated as a “maintenance” area. Maintenance areas have met the ozone standard and have an approved 10-year plan to continue to maintain the standard. In 2003, EPA changed the ozone standard from a 1-hour standard to an 8-hour standard. Under the new 8-hour standard, the Portland area is redesignated to “attainment” status, making the area no longer eligible for distribution of CMAQ funds on the basis of ozone.

Current CMAQ authorization:

“Title 23 – Highways; Chapter 1 – Federal Aid Highways; Subchapter 1 – General Provisions; Section 104 Apportionment; Subsection (2) Congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program.--

(A) In general.--For the congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program, in the ratio that--

- (i) the total of all weighted nonattainment and maintenance area populations in each State; bears to
- (ii) the total of all weighted nonattainment and maintenance area populations in all States.

(B) Calculation of weighted nonattainment and maintenance area population.--Subject to subparagraph (C), for the purpose of subparagraph (A), the weighted nonattainment and maintenance area population shall be calculated by multiplying the population of each area in a State that was a nonattainment area or maintenance area as described in section 149(b) for ozone or carbon monoxide by a factor of--

- (i) 0.8 if--
 - (I) at the time of the apportionment, the area is a maintenance area; or
 - (II) at the time of the apportionment, the area is classified as a submarginal ozone nonattainment area under the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.);
- (ii) 1.0 if, at the time of the apportionment, the area is classified as a marginal ozone nonattainment area under subpart 2 of part D of title I of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7511 et seq.);
- (iii) 1.1 if, at the time of the apportionment, the area is classified as a moderate ozone nonattainment area under such subpart;
- (iv) 1.2 if, at the time of the apportionment, the area is classified as a serious ozone nonattainment area under such subpart;
- (v) 1.3 if, at the time of the apportionment, the area is classified as a severe ozone nonattainment area under such subpart;

- (vi) 1.4 if, at the time of the apportionment, the area is classified as an extreme ozone nonattainment area under such subpart; or
- (vii) 1.0 if, at the time of the apportionment, the area is not a nonattainment or maintenance area as described in section 149(b) for ozone, but is classified under subpart 3 of part D of title I of such Act (42 U.S.C. 7512 et seq.) as a nonattainment area described in section 149(b) for carbon monoxide.

(C) Additional adjustment for carbon monoxide areas.--

(i) Carbon monoxide nonattainment areas.--If, in addition to being classified as a nonattainment or maintenance area for ozone, the area was also classified under subpart 3 of part D of title I of such Act (42 U.S.C. 7512 et seq.) as a nonattainment area described in section 149(b) for carbon monoxide, the weighted nonattainment or maintenance area population of the area, as determined under clauses (i) through (vi) of subparagraph (B), shall be further multiplied by a factor of 1.2.

(ii) Carbon monoxide maintenance areas.--If, in addition to being classified as a nonattainment or maintenance area for ozone, the area was at one time also classified under subpart 3 of part D of title I of such Act (42 U.S.C. 7512 et seq.) as a nonattainment area described in section 149(b) for carbon monoxide but has been redesignated as a maintenance area, the weighted nonattainment or maintenance area population of the area, as determined under clauses (i) through (vi) of subparagraph (B), shall be further multiplied by a factor of 1.1.

(D) Minimum apportionment.--Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, each State shall receive a minimum of $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 percent of the funds apportioned under this paragraph.

(E) Determinations of population.--In determining population figures for the purposes of this paragraph, the Secretary shall use the latest available annual estimates prepared by the Secretary of Commerce.

Proposed CMAQ amendment:

In paragraph (1) below, SAFETEA changes the apportionment formula by changing the weighting factor for "maintenance" areas from 0.8 to 1.0 thereby having the affect of removing the disincentive of a 20% funding reduction for areas that have cleaned up their air and met federal ozone standards. This is a significant improvement and should be supported.

In paragraph (2) below, SAFETEA changes the apportionment formula by adding two more subsections [(viii) and (ix)] with weighting factors to apportion funds to areas previously not designated under the old 1-hour ozone standard but now designated under the new 8-hour ozone standard and to apportion funds to areas with violations to the particulate standard. **Inserted into subparagraph (2) below is a new section (x) proposed for inclusion by the Portland region to recognize areas like the Portland region that were previously designated under the 1-hour standard.**

*SAFETEA: SEC. 1611. ADDITION OF PARTICULATE MATTER AREAS TO CMAQ.
Section 104(b)(2) of title 23, United States Code, is amended--*

(1) in subparagraph B--

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking 'ozone or carbon monoxide' and inserting 'ozone, carbon monoxide, or fine particulate matter (PM2.5)';

(B) by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

'(i) 1.0, if at the time of apportionment, the area is a maintenance area;';

(C) in clause (vi), by striking 'or' after the semicolon; and

(D) in clause (vii), by striking 'area as described in section 149(b) for ozone,' and inserting 'area for ozone (as described in section 149(b)) or for PM-2.5';

(2) by adding at the end the following:

'(viii) 1.0 if, at the time of apportionment, any county that is not designated as a nonattainment or maintenance area under the 1-hour ozone standard is designated as nonattainment under the 8-hour ozone standard;

'(ix) 1.2 if, at the time of apportionment, the area is not a nonattainment or maintenance area as described in section 149(b) for ozone or carbon monoxide, but is an area designated nonattainment under the PM-2.5 standard.'

"(x) 1.0 if, at the time of apportionment, the area is not designated as a nonattainment or maintenance area under the 8-hour ozone standard but was designated as a nonattainment area or maintenance area under the 1-hour ozone standard."

(3) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

'(C) **ADDITIONAL ADJUSTMENT FOR CARBON MONOXIDE AREAS-** If, in addition to being designated as a nonattainment or maintenance area for ozone as described in section 149(b), any county within the area was also classified under subpart 3 of part D of title I of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7512 et seq.) as a nonattainment or maintenance area described in section 149(b) for carbon monoxide, the weighted nonattainment or maintenance area population of the county, as determined under clauses (i) through (vi) or clause (viii) of subparagraph (B), shall be further multiplied by a factor of 1.2.';

(4) by redesignating subparagraph (D) and (E) as subparagraphs (E) and (F) respectively; and

(5) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

'(D) **ADDITIONAL ADJUSTMENT FOR PM 2.5 AREAS-** If, in addition to being designated as a nonattainment or maintenance area for ozone or carbon monoxide, or both as described in section 149(b), any county within the area was also designated under the PM-2.5 standard as a nonattainment or maintenance area, the weighted nonattainment or maintenance area population of those counties shall be further multiplied by a factor of 1.2.'.

Metro Area Reauthorization Request List
(\$million)

4-20-05

Project Type/ Name	Authorization Request	Source	Purpose	House T&I Mark	Page
Regional Highway Projects					
I-5 Trade Corridor (ODOT Share)					
* I-5: Delta Park to Lombard Widening	\$ 32.800	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 10.000	
* Highway/Transit Columbia Crossing	\$ 15.000	Hwy Demo	PE/EIS	\$ 6.000	
* Highway/Transit Columbia Crossing	\$ 35.000	Projects of National Significance ¹	PE/EIS/Final Design		
I-5/99W Connector	\$ 15.000	Hwy Demo	PE/ROW		
Hwy 217:Tualatin Valley Highway to US 26	\$ 26.900	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 6.250	
Sunrise Project I-205 to Rock Creek	\$ 32.000	Hwy Demo	PE/ROW	\$ 3.000	
Columbia Intermodal Corridor					
* Ramsey Railroad Yard	\$ 11.000	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 12.000	
* Air Cargo Access Road	\$ 9.000	Hwy Demo	Construction		
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 176.700			\$ 37.250	
Regional Transit Priorities					
	<i>This assumes that rail projects will not be dollar earmarked</i>				
South/North LRT Project Segments					
	<i>Reauthorization</i>				
Interstate MAX	Reauthorize	5309 New Starts	Construction	\$ 23.293	
South Corridor/I-205	Reauthorize	5309 New Starts	Construction	Authorized	
Milwaukie Light Rail	Reauthorize	5309 New Starts	PE		
North: Expo to Clark County	Reauthorize	5309 New Starts	PE		
Wilsonville-Beaverton Commuter Rail Proj.	Reauthorize	5309 New Starts	Construction	Authorized	
TriMet Bus and Bus Related	\$ 41.000	5309 Bus	Buses		
SMART Bus - Wilsonville	\$ 1.900	5309 Bus	Buses/Bus Facility	\$ 0.800	
Portland Streetcar				Authorized	
Segment 1: to Lloyd District	Authorize	Small Starts	Construction		
Segment 2: To Central Eastside District	Authorize	Small Starts	Construction		
Segment 3: To South Waterfront	Authorize	Small Starts	Construction		
Segment 4: To Lake Oswego	Authorize	Small Starts	Construction		
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 42.900			\$ 24.093	
Local Project Priorities					
Wilsonville: Boeckman Road -Urban Village	\$ 3.000	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 3.000	
Wilsonville: Barber Street Urban Village Connection	\$ 3.700	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 1.000	
Milwaukie: Lake Road	\$ 6.000	TCSP/Safe Routes to Schools	Construction	\$ 3.000	
Gresham: Gresham Civic Neighborhood LRT Station	\$ 2.700	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 1.500	
Gresham: Rockwood Town Center	\$ 2.000	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 2.000	
Oregon City: I-205/Hwy 213 Interchange	\$ 5.600	Hwy Demo	PE/EIS		
Portland: North Macadam Access	\$ 23.000	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 9.000	
Portland: Gateway 102nd ²	\$ 4.800	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 7.800	
Portland: East Burnside - Willamette River to East 14th ³	\$ 1.500	Hwy Demo	PE		
Portland: Eastside Streetcar ³	\$ 1.500	Hwy Demo	PE		
Multnomah Co.: Sellwood Bridge	\$ 25.000	Bridge/Hwy Demo	Construction		
Washington Co.: Beaverton Hillsdale/Scholls	\$ 25.000	Hwy Demo	PE/ROW		
Metro TOD Revolving Fund	\$ 10.000	TCSP	Construction		
Metro Regional Trail Program - Next Phase	\$ 5.000	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 4.500	
Metro Regional Culvert Retrofit - Phase I	\$ 5.000	Hwy Demo	Construction		
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 123.800			\$ 31.800	
Research					
Designated Portland State University as Federal University Transportation Research Center	\$ 2.500	University Transportation Centers Program	Designate as University Research Ctr.	Language	
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 2.500				
Request for Other Priorities					
I-5 Trade Corridor ³ (WSDOT Share)	\$ 50.000	Hwy Demo	PE/EIS/Final Design	\$ 10.000	
City of Sandy Transit	\$ 1.200	5309 Bus	Veh. Maintenance & Storage Facility		
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 51.200			\$ 10.000	

¹Subject to creation of this category of funds.
²Request to Washington Congressional Delegation.
³Could be submitted as a single \$7.8 million Gateway request.

Metro Area Reauthorization Request List
(Smillion)

03.04.05

Project Type/ Name	Authorization Request	Source	Purpose	House T&I Mark	Page
Regional Highway Projects					
I-5 Trade Corridor (ODOT Share)					
* I-5: Delta Park to Lombard Widening	\$ 32.800	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 10.000	
* Highway/Transit Columbia Crossing	\$ 15.000	Hwy Demo	PE/EIS	\$ 6.000	
* Highway/Transit Columbia Crossing	\$ 35.000	Projects of National Significance ¹	PE/EIS/Final Design		
I-5/99W Connector	\$ 15.000	Hwy Demo	PE/ROW		
Hwy 217:Tualatin Valley Highway to US 26	\$ 26.900	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 6.250	
Sunrise Project I-205 to Rock Creek	\$ 32.000	Hwy Demo	PE/ROW	\$ 3.000	
Columbia Intermodal Corridor					
* Ramsey Railroad Yard	\$ 11.000	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 12.000	
* Air Cargo Access Road	\$ 9.000	Hwy Demo	Construction		
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 176.700			\$ 37.250	
Regional Transit Priorities					
	<i>This assumes that rail projects will not be dollar earmarked</i>				
South/North LRT Project Segments					
	<i>Reauthorization</i>				
Interstate MAX	Reauthorize	5309 New Starts	Construction	\$ 23.293	
South Corridor/I-205	Reauthorize	5309 New Starts	Construction	Authorized	
Milwaukie Light Rail	Reauthorize	5309 New Starts	PE		
North: Expo to Clark County	Reauthorize	5309 New Starts	PE		
Wilsonville-Beaverton Commuter Rail Proj.	Reauthorize	5309 New Starts	Construction	Authorized	
TriMet Bus and Bus Related	\$ 41.000	5309 Bus	Buses		
SMART Bus - Wilsonville	\$ 1.900	5309 Bus	Buses/Bus Facility	\$ 0.800	
Portland Streetcar				Authorized	
Segment 1: to Lloyd District	Authorize	Small Starts	Construction		
Segment 2: To Central Eastside District	Authorize	Small Starts	Construction		
Segment 3: To South Waterfront	Authorize	Small Starts	Construction		
Segment 4: To Lake Oswego	Authorize	Small Starts	Construction		
-TOTAL	\$ 42.900			\$ 24.093	
Local Project Priorities					
Wilsonville: Boeckman Road -Urban Village	\$ 3.000	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 3.000	
Wilsonville: Barber Street Urban Village Connection	\$ 3.700	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 1.000	
Milwaukie: Lake Road	\$ 6.000	TCSP/Safe Routes to Schools	Construction	\$ 3.000	
Gresham: Gresham Civic Neighborhood LRT Station	\$ 2.700	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 1.500	
Gresham: Rockwood Town Center	\$ 2.000	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 2.000	
Oregon City: I-205/Hwy 213 Interchange	\$ 5.600	Hwy Demo	PE/EIS		
Portland: North Macadam Access	\$ 15.000	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 15.000	
Portland: North Macadam Access	\$ 9.000	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 9.000	
Portland: Gateway 102nd ¹	\$ 4.800	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 7.800	
Portland: East Burnside - Willamette River to East 14th ³	\$ 1.500	Hwy Demo	PE		
Portland: Eastside Streetcar ²	\$ 1.500	Hwy Demo	PE		
Multnomah Co.: Sellwood Bridge	\$ 25.000	Bridge/Hwy Demo	Construction		
Washington Co.: Beaverton Hillsdale/Scholls	\$ 25.000	Hwy Demo	PE/ROW		
Metro TOD Revolving Fund	\$ 10.000	TCSP	Construction		
Metro Regional Trail Program - Next Phase	\$ 5.000	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 4.500	
Metro Regional Culvert Retrofit - Phase I	\$ 5.000	Hwy Demo	Construction		
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 124.800			\$ 46.800	
Research					
Designated Portland State University as Federal University Transportation Research Center	\$ 2.500	University Transportation Centers Program	Designate as University Research Ctr.	Language	
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 2.500				
Port for Other Priorities					
I-5 Trade Corridor ² (WSDOT Share)	\$ 50.000	Hwy Demo	PE/EIS/Final Design	\$ 10.000	
City of Sandy Transit	\$ 1.200	5309 Bus	Veh. Maintenance & Storage Facility		
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 51.200			\$ 10.000	

¹Subject to creation of this category of funds.

²Request to Washington Congressional Delegation.

³Could be submitted as a single \$7.8 million Gateway request.

Metro Area Reauthorization Request List
(\$million)

05-00-05




Project Type/ Name	Authorization Request	Source	Purpose	House T&I Mark	Page
Regional Highway Projects					
I-5 Trade Corridor (ODOT Share)					
* I-5: Delta Park to Lombard Widening	\$ 32.800	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 10.000	
* Highway/Transit Columbia Crossing	\$ 15.000	Hwy Demo	PE/EIS	\$ 6.000	
* Highway/Transit Columbia Crossing	\$ 35.000	Projects of National Significance ¹	PE/EIS/Final Design		
I-5/99W Connector	\$ 15.000	Hwy Demo	PE/ROW		
Hwy 217:Tualatin Valley Highway to US 26	\$ 26.900	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 6.250	
Sunrise Project I-205 to Rock Creek	\$ 32.000	Hwy Demo	PE/ROW	\$ 3.000	
Columbia Intermodal Corridor					
* Ramsey Railroad Yard	\$ 11.000	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 12.000	
* Air Cargo Access Road	\$ 9.000	Hwy Demo.	Construction		
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 176.700			\$ 37.250	
Regional Transit Priorities					
	<i>This assumes that rail projects will not be dollar earmarked</i>				
South/North LRT Project Segments					
<i>Reauthorization</i>					
Interstate MAX	Reauthorize	5309 New Starts	Construction	\$ 23.293	
South Corridor/I-205	Reauthorize	5309 New Starts	Construction	Authorized	
Milwaukie Light Rail	Reauthorize	5309 New Starts	PE		
North: Expo to Clark County	Reauthorize	5309 New Starts	PE		
Wilsonville-Beaverton Commuter Rail Proj.	Reauthorize	5309 New Starts	Construction	Authorized	
TriMet Bus and Bus Related	\$ 41.000	5309 Bus	Buses		
SMART Bus - Wilsonville	\$ 1.900	5309 Bus	Buses/Bus Facility	\$ 0.800	
Portland Streetcar				Authorized	
Segment 1: to Lloyd District	Authorize	Small Starts	Construction		
Segment 2: To Central Eastside District	Authorize	Small Starts	Construction		
Segment 3: To South Waterfront	Authorize	Small Starts	Construction		
Segment 4: To Lake Oswego	Authorize	Small Starts	Construction		
TOTAL	\$ 42.900			\$ 24.093	
Local Project Priorities					
Wilsonville: Bockman Road -Urban Village	\$ 3.000	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 3.000	
Wilsonville: Barber Street Urban Village Connection	\$ 3.700	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 1.000	
Milwaukie: Lake Road	\$ 6.000	TCSP/Safe Routes to Schools	Construction	\$ 3.000	
Gresham: Gresham Civic Neighborhood LRT Station	\$ 2.700	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 1.500	
Gresham: Rockwood Town Center	\$ 2.000	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 2.000	
Oregon City: I-205/Hwy 213 Interchange	\$ 5.600	Hwy Demo	PE/EIS		
Portland: North Macadam Access	\$ 15.000	Hwy Demo	Construction		
Portland: North Macadam Access	\$ 9.000	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 9.000	
Portland: Gateway 102nd	\$ 4.800	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 7.800	
Portland: East Burnside/Street Car	\$ 5.000	Hwy Demo	PE		
Multnomah Co.: Sellwood Bridge	\$ 25.000	Bridge/Hwy Demo	Construction		
Washington Co.: Beaverton Hillsdale/Scholls	\$ 25.000	Hwy Demo	PE/ROW		
Metro TOD Revolving Fund	\$ 10.000	TCSP	Construction		
Metro Regional Trail Program - Next Phase	\$ 5.000	Hwy Demo	Construction	\$ 4.500	
Metro Regional Culvert Retrofit - Phase 1	\$ 5.000	Hwy Demo	Construction		
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 126.800			\$ 31.800	
Research					
Designated Portland State University and Federal University Transportation Research Center	\$ 2.500	University Transportation Centers Program	Designate as University Research Ctr.	Language	
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 2.500				
Support for Other Priorities					
I-5 Trade Corridor ² (WSDOT Share)	\$ 50.000	Hwy Demo	PE/EIS/Final Design	\$ 10.000	
Sandy Transit	\$ 1.200	5309 Bus	Veh. Maintenance & Storage Facility		
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 51.200			\$ 10.000	

¹Subject to creation of this category of funds.

²Request to Washington Congressional Delegation.

TEA-LU (HR 3550)
HIGHWAY TITLE ONLY

The House Transportation Reauthorization bill is the product of two committees. The House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee released a bill (TEA-LU) covering the highway and transit title. Because TEA-LU increases funding beyond existing capacity, new revenues must be enacted by the House Ways and Means Committee. Ways and Means has not yet produced a bill. So, the table below reviews only TEA-LU. Only changes to TEA-21 are addressed. The table uses the following symbols to rate the overall affect of a proposed change.

Very Good	Good	Neutral	Bad	Very Bad	Unclear
					









Highway Title Revenue: 2004-2009 Section 2311(c) (Amended)		SOURCE OF FUNDING (Total of Funding) EXISTING PROGRAMS (TEA-21)																																
AMOUNT FROM EPW'S AND WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE (Total) (Only those programs that increase the Total Funding)																																		
	Interstate Maintenance Program SAFTEA §1101(a)(1) Amends 23 USC 119	<p><u>If revenue is enhanced</u>, TEA-LU provides 36% higher Interstate Maintenance funding than TEA 21; 16% less IM funding than SAFETEA.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bill:</th> <th>Yr 1</th> <th>Yr 2</th> <th>Yr 3</th> <th>Yr 4</th> <th>Yr 5</th> <th>Yr 6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-21</td> <td>\$3.43</td> <td>\$3.96</td> <td>\$4.00</td> <td>\$4.07</td> <td>\$4.14</td> <td>\$4.22</td> <td>\$23.81</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EPW Bill</td> <td>\$5.50</td> <td>\$6.30</td> <td>\$6.55</td> <td>\$6.55</td> <td>\$6.55</td> <td>\$6.55</td> <td>\$38.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill</td> <td>\$4.50</td> <td>\$4.99</td> <td>\$5.36</td> <td>\$5.71</td> <td>\$5.87</td> <td>\$6.07</td> <td>\$32.50</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>In FY2003, Oregon received 1.30% (\$57M) of the nationwide apportionment of Interstate Maintenance funds; the highest percentage share among all major road programs, except for High Priority Projects.</p>	Bill:	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5	Yr 6	TOTAL	TEA-21	\$3.43	\$3.96	\$4.00	\$4.07	\$4.14	\$4.22	\$23.81	EPW Bill	\$5.50	\$6.30	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$38.00	House Bill	\$4.50	\$4.99	\$5.36	\$5.71	\$5.87	\$6.07	\$32.50
Bill:	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5	Yr 6	TOTAL																											
TEA-21	\$3.43	\$3.96	\$4.00	\$4.07	\$4.14	\$4.22	\$23.81																											
EPW Bill	\$5.50	\$6.30	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$38.00																											
House Bill	\$4.50	\$4.99	\$5.36	\$5.71	\$5.87	\$6.07	\$32.50																											

Exhibit C-1 to Resolution No. 05-3544



	National Highway System Program TEA-LU §1101(a)(2) Amends 23 USC 103	<p><u>If revenue is enhanced</u>, TEA-LU provides 36% higher National Highway System funding than TEA 21; 15% less NHS funding than SAFETEA.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bill:</th> <th>Year 1</th> <th>Year 2</th> <th>Year 3</th> <th>Year 4</th> <th>Year 5</th> <th>Year 6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-21</td> <td>\$4.112</td> <td>\$4.749</td> <td>\$4.793</td> <td>\$4.888</td> <td>\$4.968</td> <td>\$5.061</td> <td>\$28.571</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EPW Bill</td> <td>\$6.650</td> <td>\$7.650</td> <td>\$7.950</td> <td>\$7.950</td> <td>\$7.950</td> <td>\$7.950</td> <td>\$46.100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill</td> <td>\$5.401</td> <td>\$5.986</td> <td>\$6.431</td> <td>\$6.854</td> <td>\$7.039</td> <td>\$7.287</td> <td>\$38.998</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>In FY2003, Oregon received 1.24% (\$68M) of the nationwide apportionment of NHS funds.</p>	Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL	TEA-21	\$4.112	\$4.749	\$4.793	\$4.888	\$4.968	\$5.061	\$28.571	EPW Bill	\$6.650	\$7.650	\$7.950	\$7.950	\$7.950	\$7.950	\$46.100	House Bill	\$5.401	\$5.986	\$6.431	\$6.854	\$7.039	\$7.287	\$38.998
Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL																											
TEA-21	\$4.112	\$4.749	\$4.793	\$4.888	\$4.968	\$5.061	\$28.571																											
EPW Bill	\$6.650	\$7.650	\$7.950	\$7.950	\$7.950	\$7.950	\$46.100																											
House Bill	\$5.401	\$5.986	\$6.431	\$6.854	\$7.039	\$7.287	\$38.998																											
	Highway Bridge Program TEA-LU §1101(a)(3); §1112 Amends 23 USC 144	<p><u>If revenue is enhanced</u>, TEA-LU provides 37% higher Highway Bridge funding than TEA 21, and 14% less Highway Bridge funding than SAFETEA.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bill:</th> <th>Year 1</th> <th>Year 2</th> <th>Year 3</th> <th>Year 4</th> <th>Year 5</th> <th>Year 6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-21</td> <td>\$2.941</td> <td>\$3.395</td> <td>\$3.427</td> <td>\$3.495</td> <td>\$3.552</td> <td>\$3.619</td> <td>\$20.429</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senate Bill</td> <td>\$4.700</td> <td>\$5.400</td> <td>\$5.600</td> <td>\$5.600</td> <td>\$5.600</td> <td>\$5.600</td> <td>\$32.500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill</td> <td>\$3.862</td> <td>\$4.280</td> <td>\$4.599</td> <td>\$4.901</td> <td>\$5.033</td> <td>\$5.211</td> <td>\$27.886</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>In FY2003, Oregon received 1.22% (\$46M) of the nationwide apportionment of Bridge funds. TEA-LU makes few changes to Highway Bridge program. Restrictions on preventive maintenance are eased. Bridge Discretionary Program levels remains at \$100M per year, as in TEA-21. From 1998-2002 Oregon received <u>no</u> Bridge Discretionary funds; while \$462M was granted nationally.</p>	Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL	TEA-21	\$2.941	\$3.395	\$3.427	\$3.495	\$3.552	\$3.619	\$20.429	Senate Bill	\$4.700	\$5.400	\$5.600	\$5.600	\$5.600	\$5.600	\$32.500	House Bill	\$3.862	\$4.280	\$4.599	\$4.901	\$5.033	\$5.211	\$27.886
Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL																											
TEA-21	\$2.941	\$3.395	\$3.427	\$3.495	\$3.552	\$3.619	\$20.429																											
Senate Bill	\$4.700	\$5.400	\$5.600	\$5.600	\$5.600	\$5.600	\$32.500																											
House Bill	\$3.862	\$4.280	\$4.599	\$4.901	\$5.033	\$5.211	\$27.886																											
	Surface Transport. Program TEA-LU §1101(a)(5); §1202(c) Amends 23 USC 133	<p>TEA-LU removes from the STP program the 10% set-aside requirement for safety projects (creating a separate, highly-funded safety program in lieu of the set-aside). Taken this adjustment into account, TEA-LU increases funds for non-safety, STP projects by 51%, <u>if revenue is enhanced</u>; a notably greater increase than for other funding programs.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">STP Funds Not Set Aside for Safety Projects Excludes funds Set Aside for Stormwater in SAFTEA</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bill:</th> <th>Year 1</th> <th>Year 2</th> <th>Year 3</th> <th>Year 4</th> <th>Year 5</th> <th>Year 6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-21</td> <td>\$4.318</td> <td>\$4.986</td> <td>\$5.033</td> <td>\$5.133</td> <td>\$5.216</td> <td>\$5.315</td> <td>\$30.000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senate Bill</td> <td>\$6.811</td> <td>\$7.791</td> <td>\$8.085</td> <td>\$8.085</td> <td>\$8.085</td> <td>\$8.085</td> <td>\$46.942</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill</td> <td>\$6.286</td> <td>\$6.954</td> <td>\$7.461</td> <td>\$7.942</td> <td>\$8.147</td> <td>\$8.446</td> <td>\$45.236</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>TEA-LU adds to the list of STP-eligible projects incident response, technology deployment, emergency response, traveler information, etc. activities. The STP program is Oregon's largest federal road program. FY2003, Oregon received 1.26% (\$81M) of the nationwide apportionment of STP funds. <u>The JPACT reauthorization agenda should prioritize increases to the STP program.</u></p>	Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL	TEA-21	\$4.318	\$4.986	\$5.033	\$5.133	\$5.216	\$5.315	\$30.000	Senate Bill	\$6.811	\$7.791	\$8.085	\$8.085	\$8.085	\$8.085	\$46.942	House Bill	\$6.286	\$6.954	\$7.461	\$7.942	\$8.147	\$8.446	\$45.236
Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL																											
TEA-21	\$4.318	\$4.986	\$5.033	\$5.133	\$5.216	\$5.315	\$30.000																											
Senate Bill	\$6.811	\$7.791	\$8.085	\$8.085	\$8.085	\$8.085	\$46.942																											
House Bill	\$6.286	\$6.954	\$7.461	\$7.942	\$8.147	\$8.446	\$45.236																											

	<p>CMAQ Program TEA-LU §1101(a)(6); Amends 23 USC 104(b)(2); 149</p>	<p>Consistent with other existing funding sources, TEA-LU proposes to increase CMAQ funding by 59% compared to TEA-21.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="756 274 1693 407"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bill:</th> <th>Year 1</th> <th>Year 2</th> <th>Year 3</th> <th>Year 4</th> <th>Year 5</th> <th>Year 6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-21</td> <td>\$1.193</td> <td>\$1.345</td> <td>\$1.358</td> <td>\$1.385</td> <td>\$1.407</td> <td>\$1.434</td> <td>\$ 8.122</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senate Bill</td> <td>\$1.900</td> <td>\$2.150</td> <td>\$2.225</td> <td>\$2.225</td> <td>\$2.225</td> <td>\$2.225</td> <td>\$12.950</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill</td> <td>\$1.530</td> <td>\$1.696</td> <td>\$1.822</td> <td>\$1.942</td> <td>\$1.994</td> <td>\$2.065</td> <td>\$11.049</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>CMAQ is the lowest of the major funding sources for Oregon, both as an absolute amount and in terms of its share of the nationwide apportionment, but is a critical source allocated through JPACT and the Metro Council. In FY2003, Oregon received 0.68% (\$10M) of the nationwide apportionment of CMAQ funds. It is also the most restrictive in terms of eligible projects. A recent EPA rule changed ozone standards; making Portland an "attainment area" rather than a "maintenance area." As a result, Portland will get a lower share of CMAQ funds in the future. Accordingly:</p> <p>(a) Allow Portland to retain its eligibility for ozone-related CMAQ funds by amending TEA-LU to add 23 USC 104(b)(2)(B)(viii) as follows: <u>"(viii) 1.0 if, at the time of apportionment, the area is not designated as a nonattainment or maintenance area under the 8-hour ozone standard but was designated as a nonattainment area or maintenance area under the 1-hour ozone standard."</u></p> <p>(b) Support the change of the apportionment factor from .8 to 1.0 for areas achieving a "Maintenance status."</p>	Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL	TEA-21	\$1.193	\$1.345	\$1.358	\$1.385	\$1.407	\$1.434	\$ 8.122	Senate Bill	\$1.900	\$2.150	\$2.225	\$2.225	\$2.225	\$2.225	\$12.950	House Bill	\$1.530	\$1.696	\$1.822	\$1.942	\$1.994	\$2.065	\$11.049																																																
Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL																																																																											
TEA-21	\$1.193	\$1.345	\$1.358	\$1.385	\$1.407	\$1.434	\$ 8.122																																																																											
Senate Bill	\$1.900	\$2.150	\$2.225	\$2.225	\$2.225	\$2.225	\$12.950																																																																											
House Bill	\$1.530	\$1.696	\$1.822	\$1.942	\$1.994	\$2.065	\$11.049																																																																											
	<p>Transportation & Community & System Preservation Program TEA-LU §1113 Amends 23USC101 note 112 Stat 223</p>	<p>The total TCSP authorization under TEA-LU is roughly double TEA-21. No other changes are proposed.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="846 862 1481 995"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bill:</th> <th>Year 1</th> <th>Year 2</th> <th>Year 3</th> <th>Year 4</th> <th>Year 5</th> <th>Year 6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-21</td> <td></td> <td>\$0020</td> <td>\$0025</td> <td>\$0025</td> <td>\$0025</td> <td>\$0025</td> <td>\$0120</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senate Bill</td> <td>\$0050</td> <td>\$0050</td> <td>\$0050</td> <td>\$0050</td> <td>\$0050</td> <td>\$0050</td> <td>\$0300</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill</td> <td>\$0030</td> <td>\$0035</td> <td>\$0040</td> <td>\$0045</td> <td>\$0050</td> <td>\$0050</td> <td>\$0250</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>However, the authorization levels and selection criteria under TEA-21 had little to do with actual grants:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="816 1058 1542 1277"> <thead> <tr> <th>TEA-21 ACTUAL</th> <th>1998</th> <th>1999</th> <th>2000</th> <th>2001</th> <th>2002</th> <th>2003</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Discretionary Grant</td> <td></td> <td>\$0013</td> <td>\$0009</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>\$0022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cong. Earmark</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>\$0022</td> <td>\$0047</td> <td>\$0273</td> <td>\$0089</td> <td>\$0431</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td></td> <td>\$0013</td> <td>\$0031</td> <td>\$0047</td> <td>\$0273</td> <td>\$0089</td> <td>\$0453</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Oregon Grants</td> <td></td> <td>\$0001</td> <td>\$0001</td> <td>\$0000</td> <td>\$ -</td> <td>\$0001</td> <td>\$0003</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Oregon Percent</td> <td></td> <td>84%</td> <td>181%</td> <td>080%</td> <td>000%</td> <td>143%</td> <td>073%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Overall, Oregon/Portland has not done as well with TCSP as other programs.</p>	Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL	TEA-21		\$0020	\$0025	\$0025	\$0025	\$0025	\$0120	Senate Bill	\$0050	\$0050	\$0050	\$0050	\$0050	\$0050	\$0300	House Bill	\$0030	\$0035	\$0040	\$0045	\$0050	\$0050	\$0250	TEA-21 ACTUAL	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	TOTAL	Discretionary Grant		\$0013	\$0009				\$0022	Cong. Earmark			\$0022	\$0047	\$0273	\$0089	\$0431	Total		\$0013	\$0031	\$0047	\$0273	\$0089	\$0453	Oregon Grants		\$0001	\$0001	\$0000	\$ -	\$0001	\$0003	Oregon Percent		84%	181%	080%	000%	143%	073%
Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL																																																																											
TEA-21		\$0020	\$0025	\$0025	\$0025	\$0025	\$0120																																																																											
Senate Bill	\$0050	\$0050	\$0050	\$0050	\$0050	\$0050	\$0300																																																																											
House Bill	\$0030	\$0035	\$0040	\$0045	\$0050	\$0050	\$0250																																																																											
TEA-21 ACTUAL	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	TOTAL																																																																											
Discretionary Grant		\$0013	\$0009				\$0022																																																																											
Cong. Earmark			\$0022	\$0047	\$0273	\$0089	\$0431																																																																											
Total		\$0013	\$0031	\$0047	\$0273	\$0089	\$0453																																																																											
Oregon Grants		\$0001	\$0001	\$0000	\$ -	\$0001	\$0003																																																																											
Oregon Percent		84%	181%	080%	000%	143%	073%																																																																											





	<p>Multi-State Corridor TEA-LU §1101(a)(10); §1301 Border Planning, Operations, Tech. TEA-LU §1101(a)(11); §1302</p>	<p>“Corridor” funds are available to the I-5 Trade Corridor. Oregon is not eligible for “Border” funds. Under TEA-21, “Border” and “Corridor” funds were authorized as one program. About 80% of these funds were allocated to “Corridor” projects. TEA-LU establishes independent funding authorizations for both programs and increases funding by about eight-fold. TEA-LU’s split between Border and Corridor funds is consistent with past practice. A section has been reserved in TEA-LU for the operations of the program; <u>so it is yet not clear how the funds will be allocated.</u></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="655 407 1697 831"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="8">Borders and Corridors Programs</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="8"><i>In TEA-21 Programs Combined, in SAFETEA/TEA-LU Separate Programs</i></th> </tr> <tr> <th>Bill:</th> <th>Year 1</th> <th>Year 2</th> <th>Year 3</th> <th>Year 4</th> <th>Year 5</th> <th>Year 6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-21; B&C.</td> <td>\$0.140</td> <td>\$0.140</td> <td>\$0.140</td> <td>\$0.140</td> <td>\$0.140</td> <td>\$0.140</td> <td>\$0.840</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senate Bill: Corridors</td> <td>\$0.112</td> <td>\$0.135</td> <td>\$0.157</td> <td>\$0.180</td> <td>\$0.202</td> <td>\$0.225</td> <td>\$1.011</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senate Bill: Borders</td> <td>\$0.112</td> <td>\$0.135</td> <td>\$0.157</td> <td>\$0.180</td> <td>\$0.202</td> <td>\$0.225</td> <td>\$1.011</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senate Bill: B&C</td> <td>\$0.224</td> <td>\$0.270</td> <td>\$0.314</td> <td>\$0.360</td> <td>\$0.404</td> <td>\$0.450</td> <td>\$2.022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill: Corridors</td> <td>\$0.500</td> <td>\$0.900</td> <td>\$0.900</td> <td>\$0.900</td> <td>\$0.900</td> <td>\$0.900</td> <td>\$5.000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill: Borders</td> <td>\$0.200</td> <td>\$0.300</td> <td>\$0.325</td> <td>\$0.350</td> <td>\$0.400</td> <td>\$0.400</td> <td>\$1.975</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill: B&C</td> <td>\$0.700</td> <td>\$1.200</td> <td>\$1.225</td> <td>\$1.250</td> <td>\$1.300</td> <td>\$1.300</td> <td>\$6.975</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Corridor funds were intended as a criteria-based discretionary program. However, actual funding under TEA-21 had little to do with the authorized funding levels or criteria. Over TEA-21, Oregon’s share has been about the same as for NHS funds, but more erratic</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="822 969 1568 1097"> <thead> <tr> <th>HE:</th> <th>1998</th> <th>1999</th> <th>2000</th> <th>2001</th> <th>2002</th> <th>2003</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>B&CFunds Allocated</td> <td></td> <td>\$12360</td> <td>\$12180</td> <td>\$12308</td> <td>\$47998</td> <td>\$25500</td> <td>\$1,10346</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Amount to Oregon</td> <td></td> <td>\$200</td> <td>\$000</td> <td>\$088</td> <td>\$486</td> <td>\$650</td> <td>\$1423</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Percent to Oregon</td> <td></td> <td>162%</td> <td>000%</td> <td>071%</td> <td>101%</td> <td>255%</td> <td>129%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unlike other targeted programs, this program should be supported by JPACT, so long as Corridor funds are about 80% of total, because, with Washington’s help, this may be good funding source for I-5 PE/EIS work.</p>	Borders and Corridors Programs								<i>In TEA-21 Programs Combined, in SAFETEA/TEA-LU Separate Programs</i>								Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL	TEA-21; B&C.	\$0.140	\$0.140	\$0.140	\$0.140	\$0.140	\$0.140	\$0.840	Senate Bill: Corridors	\$0.112	\$0.135	\$0.157	\$0.180	\$0.202	\$0.225	\$1.011	Senate Bill: Borders	\$0.112	\$0.135	\$0.157	\$0.180	\$0.202	\$0.225	\$1.011	Senate Bill: B&C	\$0.224	\$0.270	\$0.314	\$0.360	\$0.404	\$0.450	\$2.022	House Bill: Corridors	\$0.500	\$0.900	\$0.900	\$0.900	\$0.900	\$0.900	\$5.000	House Bill: Borders	\$0.200	\$0.300	\$0.325	\$0.350	\$0.400	\$0.400	\$1.975	House Bill: B&C	\$0.700	\$1.200	\$1.225	\$1.250	\$1.300	\$1.300	\$6.975	HE:	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	TOTAL	B&CFunds Allocated		\$12360	\$12180	\$12308	\$47998	\$25500	\$1,10346	Amount to Oregon		\$200	\$000	\$088	\$486	\$650	\$1423	Percent to Oregon		162%	000%	071%	101%	255%	129%
Borders and Corridors Programs																																																																																																																		
<i>In TEA-21 Programs Combined, in SAFETEA/TEA-LU Separate Programs</i>																																																																																																																		
Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL																																																																																																											
TEA-21; B&C.	\$0.140	\$0.140	\$0.140	\$0.140	\$0.140	\$0.140	\$0.840																																																																																																											
Senate Bill: Corridors	\$0.112	\$0.135	\$0.157	\$0.180	\$0.202	\$0.225	\$1.011																																																																																																											
Senate Bill: Borders	\$0.112	\$0.135	\$0.157	\$0.180	\$0.202	\$0.225	\$1.011																																																																																																											
Senate Bill: B&C	\$0.224	\$0.270	\$0.314	\$0.360	\$0.404	\$0.450	\$2.022																																																																																																											
House Bill: Corridors	\$0.500	\$0.900	\$0.900	\$0.900	\$0.900	\$0.900	\$5.000																																																																																																											
House Bill: Borders	\$0.200	\$0.300	\$0.325	\$0.350	\$0.400	\$0.400	\$1.975																																																																																																											
House Bill: B&C	\$0.700	\$1.200	\$1.225	\$1.250	\$1.300	\$1.300	\$6.975																																																																																																											
HE:	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	TOTAL																																																																																																											
B&CFunds Allocated		\$12360	\$12180	\$12308	\$47998	\$25500	\$1,10346																																																																																																											
Amount to Oregon		\$200	\$000	\$088	\$486	\$650	\$1423																																																																																																											
Percent to Oregon		162%	000%	071%	101%	255%	129%																																																																																																											
	<p>Interstate Discretionary Projects TEA-LU §1111 Amends 23USC118(c)</p>	<p>In TEA-LU, <u>the \$100M per year Interstate Discretionary Program is eliminated.</u> Oregon has received little from the Interstate Discretionary Program. Of the \$560M allocated during TEA-21, Oregon received \$1.765M, or 0.3%. Elimination of discretionary program adds to formula apportionments, a benefit to Oregon.</p>																																																																																																																






NEW FINANCING PROGRAMS

Amendments to Title 23, Oregon Administrative Code
(with House amendments, if applicable, in parentheses)

	<p>Highway Safety Improvement Prog. TEA-LU §1101(6); §1401; Amends 23USC130; 23USC152</p>	<p>TEA-LU repeals the 10% (\$649M in FY03) safety set-aside in the STP program and replaces it with a new, formula program with a 90% federal share.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="701 420 1649 561"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bill:</th> <th>Year 1</th> <th>Year 2</th> <th>Year 3</th> <th>Year 4</th> <th>Year 5</th> <th>Year 6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-21</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senate Bill</td> <td>\$1.200</td> <td>\$1.300</td> <td>\$1.350</td> <td>\$1.350</td> <td>\$1.350</td> <td>\$1.350</td> <td>\$7.900</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill</td> <td>\$1.000</td> <td>\$1.100</td> <td>\$1.200</td> <td>\$1.300</td> <td>\$1.400</td> <td>\$1.500</td> <td>\$7.500</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>One-third of these amounts are allocated to states for the railroad crossing program in 23USC130. One-half of these funds are apportioned to states based on the STP formula and one-half based on the number of railroad crossings. Two-thirds of these amounts are allocated to states for the hazard elimination program in 23USC152 based on the STP formula.</p> <p>Project requirements do not appear onerous, but do not know how they comply with Oregon/Portland priorities. This new program is in addition to continuing the Nat'l Highway Traffic Safety Administration (HSTSA) and Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP).</p> <p><u>Generally, JPACT should support increases in flexible programs, such as STP, and be wary of targeted or restrictive programs with new administrative requirements. However, this is mitigated somewhat in the Safety Program because it makes more flexible STP dollars available with the elimination of the 10% STP set-aside for safety projects.</u></p>	Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL	TEA-21	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Senate Bill	\$1.200	\$1.300	\$1.350	\$1.350	\$1.350	\$1.350	\$7.900	House Bill	\$1.000	\$1.100	\$1.200	\$1.300	\$1.400	\$1.500	\$7.500
Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL																											
TEA-21	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A																											
Senate Bill	\$1.200	\$1.300	\$1.350	\$1.350	\$1.350	\$1.350	\$7.900																											
House Bill	\$1.000	\$1.100	\$1.200	\$1.300	\$1.400	\$1.500	\$7.500																											
	<p>Safe Routes to Schools TEA-LU §1101(a)(23) §1118(b)</p>	<p>Creates a \$250M per year, six-year formula program for sidewalks, traffic calming, bicycle facilities, etc. in the vicinity of primary and middle schools. Apportionment to states based on school enrollment with a \$2M per year minimum apportionment (probably would be Oregon's share). 10%-30% of funds to be used for activities to encourage walking and bicycling to school, including public awareness campaigns, traffic education and enforcement in the vicinity of schools, student sessions on bicycle and pedestrian safety, etc</p>																																




?	<p>Projects of National and Regional Significance TEA-LU §1101(a)(12); §1304</p>	<p>Creates a "New Starts-like" discretionary program for "mega" road projects. Only projects costing the lesser of \$500M or 75% of the sponsoring state's annual federal highway assistance program are eligible.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bill:</th> <th>Year1</th> <th>Year2</th> <th>Year3</th> <th>Year4</th> <th>Year5</th> <th>Year6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-21</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>\$ -</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senate Bill</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>\$ -</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill</td> <td>\$2900</td> <td>\$2900</td> <td>\$2900</td> <td>\$2900</td> <td>\$3000</td> <td>\$3000</td> <td>\$17600</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Criteria for competitive grants include: generate national benefits, reduce congestion, improve safety, leverage non-federal investment, etc. Projects would be evaluated and rated in manner similar to New Starts program. Projects funded through a Full Funding Grant Agreement. One can anticipate that this program will operate similarly as the New Starts program; highly competitive, congressionally earmarked, etc.</p> <p>On its merits, the I-5 Project would be eligible and competitive for "mega" project funds. Perhaps Sunrise Corridor would also be eligible. <u>However, the utility of this program to Oregon depends on our ability to be competitive in a national process.</u> Oregon has done well with New Starts funds, but no other discretionary program. Without members that are Committee Chairs, in leadership positions or on Appropriations, <u>it may be unrealistic to count on concurrently securing FFGAs and appropriations for a New Starts project and a Mega project.</u></p> <p>If the amount of funds authorized for mega projects were made available through a formula program with an apportionment similar to NHS, Oregon would be allocated about \$220M over six years. A "bird in hand ...," We should determine whether Oregon would be better served with funds in a formula program than in this mega project program. The exception may be I-5, where with help from State of Washington, the mega project program could be beneficial.</p>	Bill:	Year1	Year2	Year3	Year4	Year5	Year6	TOTAL	TEA-21	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ -	Senate Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ -	House Bill	\$2900	\$2900	\$2900	\$2900	\$3000	\$3000	\$17600
Bill:	Year1	Year2	Year3	Year4	Year5	Year6	TOTAL																											
TEA-21	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ -																											
Senate Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ -																											
House Bill	\$2900	\$2900	\$2900	\$2900	\$3000	\$3000	\$17600																											
★	<p>High Priority Projects TEA-LU §1101(a)(17) Amends 23 USC 117</p>	<p>This program is a placeholder for "demo projects." With good representation in the House T&I Committee, Oregon has done well with demo projects. Under TEA-21, Oregon received 1.85% of such funds; a share that is about 50% higher than for NHS funds. TEA-LU proposes to increase demo funding by 60% above TEA-21 levels.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bill:</th> <th>Year1</th> <th>Year2</th> <th>Year3</th> <th>Year4</th> <th>Year5</th> <th>Year6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-21</td> <td>\$1,030</td> <td>\$1,404</td> <td>\$1,685</td> <td>\$1,685</td> <td>\$1,778</td> <td>\$1,778</td> <td>\$ 9360</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senate Bill</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>\$ -</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill</td> <td>\$1,953</td> <td>\$2,144</td> <td>\$2,355</td> <td>\$2,587</td> <td>\$2,841</td> <td>\$3,120</td> <td>\$15000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Bill:	Year1	Year2	Year3	Year4	Year5	Year6	TOTAL	TEA-21	\$1,030	\$1,404	\$1,685	\$1,685	\$1,778	\$1,778	\$ 9360	Senate Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ -	House Bill	\$1,953	\$2,144	\$2,355	\$2,587	\$2,841	\$3,120	\$15000
Bill:	Year1	Year2	Year3	Year4	Year5	Year6	TOTAL																											
TEA-21	\$1,030	\$1,404	\$1,685	\$1,685	\$1,778	\$1,778	\$ 9360																											
Senate Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ -																											
House Bill	\$1,953	\$2,144	\$2,355	\$2,587	\$2,841	\$3,120	\$15000																											

	<p>Freight Intermodal Connectors TEA-LU §1101(a)(18); §1303</p>	<p>New formula program with 80% federal share. Funds apportioned to states on basis of one third each of (i) the state's percent of the national total number of freight intermodal connectors, (ii) the state's percentage contribution to the Trust Fund and (iii) the NHS formula.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="862 291 1507 420"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bill:</th> <th>Year 1</th> <th>Year 2</th> <th>Year 3</th> <th>Year 4</th> <th>Year 5</th> <th>Year 6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-ZI</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>\$ -</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senate Bill</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>\$ -</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill</td> <td>\$0300</td> <td>\$0400</td> <td>\$0500</td> <td>\$0600</td> <td>\$0600</td> <td>\$0600</td> <td>\$3,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Funds must be used for construction of publicly owned intermodal connectors and related operational improvements. Priority is to be given to NHS intermodal connectors. Funds can be used for other road projects if state certifies there are no intermodal connector needs. While program is a formula apportionment (which is generally better for Oregon), it is likely that formula produces lower share than NHS formula. <u>Generally, JPACT should support increases in flexible programs, such as STP, and be wary of targeted or restrictive programs with new administrative requirements</u></p>	Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL	TEA-ZI	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ -	Senate Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ -	House Bill	\$0300	\$0400	\$0500	\$0600	\$0600	\$0600	\$3,000
Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL																											
TEA-ZI	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ -																											
Senate Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ -																											
House Bill	\$0300	\$0400	\$0500	\$0600	\$0600	\$0600	\$3,000																											
	<p>Dedicated Truck Lanes TEA-LU §1101(a)(22); §1305</p>	<p>TEA-LU includes authorized funding, but does not define the program (section reserved for this purpose).</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="862 707 1528 835"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bill:</th> <th>Year 1</th> <th>Year 2</th> <th>Year 3</th> <th>Year 4</th> <th>Year 5</th> <th>Year 6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-ZI</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>\$000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senate Bill</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>\$000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill</td> <td>\$025</td> <td>\$035</td> <td>\$035</td> <td>\$035</td> <td>\$035</td> <td>\$035</td> <td>\$200</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL	TEA-ZI	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$000	Senate Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$000	House Bill	\$025	\$035	\$035	\$035	\$035	\$035	\$200
Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL																											
TEA-ZI	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$000																											
Senate Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$000																											
House Bill	\$025	\$035	\$035	\$035	\$035	\$035	\$200																											
	<p>Congestion Relief TEA-LU §1202</p>	<p>Requires that a portion of STP, NHS, CMAQ and Interstate Maintenance funds be dedicated for congestion relief activities. The portion to be dedicated is 10% of these funding categories times the percent of the state's population in urbanized areas with a population over 200,000. Each year 40% of the dedicated revenues must be allocated to congestion relief projects that can be implemented in one year, 35% to congestion relief projects that can be implemented in three years, and 25% to any congestion relief activity. This program is not a new funding source, but rather a limitation on flexibility and an additional administrative burden, and should be opposed.</p>																																
<p>OTHER PROGRAMS AND POLICIES <i>(Research not Addressed, Defer to PSU)</i></p>																																		
	<p>TIFIA TEA-LU §1303 Amends 23 USC181-189</p>	<p>Threshold for eligibility reduced to \$50M. \$150M per year for six years authorized to support program. The maximum annual credit amounts set at \$2.6B.</p>																																

	TSM TEA-LU §1202 Amends 23 USC 133, 23 USC 149	Expends list of eligible projects for STP and CMAQ funds to include transportation system management and operations activities.
	ITS TEA-LU §1205 Adds 23 USC 150	Requires States to obligate a portion of their annual NHS, Interstate Maintenance, STP and CMAQ funds on ITS projects. The portion of a state's federal funds that must be spend on ITS is \$500M times the percent of federal road funds that state receives compared to the national total. For Oregon, this means about \$6M per year. This program is not a new funding source, but rather a limitation on flexibility and an additional administrative burden, and should be opposed.
	Tolling	Nothing proposed.
	Public Private Partnerships TEA-LU §1503	Section reserved, proposal to be added later.
	Design Build Contracts TEA-LU §1501	Section reserved, proposal to be added later.

TEA-LU (HR 3550)
TRANSIT TITLE ONLY
New Start and Small Start Programs Reviewed Separately

The House Transportation Reauthorization bill is the product of two committees. The House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee released a bill (TEA-LU) covering the highway and transit title. Because TEA-LU increases funding beyond existing capacity, new revenues must be enacted by the House Ways and Means Committee. Ways and Means has not yet produced a bill. So, the table below reviews only the transit elements of TEA-LU, except for the New Start and Small Start provisions that are reviewed separately. Only changes to TEA-21 are addressed. The table uses the following symbols to rate the overall affect of a proposed change.

Very Good	Good	Neutral	Bad	Very Bad	Unclear
					








Rating	Title of Program Section of Title Amendment	Summary of Change Explanation of Rating																																
TEA-LU - NEW START PROGRAMS																																		
Authorization Levels and Appropriation Committee (Only those programs with a rating of 1 or 2 are shown)																																		
	Urban Area Formula Grants TEA-LU §3008 Amends 49USC 5307	<p>TEA-LU provides an 87% increase in §5307 funds over TEA-21. Year 1 of TEA-LU only provides a 4% increase over Year 6 of TEA-21, but it includes a 13% per year increase each year thereafter.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bill:</th> <th>Year 1</th> <th>Year 2</th> <th>Year 3</th> <th>Year 4</th> <th>Year 5</th> <th>Year 6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-21</td> <td>\$230</td> <td>\$255</td> <td>\$278</td> <td>\$300</td> <td>\$323</td> <td>\$345</td> <td>\$1731</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senate Bill</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>\$ -</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill</td> <td>\$360</td> <td>\$431</td> <td>\$487</td> <td>\$548</td> <td>\$606</td> <td>\$672</td> <td>\$31.03</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>There are no other notable changes in the urban grant program. The Portland region receives about 0.8%-0.9% of the national appropriation of 5307 formula funds. Over its six years, the increased proposed by TEA-LU results in an additional \$120M for the Portland region compared to TEA-21.</p>	Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL	TEA-21	\$230	\$255	\$278	\$300	\$323	\$345	\$1731	Senate Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ -	House Bill	\$360	\$431	\$487	\$548	\$606	\$672	\$31.03
Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL																											
TEA-21	\$230	\$255	\$278	\$300	\$323	\$345	\$1731																											
Senate Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ -																											
House Bill	\$360	\$431	\$487	\$548	\$606	\$672	\$31.03																											

Exhibit C-2 to Resolution No. 05-3544





	<p>Jobs Access Reverse Commute (JARC) TEA-LU §3017 Adds 49USC5316</p>	<p>TEA-LU increases JARC funds by 140% compared to TEA-21.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bill:</th> <th>Year1</th> <th>Year2</th> <th>Year3</th> <th>Year4</th> <th>Year5</th> <th>Year6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-21</td> <td></td> <td>\$005</td> <td>\$008</td> <td>\$010</td> <td>\$013</td> <td>\$015</td> <td>\$050</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senate Bill</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill</td> <td>\$0175</td> <td>\$0185</td> <td>\$0195</td> <td>\$0205</td> <td>\$0215</td> <td>\$0225</td> <td>\$1200</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Under TEA-21, JARC was a discretionary grant program that ultimately became one of federal earmarks. TEA-LU proposes to make JARC a formula program. 60% of funds would be apportioned to transit operators in urban areas with >200,000 population based on relative share of low-income persons and welfare recipients. 20% would be apportioned to states and 20% to urban areas with less than 200,000 population based on same factors. Not enough information to know impact on Oregon.</p>	Bill:	Year1	Year2	Year3	Year4	Year5	Year6	TOTAL	TEA-21		\$005	\$008	\$010	\$013	\$015	\$050	Senate Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	House Bill	\$0175	\$0185	\$0195	\$0205	\$0215	\$0225	\$1200
Bill:	Year1	Year2	Year3	Year4	Year5	Year6	TOTAL																											
TEA-21		\$005	\$008	\$010	\$013	\$015	\$050																											
Senate Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA																											
House Bill	\$0175	\$0185	\$0195	\$0205	\$0215	\$0225	\$1200																											
	<p>Clean Fuels Formula Grant Program TEA-LU §3009 Amends 49USC5308, 5338</p>	<p>TEA-21 authorized specific amounts for Clean Fuels, but each year appropriators merged Clean Fuels authority into §5307 formula funds. TEA-LU increases authorization for Clean Fuel Program by 140%.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bill:</th> <th>Year1</th> <th>Year2</th> <th>Year3</th> <th>Year4</th> <th>Year5</th> <th>Year6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-21</td> <td></td> <td>\$005</td> <td>\$005</td> <td>\$005</td> <td>\$005</td> <td>\$005</td> <td>\$025</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senate Bill</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>\$000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill</td> <td>\$010</td> <td>\$010</td> <td>\$010</td> <td>\$010</td> <td>\$010</td> <td>\$010</td> <td>\$060</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>However, TriMet would no longer be eligible for formula apportionments under the program. A recent EPA rule changed ozone standards; making Portland an “attainment area” rather than a “maintenance area.” The apportionment formula for Clean Fuels is based on weight factors for non-attainment. My read is that as an attainment area, that weight factor would be zero. To continue TriMet’s eligibility, add the following to 49USC5308(d)(2)(A):</p> <p>: <u>“(vii) 1.0 if, at the time of apportionment, the area is not designated as a nonattainment or maintenance area under the 8-hour ozone standard but was designated as a nonattainment area or maintenance area under the 1-hour ozone standard.”</u></p>	Bill:	Year1	Year2	Year3	Year4	Year5	Year6	TOTAL	TEA-21		\$005	\$005	\$005	\$005	\$005	\$025	Senate Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$000	House Bill	\$010	\$010	\$010	\$010	\$010	\$010	\$060
Bill:	Year1	Year2	Year3	Year4	Year5	Year6	TOTAL																											
TEA-21		\$005	\$005	\$005	\$005	\$005	\$025																											
Senate Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$000																											
House Bill	\$010	\$010	\$010	\$010	\$010	\$010	\$060																											
	<p>Elderly and Disabled Formula Funds TEA-LU §3011 49USC5310, 5338</p>	<p>TEA-LU increases E&D Formula funds by 90% compared to TEA-21.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bill:</th> <th>Year1</th> <th>Year2</th> <th>Year3</th> <th>Year4</th> <th>Year5</th> <th>Year6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-21</td> <td>\$006</td> <td>\$007</td> <td>\$007</td> <td>\$008</td> <td>\$009</td> <td>\$009</td> <td>\$046</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senate Bill</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill</td> <td>\$010</td> <td>\$012</td> <td>\$014</td> <td>\$015</td> <td>\$017</td> <td>\$019</td> <td>\$087</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The program is changed to allow funds to be used for operating expenses, at a 50% match ratio. A requirement to certify coordination with non-profits is added. Also requires that projects be derived from a “locally developed coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan.” The State of Oregon received on average 1.36% of E&D Formula funds from 1999-2003.</p>	Bill:	Year1	Year2	Year3	Year4	Year5	Year6	TOTAL	TEA-21	\$006	\$007	\$007	\$008	\$009	\$009	\$046	Senate Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	House Bill	\$010	\$012	\$014	\$015	\$017	\$019	\$087
Bill:	Year1	Year2	Year3	Year4	Year5	Year6	TOTAL																											
TEA-21	\$006	\$007	\$007	\$008	\$009	\$009	\$046																											
Senate Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA																											
House Bill	\$010	\$012	\$014	\$015	\$017	\$019	\$087																											

	<p>New Start Funds TEA-LU §3010 49USC5309, 5338</p>	<p>TEA-LU increases New Start funds for “major” projects by 87% compared to TEA-21, and that is on top of the “small start” funds.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bill:</th> <th>Year1</th> <th>Year2</th> <th>Year3</th> <th>Year4</th> <th>Year5</th> <th>Year6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-21</td> <td>\$0800</td> <td>\$0902</td> <td>\$0980</td> <td>\$1,058</td> <td>\$1,136</td> <td>\$1,214</td> <td>\$6,090</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senate Bill</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill</td> <td>\$1,350</td> <td>\$1,596</td> <td>\$1,791</td> <td>\$2,002</td> <td>\$2,197</td> <td>\$2,426</td> <td>\$11,362</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Programmatic issues are discussed in a separate review.</p>	Bill:	Year1	Year2	Year3	Year4	Year5	Year6	TOTAL	TEA-21	\$0800	\$0902	\$0980	\$1,058	\$1,136	\$1,214	\$6,090	Senate Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	House Bill	\$1,350	\$1,596	\$1,791	\$2,002	\$2,197	\$2,426	\$11,362
Bill:	Year1	Year2	Year3	Year4	Year5	Year6	TOTAL																											
TEA-21	\$0800	\$0902	\$0980	\$1,058	\$1,136	\$1,214	\$6,090																											
Senate Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA																											
House Bill	\$1,350	\$1,596	\$1,791	\$2,002	\$2,197	\$2,426	\$11,362																											
	<p>Bus Discretionary Funds TEA-LU §3010 49USC5309, 5338</p>	<p>TEA-LU increases Bus Discretionary funds by 87% compared to TEA-21. No other notable changes are proposed.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bill:</th> <th>Year1</th> <th>Year2</th> <th>Year3</th> <th>Year4</th> <th>Year5</th> <th>Year6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-21</td> <td>\$0400</td> <td>\$0451</td> <td>\$0490</td> <td>\$0529</td> <td>\$0568</td> <td>\$0607</td> <td>\$3,045</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senate Bill</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill</td> <td>\$0,675</td> <td>\$0,798</td> <td>\$0,896</td> <td>\$1,001</td> <td>\$1,099</td> <td>\$1,213</td> <td>\$5,681</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The State of Oregon received on average 1.36% of Bus Discretionary grants from 1999-2003; a high percentage compared to other federal transportation programs. The Portland region received 0.4%.</p>	Bill:	Year1	Year2	Year3	Year4	Year5	Year6	TOTAL	TEA-21	\$0400	\$0451	\$0490	\$0529	\$0568	\$0607	\$3,045	Senate Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	House Bill	\$0,675	\$0,798	\$0,896	\$1,001	\$1,099	\$1,213	\$5,681
Bill:	Year1	Year2	Year3	Year4	Year5	Year6	TOTAL																											
TEA-21	\$0400	\$0451	\$0490	\$0529	\$0568	\$0607	\$3,045																											
Senate Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA																											
House Bill	\$0,675	\$0,798	\$0,896	\$1,001	\$1,099	\$1,213	\$5,681																											
	<p>Rail Modernization Funds TEA-LU §3010 49USC5309, 5338</p>	<p>TEA-LU increases Rail Mod funds by 87% compared to TEA-21. No other notable changes are proposed.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bill:</th> <th>Year1</th> <th>Year2</th> <th>Year3</th> <th>Year4</th> <th>Year5</th> <th>Year6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-21</td> <td>\$0800</td> <td>\$0902</td> <td>\$0980</td> <td>\$1,058</td> <td>\$1,136</td> <td>\$1,214</td> <td>\$6,090</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senate Bill</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill</td> <td>\$1,350</td> <td>\$1,596</td> <td>\$1,791</td> <td>\$2,002</td> <td>\$2,197</td> <td>\$2,426</td> <td>\$11,362</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Portland only receives about 0.37% of Rail Mod funds, although that percent will increase slightly as more rail lines reach Rail Mod eligibility. The way the apportionment formula works, Portland’s share of this program will continue to be small. Because Rail Mod funding levels are directly tied to New Start funding levels, JPACT must be supportive (or not opposed to) these funding levels, even though the Portland share is low.</p>	Bill:	Year1	Year2	Year3	Year4	Year5	Year6	TOTAL	TEA-21	\$0800	\$0902	\$0980	\$1,058	\$1,136	\$1,214	\$6,090	Senate Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	House Bill	\$1,350	\$1,596	\$1,791	\$2,002	\$2,197	\$2,426	\$11,362
Bill:	Year1	Year2	Year3	Year4	Year5	Year6	TOTAL																											
TEA-21	\$0800	\$0902	\$0980	\$1,058	\$1,136	\$1,214	\$6,090																											
Senate Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA																											
House Bill	\$1,350	\$1,596	\$1,791	\$2,002	\$2,197	\$2,426	\$11,362																											

?	<p>New Freedom Program TEA-LU §3018 Creates 49USC5317</p>	<p>New formula program aimed at new public transportation alternatives for disabled persons beyond that required by the ADA. Funds available for capital projects at 80% share and operations at 50% share.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="856 247 1441 376"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bill</th> <th>Year1</th> <th>Year2</th> <th>Year3</th> <th>Year4</th> <th>Year5</th> <th>Year6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-21</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senate Bill</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill</td> <td>\$010</td> <td>\$012</td> <td>\$013</td> <td>\$015</td> <td>\$015</td> <td>\$018</td> <td>\$082</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>60% of funds would be apportioned to transit operators in urban areas with >200,000 population based on relative share of disabled persons. 20% would be apportioned to states and 20% to urban areas with less than 200,000 population based on same factors. Not enough data to know impact on Oregon.</p>	Bill	Year1	Year2	Year3	Year4	Year5	Year6	TOTAL	TEA-21	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Senate Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	House Bill	\$010	\$012	\$013	\$015	\$015	\$018	\$082
Bill	Year1	Year2	Year3	Year4	Year5	Year6	TOTAL																											
TEA-21	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA																											
Senate Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA																											
House Bill	\$010	\$012	\$013	\$015	\$015	\$018	\$082																											
★	<p>Small Starts Funds TEA-LU § 49USC5309, 5338</p>	<p>New discretionary program for fixed guideway projects between \$25M-\$75M in federal assistance. Not clear where projects under \$25M fit.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="856 581 1562 705"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bill</th> <th>Year1</th> <th>Year2</th> <th>Year3</th> <th>Year4</th> <th>Year5</th> <th>Year6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-21</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senate Bill</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill</td> <td>\$015</td> <td>\$018</td> <td>\$021</td> <td>\$024</td> <td>\$027</td> <td>\$030</td> <td>\$135</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Small Starts program mutually exclusive of funding for "major" projects. Small starts cannot access New Starts funds, and vice versa. Programmatic issues are discussed in a separate review.</p>	Bill	Year1	Year2	Year3	Year4	Year5	Year6	TOTAL	TEA-21	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Senate Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	House Bill	\$015	\$018	\$021	\$024	\$027	\$030	\$135
Bill	Year1	Year2	Year3	Year4	Year5	Year6	TOTAL																											
TEA-21	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA																											
Senate Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA																											
House Bill	\$015	\$018	\$021	\$024	\$027	\$030	\$135																											
<p>OTHER PROGRAMS AND POLICIES <i>(Research not Addressed, Defer to PSU)</i></p>																																		
?	<p>Metropolitan/State Planning TEA-LU Title VI Amends 23USC134, 135 49USC5303-5305</p>	<p>Title reserved to establish Chapter 52, which integrates provisions for metropolitan and statewide planning for highways and transit. Provisions not yet included.</p>																																
?	<p>Planning Programs TEA-LU §3005 49USC5303-5305</p>	<p>Section on TIP deleted and replaced with combination of planning activities for States and MPOs. Establishes split of planning funds under 49USC5338(c) as 82.72% for MPOs and 17.28% for States. State and MPOs devise formula for allocating MPO funds within the State.</p>																																
?	<p>Contract Requirements TEA-LU §3025 Amends 49USC5325</p>	<p>Changes rules on competition. TEA-21 only required of non-competitive contract awards for capital projects or improvements that records be provided to DOT and Comptroller General. TEA-LU proposes that all procurements be done in "full and open competition, as determined by the Secretary." Allows states with a formal state procedure for procuring A&E services that is in effect prior to TEA-LU to be exempt from TEA-LU requirements for A&E procurement. Allows design-build contracts. Changes some administrative requirements relating to indirect rates, establishes certain confidentiality.</p>																																

**TEA - LU
New Start/Small Start Program Issues**

This analysis examines Section 3010 (Capital Investment Grants) of HR 3550 (Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users), which primarily amends Section 5309 of the Transit Act, Section 3037, which authorizes fixed guideway projects for Final Design and Construction, and Section 3034, which authorizes funding for such capital grants. The changes proposed to the provisions of TEA-21 in TEA-LU are described in the table below. The table uses the following symbols to describe the overall affect of a proposed change.

Very Good	Good	Neutral	Bad	Very Bad	Unclear
					











Rating	Section/Issue	Summary of Issue/Change
	§5309(a)(1) General Authority	Loans of §5309 Funds no longer permitted, does not affect Portland region projects.
Major (5309) Fixed Guideway Projects		
	§5309(c): Establish Category for Major Capital Investment Grants	\$75M threshold for full new starts evaluation process allows streetcar projects to proceed without onerous criteria.
	Deleted from TEA-21: Exemption from New Starts Criteria for Entirely Flexible Funded Projects	TEA-21 exempts from the New Starts review <i>“part of a project financed completely with amounts made available from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account).”</i> Thus, a MOS entirely funded with STP funds is exempt from New Starts criteria under TEA-21. Under TEA-LU such an MOS would be subject to New Starts review. This would affect a small streetcar project funded entirely with MTIP funds.
	§5309(c)(2)(B): Justification Criteria for Major Projects	The factors considered in FTA’s “comprehensive review” are expanded to include <i>“transit supportive policies”</i> and <i>“existing land use.”</i> While <i>“transit supportive policies”</i> helps Portland region, <i>“existing land use”</i> helps mega-cities like NY, Chicago, etc. and hurts Portland. A preferable factor is <i>“land use policies.”</i>

Exhibit C-3 to Resolution No. 05-3544







★	§5309(d)(1): \$75M "Small Starts" Threshold	Overall, the small starts program much more supportive of streetcar projects than the major fixed guideway program. But some specifics, discussed below, are troublesome.
↓	§5309(d)(1): \$25M "Exempt" Threshold	TEA-LU does not proscribe any processes or criteria for "exempt projects" (i.e. <\$25M). Congress should set parameters for exempt projects rather than leave it entirely to FTA.
↓	§5309(d)(2) and (3): Alternatives Analysis Required	§5309(d)(2) and (3) require that the evaluation of small starts be based on the results of Alternatives Analysis (AA). AA requires consideration of non-streetcar project alternatives, probably including a baseline alternative for cost effectiveness rating. Unless narrowed by statute, this will lead to considerable FTA involvement and interference. Thus, amend §5309(d)(2)(A) as follows " <i>(A) based on the result of planning and alternatives analysis (as used in this subsection, alternatives analysis requires a comparison only to the no build alternative).</i> "
★	§5309(d)(4)(A) and (C): Project Justification Factors	While the justification of "major" projects must consider "operating efficiencies," "environmental benefits," "mobility" and "existing land use," these factors are not considered in evaluating small start projects. This helps because small starts would not be competitive with regard to these factors. Paragraph C establishes "positive effect on local economic development" as a key criterion. This helps Portland streetcar projects.
⚡	§5309(d)(4)(B): Cost Effectiveness	Grant approval requires consideration of "cost effectiveness at the time of the initiation of revenue service." FTA is provided 120 days after bill passage to develop regulations on how cost effectiveness (CE) will be evaluated. If history is an indication, FTA will propose a CE that compares the small start project with a baseline alternative. This begins to drag the "streamlined" small starts process into the same issues that delay "major" projects. Also, CE is evaluated when operations start, rather than the normal 20-year basis; making "cost per rider" and "cost per new rider" measures worse for small starts than for "major" projects. Bill should define parameters for CE calculation, rather than leaving to FTA discretion, as follows: " <i>B. determine cost effectiveness based on the amount of development leveraged by the transit investment (compared to the no build alternative) at the time of the initiation of revenue service.</i> "
★ ?	§5309(d)(5): Local Financial Commitment	The bill excludes for "small starts" certain financial evaluation factors required of "major" projects, such as "the extent to which ... local financial commitment exceeds the required non-Federal share ...," and "local resources are available to operate the overall proposed public transportation system ... without ... a reduction in existing ... services ..." These are very helpful exclusions. However, their absence in the bill does not necessarily mean they will not be part of FTA's ratings. Congress should clarify that rating factors required in the bill of "major" projects but not "small starts" establish legislative intent to exclude such factors for "small start" ratings.

★	§5309(d)(7) and (8): Construction Grant Agreements	In lieu of Full Funding Grant Agreements (FFGA), “small starts” receive Construction Grant Agreements (CGA). The content of a FFGA and CGA appear similar. But a FFGA requires 60-day congressional review, and a CGA does not. FTA requires 60% Final Design completion before starting FFGA negotiations, and up to 1 year to complete the FFGA approval process. To avoid this aberrant delay, add to the end of §5309(d)(8) <u>“Construction Grant Agreements may be issued at the start of Final Design and cover the cost of Final Design and construction.”</u>
🏠	§309(d)(10): Eligible Projects in Small Starts Program	Small starts include <i>“corridor-based public transportation bus capital projects if the majority of the project’s corridor right of way is ... for exclusive use by public transportation ... all or part of the day.”</i> This limits small start program funding for BRT projects to only those with substantial bus-only lanes.
Other Provisions		
⚡	§5309(e): Grandfather Provisions	Only projects with a FFGA or Letter of Intent (LOI) before enactment of the bill are exempt from the provisions for “major” projects and “small starts.” This is a serious problem for Commuter Rail, which will not have a FFGA in time. Commuter Rail will be subject to the small start provisions and await enactment of “small start” rules before proceeding – undoubtedly a year delay. Also, Commuter Rail will be re-evaluated based on “small start” factors; reopening discussions with FTA on the merits of the project. A non-bill fix is to obtain a LOI for Commuter Rail prior to bill enactment (recall an LOI requires 2-month congressional review). Alternatively, amend provision as follows: <u>“Subsections (c) and (d) do not apply to projects for which the Secretary has issued a letter of intent or entered into a full funding grant agreement before the date of enactment ... Subsection (d) does not apply to projects for which the Secretary has approved Final Design before the date of enactment [of the bill].”</u>
🏠 ?	§5309(f)(4)(A): Limitations on Amounts that can be Obligated	Section is hard to decipher, but looks like the amount that can be contingently committed to projects is raised from 2-years worth of authorization under TEA-21 to 3-years under TEA-LU.
↔	§5309(f)(5): Notification of Congress	Eliminates House and Senate Appropriations Committees from notice of intent to issue a FFGA. Doubt that this stops Istook-like problems.
?	§5309(g)(2): Remainder of Net Project Cost	Do not know what this means.
🏠 ?	§5309(g)(3): FTA Not Authorized to Require Local Match in excess of 20 percent	Sounds good, but hard to reconcile with other provisions. §5309(c)(3)(D)(iv) states that the amount of overmatch shall be considered in evaluating local financing. §5309(c)(4) states that the degree of local financial commitment is a basis for determining the rating of a project. §5309(g)(3) may mean that FTA cannot <u>automatically</u> rate projects Not Recommended because they have only 20% match, but can rate projects with >20% local match higher.

	§5309(g)(4): Project Cost can Include Previously Purchased Vehicles	Permits the cost of a project to include vehicles purchased for the project before FTA approved the project. Requires that no federal funds were used to purchase such vehicles. May be way to get reimbursement for 10 "option" LRVs. Do not know what last sentence in provision means.
	§5309(m)(1): Small Start Funds Allocated "Off-the-Top" of Capital Funds	Funding for small start program is carved out of capital funding program before the 40-40-20 split to new starts, rail mod and bus capital. This mitigates the hit on New Starts. This will be further addressed below in explanation of Section 3034 of HR 3550.
	§5309(m)(1)(B): Small Starts cannot access funds for "Major" New Starts	Provides that 40 percent of funds remaining after allocation to "small starts" are for "major new fixed guideway capital projects." §5309(c)(5) defines "major" as costing over \$75M. Thus, this category is not available for small starts; ensuring that "small starts" projects, such as FTA-favored BRT projects, cannot use-up funding for LRT projects.
	§5309(m)(4): New Start funds must be derived from General Fund	Puts full onus of General Fund appropriations on "major" fixed guideway projects. Rumor is that General Funds are guaranteed, but there is nothing apparent in bill that provides guarantee. Small starts do not appropriation risk because a specified amount of funds is annually allocated; and the full amount will come from Trust Fund if General Funds are not appropriated. Rail Mod and Bus/Bus-Related do not share in risk because they are funded with Trust Funds. Creates need for small constituency of congresspersons with LRT interests to secure large, annual general fund appropriations. Need to get New Starts on Trust Fund rather than General Fund, or, at least, spread General Fund risk to broader constituency. One option is to delete §5309(m)(4), which would cause appropriations risk to be spread among all capital investments (New Starts, small starts, Rail Mod and Bus/Bus-Related). A broader fix would be to change allocations in §5338 (see Section 3034 of HR 3550) to have General Fund applied to formula grants and allocate only Trust Funds to capital program.
SECTION 3034		
	§5338(b)(2)(C): Allocation to Small Starts is Only for Small Starts	States that "the Secretary shall make available for capital investment grants of less than \$75,000,000 under section 5309(d)." Ensures that "major" projects do not have access to small start funds.
SECTION 3038		
	§5309(m)(I)(B): Portland Projects Not Yet Authorized for Final Design and Construction	Other than IMAX, Portland projects are not yet authorized in bill. Must get Commuter Rail and I-205 LRT authorized in this section for Final Design and Construction. Also, need Portland Streetcar, and I-5 LRT authorized; although they can, if necessary, at first be authorized for alternatives analysis and preliminary engineering and later for Final Design and construction. Also, should think about earmarking bus/bus-related projects in Section 3038 of HR 3550.

**SAFETEA (S. 1072) by EPW Committee
As Amended November 9, 2003**

The Senate's Transportation Reauthorization bill is the product of three committees. The Finance Committee is responsible for raising revenues that support the transit and highway titles. The Banking Committee proposes the transit title, and the Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee proposes the highway title. At this time, neither the Finance Committee nor the Banking Committee has produced a draft bill. Thus, this review of the EPW bill addresses only highway provisions. Only changes to TEA-21 are reviewed in the table below. The table uses the following symbols to describe the overall affect of a proposed change.

Very Good	Good	Neutral	Bad	Very Bad	Unclear
					







Revenue	SAFETEA Section Sec. of 23 USC Amended	Summary of the Department of Revenue																																
EXPLANATION OF CHANGES																																		
Authorization Levels and Appropriation for the																																		
(only those increases must be approved by the President)																																		
	Interstate Maintenance Program SAFTEA §1101(1) Amends 23 USC 129	<p>If revenue is enhanced, SAFETEA provides 60% higher Interstate Maintenance funding than TEA 21, and 17% higher IM funding than TEA-LU.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bill:</th> <th>Yr 1</th> <th>Yr 2</th> <th>Yr 3</th> <th>Yr 4</th> <th>Yr 5</th> <th>Yr 6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-21</td> <td>\$3.43</td> <td>\$3.96</td> <td>\$4.00</td> <td>\$4.07</td> <td>\$4.14</td> <td>\$4.22</td> <td>3.81</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EPW Bill</td> <td>\$5.50</td> <td>\$6.30</td> <td>\$6.55</td> <td>\$6.55</td> <td>\$6.55</td> <td>\$6.55</td> <td>8.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill</td> <td>\$4.50</td> <td>\$4.99</td> <td>\$5.36</td> <td>\$5.71</td> <td>\$5.87</td> <td>\$6.07</td> <td>2.50</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Bill:	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5	Yr 6	TOTAL	TEA-21	\$3.43	\$3.96	\$4.00	\$4.07	\$4.14	\$4.22	3.81	EPW Bill	\$5.50	\$6.30	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$6.55	8.00	House Bill	\$4.50	\$4.99	\$5.36	\$5.71	\$5.87	\$6.07	2.50
Bill:	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5	Yr 6	TOTAL																											
TEA-21	\$3.43	\$3.96	\$4.00	\$4.07	\$4.14	\$4.22	3.81																											
EPW Bill	\$5.50	\$6.30	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$6.55	\$6.55	8.00																											
House Bill	\$4.50	\$4.99	\$5.36	\$5.71	\$5.87	\$6.07	2.50																											

Exhibit C-4 to Resolution No. 05-3544

	<p>National Highway System Program SAFETEA §1102(2) Amends 23 USC 103</p>	<p><u>If revenue is enhanced</u>, SAFETEA provides 61% higher National Highway System funding than TEA 21, and 18% higher NHS funding than TEA-LU.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bill:</th> <th>Year 1</th> <th>Year 2</th> <th>Year 3</th> <th>Year 4</th> <th>Year 5</th> <th>Year 6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-21</td> <td>\$4.112</td> <td>\$4.749</td> <td>\$4.793</td> <td>\$4.888</td> <td>\$4.968</td> <td>\$5.061</td> <td>\$28.571</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EPW Bill</td> <td>\$6.650</td> <td>\$7.650</td> <td>\$7.950</td> <td>\$7.950</td> <td>\$7.950</td> <td>\$7.950</td> <td>\$46.100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill</td> <td>\$5.401</td> <td>\$5.986</td> <td>\$6.431</td> <td>\$6.854</td> <td>\$7.039</td> <td>\$7.287</td> <td>\$38.998</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL	TEA-21	\$4.112	\$4.749	\$4.793	\$4.888	\$4.968	\$5.061	\$28.571	EPW Bill	\$6.650	\$7.650	\$7.950	\$7.950	\$7.950	\$7.950	\$46.100	House Bill	\$5.401	\$5.986	\$6.431	\$6.854	\$7.039	\$7.287	\$38.998								
Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL																																			
TEA-21	\$4.112	\$4.749	\$4.793	\$4.888	\$4.968	\$5.061	\$28.571																																			
EPW Bill	\$6.650	\$7.650	\$7.950	\$7.950	\$7.950	\$7.950	\$46.100																																			
House Bill	\$5.401	\$5.986	\$6.431	\$6.854	\$7.039	\$7.287	\$38.998																																			
	<p>Highway Bridge Program SAFETEA §1102(3); §1808 Amends 23 USC 144</p>	<p><u>If revenue is enhanced</u>, SAFETEA provides 59% higher National Highway System funding than TEA 21, and 16% higher NHS funding than TEA-LU.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bill:</th> <th>Year 1</th> <th>Year 2</th> <th>Year 3</th> <th>Year 4</th> <th>Year 5</th> <th>Year 6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-21</td> <td>\$2.941</td> <td>\$3.395</td> <td>\$3.427</td> <td>\$3.495</td> <td>\$3.552</td> <td>\$3.619</td> <td>\$20.429</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senate Bill</td> <td>\$4.700</td> <td>\$5.400</td> <td>\$5.600</td> <td>\$5.600</td> <td>\$5.600</td> <td>\$5.600</td> <td>\$32.500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill</td> <td>\$3.862</td> <td>\$4.280</td> <td>\$4.599</td> <td>\$4.901</td> <td>\$5.033</td> <td>\$5.211</td> <td>\$27.886</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>SAFETEA revises several provisions of how the program operates, most notably it (a) increases the bridge discretionary program by 50% (\$150M per year); (b) does not set an upper limit on use of funds for bridges off of the Federal system and (c) provides greater flexibility in using funds for preventative maintenance and historic rehabilitations.</p>	Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL	TEA-21	\$2.941	\$3.395	\$3.427	\$3.495	\$3.552	\$3.619	\$20.429	Senate Bill	\$4.700	\$5.400	\$5.600	\$5.600	\$5.600	\$5.600	\$32.500	House Bill	\$3.862	\$4.280	\$4.599	\$4.901	\$5.033	\$5.211	\$27.886								
Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL																																			
TEA-21	\$2.941	\$3.395	\$3.427	\$3.495	\$3.552	\$3.619	\$20.429																																			
Senate Bill	\$4.700	\$5.400	\$5.600	\$5.600	\$5.600	\$5.600	\$32.500																																			
House Bill	\$3.862	\$4.280	\$4.599	\$4.901	\$5.033	\$5.211	\$27.886																																			
	<p>Surface Transport. Program SAFETEA §1102(4); §1401(g)(2); §1620 Amends 23 USC 133(d)</p>	<p>Both SAFETEA and TEA-LU create a highly funded highway safety program and remove from the STP program the 10% set-aside requirement for safety projects. However, SAFETEA adds a 2% set aside for stormwater mitigation projects. Taken both of these adjustments into account, SAFETEA increases funds for non-safety, non-stormwater projects by 56%, <u>if revenue is enhanced</u>; a slightly lower increase than for other funding programs.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="8">STP Funds Not Set Aside for Safety Projects Excludes funds Set Aside for Stormwater in SAFTEA</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Bill:</th> <th>Year 1</th> <th>Year 2</th> <th>Year 3</th> <th>Year 4</th> <th>Year 5</th> <th>Year 6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-21</td> <td>\$4.318</td> <td>\$4.986</td> <td>\$5.033</td> <td>\$5.133</td> <td>\$5.216</td> <td>\$5.315</td> <td>\$30.000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senate Bill</td> <td>\$6.811</td> <td>\$7.791</td> <td>\$8.085</td> <td>\$8.085</td> <td>\$8.085</td> <td>\$8.085</td> <td>\$46.942</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill</td> <td>\$6.286</td> <td>\$6.954</td> <td>\$7.461</td> <td>\$7.942</td> <td>\$8.147</td> <td>\$8.446</td> <td>\$45.236</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>If the new or expanded safety programs are not funded, it is likely that the 10% STP set aside for safety projects will be continued or expanded.</p>	STP Funds Not Set Aside for Safety Projects Excludes funds Set Aside for Stormwater in SAFTEA								Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL	TEA-21	\$4.318	\$4.986	\$5.033	\$5.133	\$5.216	\$5.315	\$30.000	Senate Bill	\$6.811	\$7.791	\$8.085	\$8.085	\$8.085	\$8.085	\$46.942	House Bill	\$6.286	\$6.954	\$7.461	\$7.942	\$8.147	\$8.446	\$45.236
STP Funds Not Set Aside for Safety Projects Excludes funds Set Aside for Stormwater in SAFTEA																																										
Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL																																			
TEA-21	\$4.318	\$4.986	\$5.033	\$5.133	\$5.216	\$5.315	\$30.000																																			
Senate Bill	\$6.811	\$7.791	\$8.085	\$8.085	\$8.085	\$8.085	\$46.942																																			
House Bill	\$6.286	\$6.954	\$7.461	\$7.942	\$8.147	\$8.446	\$45.236																																			

	<p>CMAQ Program SAFETEA §1102(5); §1611 Amends 23 USC 104(b)(2); 149</p>	<p>Consistent with other existing funding sources, SAFETEA proposes to increase CMAQ funding by 59% compared to TEA-21.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="707 274 1649 401"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bill:</th> <th>Year 1</th> <th>Year 2</th> <th>Year 3</th> <th>Year 4</th> <th>Year 5</th> <th>Year 6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-21</td> <td>\$1.193</td> <td>\$1.345</td> <td>\$1.358</td> <td>\$1.385</td> <td>\$1.407</td> <td>\$1.434</td> <td>\$ 8.122</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senate Bill</td> <td>\$1.900</td> <td>\$2.150</td> <td>\$2.225</td> <td>\$2.225</td> <td>\$2.225</td> <td>\$2.225</td> <td>\$12.950</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill</td> <td>\$1.530</td> <td>\$1.696</td> <td>\$1.822</td> <td>\$1.942</td> <td>\$1.994</td> <td>\$2.065</td> <td>\$11.049</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>However, several factors work to make the proposed increase in CMAQ funds unattractive for Portland. EPA recently issued a rule changing the ozone standards, which results reclassifying Portland as an "attainment area" rather than a "maintenance area." This results in Portland losing its eligibility for ozone-related CMAQ funds. Also, SAFETEA incorporates an apportionment factor relating to "fine particulates." This has the affect of spreading CMAQ funds to more areas, resulting in decreased CMAQ funds for "attainment" areas like Portland. Accordingly:</p> <p>(a) (b) Allow Portland to retain its eligibility for ozone-related CMAQ funds by amending §1611(2) of SAFETEA to include: <u>"(x) 1.0 if, at the time of apportionment, the area is not designated as a nonattainment or maintenance area under the 8-hour ozone standard but was designated as a nonattainment area or maintenance area under the 1-hour ozone standard."</u></p> <p>(b) <i>Support the change in the apportionment factor from .8 to 1.0 for areas achieving "Maintenance" status</i></p>	Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL	TEA-21	\$1.193	\$1.345	\$1.358	\$1.385	\$1.407	\$1.434	\$ 8.122	Senate Bill	\$1.900	\$2.150	\$2.225	\$2.225	\$2.225	\$2.225	\$12.950	House Bill	\$1.530	\$1.696	\$1.822	\$1.942	\$1.994	\$2.065	\$11.049
Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL																											
TEA-21	\$1.193	\$1.345	\$1.358	\$1.385	\$1.407	\$1.434	\$ 8.122																											
Senate Bill	\$1.900	\$2.150	\$2.225	\$2.225	\$2.225	\$2.225	\$12.950																											
House Bill	\$1.530	\$1.696	\$1.822	\$1.942	\$1.994	\$2.065	\$11.049																											
	<p>Transportation & Community & System Preservation Pilot Prog SAFETEA §1814 Adds 23 USC 175</p>	<p>This is a revision to Sen. Wyden's TCSP program. \$50M per year for six years is authorized for program, doubling the amount in TEA-21. Remains a competitive program (assuming it is not fully earmarked each year) for planning, development and implementation of community and system preservation projects such as TOD, impact mitigation and jobs access projects. Priority given to applicants have policies, such as UGBs, green corridors, etc. Funds must be allocated equitably to a diversity of populations and geographic regions.</p>																																


“Corridor” funds are a key discretionary source for PE/EIS work for the I-5 Trade Corridor. Oregon is not eligible for “Border” funds. Under TEA-21, “Border” and “Corridor” funds were authorized as one program. About 80% of the funds were allocated to “Corridor” projects. SAFETEA establishes independent funding authorizations for both programs, as does TEA-LU. SAFETEA also revises the eligibility requirements, but this may be of little consequence because funds have historically been earmarked by Congress. While SAFETEA increases Border & Corridor funds by 141%, it splits the funds evenly between the Border and Corridor programs. This has the affect of substantially increasing Border funds and only marginally increasing Corridor funds. The House Bill (TEA-LU) is illustrative of a Border-Corridor apportionment that is consistent with past practice. Also, many projects eligible for Border Program funds are also eligible for Corridor Program funds; allowing them to “double dip.”


Borders and Corridors Programs
In TEA-21 Programs Combined, in SAFETEA/TEA-LU Separate Programs

Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL
TEA-21; B&C.	\$0.140	\$0.140	\$0.140	\$0.140	\$0.140	\$0.140	\$0.840
Senate Bill: Corridors	\$0.112	\$0.135	\$0.157	\$0.180	\$0.202	\$0.225	\$1.011
Senate Bill: Borders	\$0.112	\$0.135	\$0.157	\$0.180	\$0.202	\$0.225	\$1.011
Senate Bill: B&C	\$0.224	\$0.270	\$0.314	\$0.360	\$0.404	\$0.450	\$2.022
House Bill: Corridors	\$0.500	\$0.900	\$0.900	\$0.900	\$0.900	\$0.900	\$5.000
House Bill: Borders	\$0.200	\$0.300	\$0.325	\$0.350	\$0.400	\$0.400	\$1.975
House Bill: B&C	\$0.700	\$1.200	\$1.225	\$1.250	\$1.300	\$1.300	\$6.975

To resolve these issues:




- (a) Amend §1101(10) and §1101(11), to either (i) combine the separate authorities into one combined authority, as in TEA-21, or (ii) revise the relative funding levels between these programs to better reflect the size of the pool of eligible projects for these programs.
- (b) In §1811, make projects using Border Program funds ineligible for Corridor Program funding.

Multi-State Corridor
 SAFETEA §1101(10);
 §1810.
 Creates 23USC171

**Border Planning,
 Operations, Tech.**
 SAFETEA §1101(11);
 §1811
 Creates 23USC172





**Interstate Discretionary
 Projects**
 SAFETEA §1805
 Amends 23USC118(c)(1)

The set aside from the Interstate Maintenance Program for Interstate Discretionary Projects is raised to \$100M per year for six years (up from \$50M).

NEW FUNDS PROGRAMS
 (Only those programs having a 90% federal share)

	<p>Highway Safety Improvement Prog. SAFETEA §1101(6); §1401; Replaces 23 USC 148</p>	<p>SAFETEA repeals the safety set-aside as part of the STP program and replaces it with a new, formula program with a 90% federal share. This new, highly funded safety program is in addition to safety programs continued under SAFETEA. Funds are formula allocated to states based on road mileage, VMT and amount of gas tax collections. Do not know how Oregon fares based on this formula.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Bill:</th> <th>Year 1</th> <th>Year 2</th> <th>Year 3</th> <th>Year 4</th> <th>Year 5</th> <th>Year 6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-21</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senate Bill</td> <td>\$1.200</td> <td>\$1.300</td> <td>\$1.350</td> <td>\$1.350</td> <td>\$1.350</td> <td>\$1.350</td> <td>\$7.900</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill</td> <td>\$1.000</td> <td>\$1.100</td> <td>\$1.200</td> <td>\$1.300</td> <td>\$1.400</td> <td>\$1.500</td> <td>\$7.500</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>A pre-requisite for funding is a State Strategic Highway Safety Plan, prepared in compliance with statutory specifications. Eligible projects must be included in this plan and comply with statutory requirements. Project requirements do not appear onerous, but do not know how they comply with Oregon/Portland priorities. <u>Generally, JPACT should support increases in flexible programs, such as STP, and be wary of targeted or restrictive programs with new administrative requirements.</u></p>	Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL	TEA-21	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Senate Bill	\$1.200	\$1.300	\$1.350	\$1.350	\$1.350	\$1.350	\$7.900	House Bill	\$1.000	\$1.100	\$1.200	\$1.300	\$1.400	\$1.500	\$7.500
Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL																											
TEA-21	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A																											
Senate Bill	\$1.200	\$1.300	\$1.350	\$1.350	\$1.350	\$1.350	\$7.900																											
House Bill	\$1.000	\$1.100	\$1.200	\$1.300	\$1.400	\$1.500	\$7.500																											
	<p>Safe Routes to Schools SAFETEA §1405 Adds 23USC150</p>	<p>Creates a \$70M per year, six-year set-aside from Highway Safety Improvement Program (above) for sidewalks, traffic calming, bicycle facilities, etc. in the vicinity of schools.</p>																																
	<p>Infrastructure Performance and Maintenance Prog. SAFETEA §1101(13); §1201 Adds 23 USC 139</p>	<p>New program focused on highway preservation and operational improvements, only limited capacity enhancements are permitted. Funds must be obligated to projects within 180 days of appropriation or lost. Bill does not specify criteria or an apportionment formula.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Bill:</th> <th>Year 1</th> <th>Year 2</th> <th>Year 3</th> <th>Year 4</th> <th>Year 5</th> <th>Year 6</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TEA-21</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>\$ -</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senate Bill</td> <td>\$2.500</td> <td>\$2.500</td> <td>\$2.000</td> <td>\$2.000</td> <td>\$2.000</td> <td>\$0.500</td> <td>\$11.500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>House Bill</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>\$ -</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Bill does not specify criteria or an apportionment formula; therefore do not know how much Oregon would receive. This appears to be a large program that is intended to phase-out. <u>Portland/Oregon objectives better met with more flexible and lasting highway programs.</u></p>	Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL	TEA-21	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ -	Senate Bill	\$2.500	\$2.500	\$2.000	\$2.000	\$2.000	\$0.500	\$11.500	House Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ -
Bill:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	TOTAL																											
TEA-21	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ -																											
Senate Bill	\$2.500	\$2.500	\$2.000	\$2.000	\$2.000	\$0.500	\$11.500																											
House Bill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ -																											

↔	Freight Intermodal Connectors to NHS SAFETEA §1203(c) Amends 23USC103(b)	Of the NHS funds allocated to Oregon, the greater of (i) 2% or (ii) the percentage of NHS miles connecting to intermodal terminals of total NHS miles in the State must be set aside for intermodal freight connector projects. State can seek exemption from set aside each year, if State certifies intermodal connectors are in good condition and there are significant NHS needs. Set aside funds have only 10% local match requirement.
OTHER PROGRAMS AND POLICIES <i>(Research not Addressed, Defer to PSU)</i>		
↑	TIFIA SAFETEA §1303 Amends 23 USC181-189	Eligible projects expanded to include intermodal freight facilities, private rail facilities “providing public benefit,” etc. State and regional planning and programming requirements do not have to be met until contract to receive federal credit instrument is executed. Threshold for eligibility reduced to \$50M or 20% of federal highway assistance apportioned to State (down from \$100M or 50%). Maximum assistance under TIFIA limited by the amount of senior debt – makes clearer that TIFIA is not to be the primary borrowing. \$130M per year for six years authorized to support program.
↑	Freight SAFETEA §1203 Adds 23 USC 325	In addition to Freight-NHS connector program discussed above, SAFETEA includes several policies and programs related to freight. Intermodal connectors and transfer facilities are made eligible for STP funds. Requires creation of State Freight Transportation Coordinator and integration of freight issues into State and Regional Transportation Planning.
↑	Tolling HOV Lanes SAFETEA §1606 Amends 23 USC 102 Tolling Programs SAFETEA §1609(a)	Allows states to establish toll program to charge non-car-pools to travel in HOV lanes. Criteria for eligibility for Interstate System Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Pilot program made more flexible. May have applicability for I-5 Trade Corridor. Variable Toll Pricing Program extended, with favorable provisions. May have applicability for I-5 Trade Corridor.
☆	MPO Funding SAFETEA §1102(b) Amends 23 USC 104(f)	Requires a 1.5% set aside of highway funds (after deduction for DOT administrative expenses) for metropolitan planning. TEA-21 had a “not to exceed 1%” requirement.
↑ ?	Local Match SAFETEA §1301 Amends 23USC120(d)	Expands ability to increase federal share of highway funding above 90% (for interstates) and 80% (for other roads) based on percent of State land in national parks, national forests, tribal lands, etc. Authority already exists for some states. Do not know affect of change on Oregon.

	Transportation Funding Study SAFETEA §1305	Establishes 11-person <i>National Commission on Future Revenue Sources to Support the Highway Trust Fund</i> to study alternatives to replace or supplement the fuel tax as the principal source to support the Highway Trust Fund.
	RTP and TIP SAFETEA §1615 Amends 23 USC 134	Changes interval that MPO is required to update RTP from “ <i>periodically as determined by Secretary</i> ” (every 3 years) to five years. TIP program extended from every three years to every four years.
	Historic Site SAFETEA §1604 Amends 23 USC 103(c)	Section aimed at generally exempting the interstate system from being considered an historic site for purposes of 23 USC 138 or 49 USC 303. However, in doing so it states that a “ <i>portion of the Interstate System that possesses an independent feature of historic significance, such as a historic bridge ... that would qualify independently for Listing on the National Register of Historic Places shall be considered a historic site ...</i> ” This affects the ability to replace the I-5 Bridge to Vancouver.

Memorandum

Date: January 31, 2005
To: Olivia Clark, Dick Feeney, Neil McFarlane; TriMet
From: Steven M. Siegel, Siegel Consulting
Subject: Section 3011 of Senate Transit Bill: Proposed Amendments to §5309 in the Transit Title

This memorandum reviews amendments to Section 5309 "Capital Investment Grants" proposed in Section 3011 of the Senate Bill (SB) received on January 27th. No other sections of the bill have been reviewed, so impacts of cross-referencing Sec. 5309 in other sections of the bill, if any, are not accounted for. Also, the Senate Bill does not yet specify funding authorization levels, so it is not possible to determine changes in the amounts of available funds.

A. Major Issues

The major issues discussed below are highly detrimental to the transportation agenda of the Portland region and others. The numbering is for reference, no priority is intended.

Major Issue 1: New Starts funds Opened to BRT Projects

Issue: Sec. 3011(j) of SB amends the former 49USC5309(m), which is redesignated §5309(i) by the SB, to allow non-fixed guideway projects access to former New Start funds (now Major Capital Project funds). TEA-21 made New Start funds available for "*capital projects for new fixed guideway systems and extensions to existing fixed guideway systems*". The SB makes these funds available for "*major capital projects for new fixed guideway systems and extensions and corridor improvements, in accordance with subsections (e) and (f)*". The term "and corridor improvements" makes BRT and other bus projects eligible for New Starts funds. FTA is already on record favoring BRT projects over LRT and Streetcar. So, not only will be more competition for LRT and Streetcar projects, there will not be an even playing field for such projects. This will severely damage the ability to achieve the Portland region's transportation agenda.

Solution: The first two following statutory amendments help clarify, the last amendment is required:

- Amend Sec. 3011(e) of SB as follows "(e) Major Fixed Guideway ~~Capital Investment~~ Grants of \$75,000,000 or More"
- Amend Sec. 3011(f) of SB as follows "(e) Major Fixed Guideway ~~Capital Investment~~ Grants Less than \$75,000,000"
- Amend Sec. 3011(j) of SB as follows: "(A) 65 percent shall be allocated for major capital projects for new fixed guideway systems and extensions ~~and corridor improvements~~, in accordance with subsections (e) and (f)".

Major Issue 2: Criteria for Small Starts Program Left Wide Open for FTA Discretion

Issue: The genesis of the Small Starts program grew from undue planning and procedural burdens placed on less expensive projects by the New Start regulations. The SB does not

specifically establish a reduced justification or streamlined process for small starts. Instead, in Section 3011(f) it states: “if the amount of a grant ... for a major capital project is less than \$75,000,000, (A) the project shall be subject to the requirements under subsection (e) to the extent the Secretary determines to be appropriate; and (B) the Secretary shall not make a grant for such a project unless the Secretary determines that the project is cost effective.” The subsection (e) referred to in the previous sentence is the project rating and grant approval criteria for major New Start projects. Thus, other than cost effectiveness, which is required, the SB does not establish any specific criteria for Small Starts and leaves it to FTA to determine which, if any, New Start factors will not apply to Small Starts.

In comparison, the House Bill (HB) includes specific criteria and procedures to facilitate the project development process for small starts. For example, TEA-LU excludes for “small starts” certain financial evaluation factors required of “major” projects, such as “the extent to which ... local financial commitment exceeds the required non-Federal share ...,” and “local resources are available to operate the overall proposed public transportation system ...without ... a reduction in existing ... services ...” . These and other factors in TEA-LU will facilitate project development of Small Starts, but improvements are needed to the HB, as well.

Solution: Add specific statutory language prescribing specific and a streamlined process criteria tailored to Small Starts. The HB provides a considerably better approach than the SB, so I suggest it as the base (although I do not include for sake of brevity). In a previous memo, I proposed statutory improvements and Report Language for the HB (TEA-LU).

Major Issue 3: Funding for Small Starts (<\$75M) and Major Projects (> \$75M) is in an Amalgamated rather than Separated Program

Issue: Given FTA’s disdain for LRT and the likelihood that Small Starts will be provided a streamline process and less burdensome justification criteria, Small Start projects will quickly advance ahead of LRT and other major projects, eventually squeezing them out of the funding queue. The HB addresses this problem by establishing mutually exclusive funding programs (after the initial allocation of capital funds) for Small Starts and Major New Starts. It further accommodated the higher costs of major new starts by funding the New Start program at a much higher level than Small Starts. Thus, while the HB provides the Portland region with a reasonable opportunity to pursue several projects in its transportation agenda, the SB forces regional projects to collide.

Solution: Amend proposal to fund Small Starts in SB to tack HB proposal by dividing New Starts program into two separate funding programs, and authorizing funding for Small Starts at 10-15% of Major New Start levels.

Major Issue 4: Must Grandfather Commuter Rail from New Requirements

Issue: Under Sec. 5309(e), as amended by Sec. 3011(e)(6) of the SB, only projects with a FFGA or Letter of Intent (LOI) before enactment of the bill are exempt from the provisions for “major” projects and “small starts.” This is a serious problem for smaller projects in Final Design or in the process of having Final Design approved, such as the Commuter Rail Project. If not clarified, these projects will be subject to the small start provisions and have to await enactment of “small start” rules before proceeding – undoubtedly a year delay. Also, these projects will have to be re-evaluated based on “small start” factors; requiring new analyses to be submitted to FTA on the merits of the project.

Statutory Solution: Amend proposed §5309(e) as follows: “This subsection shall not apply to projects for which the Secretary has issued a letter of intent or entered into a full funding grant agreement before the date of enactment ... Projects for which the Secretary has received an application for Final Design before the date of enactment of the Federal Public Transportation Act of 2004 shall proceed under the rules in effect when the application was received.”

Report Solution: Notwithstanding Sec. 5309(e), as amended, it is the intent of the Committee that projects for which an application for Final Design has been submitted to the Secretary before the date of enactment of the Federal Public Transportation Act of 2004 proceed under the rules in effect when the application was received.

Major Issue 5: SB Modifies the Criteria and Ratings Process for Major Projects, Requires New Rules to Set Criteria and Process and Allows FTA 240 Days

Issue: Unlike the Small Starts program, where new criteria and ratings procedures are required because it is a new program, there is no such requirement for the Major New Start program. While the industry is dissatisfied with the way FTA implements the process, this will not be fixed by a reinvention of the wheel. Rather, this will lead many projects in a lurch, unable to advance until new rules are issued and implemented. Undoubtedly this will cause these projects a year or more delay, during which costs will escalate and project agreements will require renegotiations.

Solution: The preferred solution is to avoid material changes to the statutory language regarding the justification and rating of major new start projects. Alternatively, grandfather projects that have advanced to, say, completion of DEIS to be grandfathered under rules in place prior to new act.

B. Moderate Issues

There are a number of moderate and minor issues that, due to time constraints, I do not address in this memorandum. Below are a few such issues that stand out.

Moderate Issue 1: New Unduly Burdensome Requirement for “Before and After” Study

Issue: Sec. 3011(g) of SB revises existing rules regarding the preparation of a “Before and After Study” for major new start projects. In the past this work occurred after a Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) was executed. Under the SB, the preparation of a plan to do the study and collection of the “Before” data is a pre-requisite to construction. This will delay construction on projects that are ready and approved for construction, increasing costs and delaying service improvements for seemingly unnecessary reasons.

Statutory Solution:

~~“(D) COLLECTION OF DATA ON CURRENT SYSTEM. To be eligible for a full funding grant agreement, recipients shall have collected data on the current system, according to the plan required, before the beginning of construction of the proposed new start project. Collection of this data shall be included in the full funding grant agreement as an eligible activity. Collection of~~

data on the current system according to the required plan shall begin as soon as practical after the full funding grant agreement is executed.

Moderate Issue 2: Ensure Transparency and Fairness in the New Start/Small Start Process

Issue: The New Starts process has been marred by controversy over FTA's implementation of TEA-21 evaluation criteria and procedures; in particular relating to the methodology and application of the user benefits (i.e. TSUB) requirements where FTA does not use the measure described in its rules. As a result the "transparency" and "fairness" of the process has been widely questioned by industry representatives and congress. The SB seeks to address these concerns through the creation of new criteria and processes and the mandate for new rules. This was previously discussed as a Major Issue, and, furthermore, will increase frustrations with FTA rather than decrease them. An alternative is to clarify the Committee's expectations under the current criteria and procedures.

Statutory Solution: None.

Report Solution: The Committee is concerned that FTA's user benefit measure has been applied without consideration of highway user benefits, user benefit thresholds have not been inflated commensurate with base year cost estimates, and ridership and user benefit estimates from FTA approved forecast models have been adjusted by FTA on an ad hoc basis. In establishing the process and criteria for rating projects under Sec. 5309(c) and (d), it is the Committee's intent that FTA applies its rules and criteria in a consistent manner that is open, clear and fair to potential grantees and consistent with FTA rules and guidance.

C. Opportunities

There are several helpful amendments proposed in the SB, that I do not address in this memorandum due to time constraints. Some require modifications to be useful to the Portland region. Below are a few such issues.

Opportunity 1: Reimbursement for Locally Purchased Vehicles used for Future Projects

Issue: Sec 3011(H)(5) of SB amends §5309(g)(4) to permit the cost of a fixed guideway project to include vehicles purchased with local funds for the project before FTA approved the project. This amendment may not cover TriMet's case where local funds were used to purchase vehicles for its eastside line, which is interlined with the I-205 LRT project between Gateway and Downtown. Passengers on the interlined section can use either line, and the number of vehicles in this section relate to the total demand. Thus, the cost of the locally purchased vehicles materially relates to the project, even though they do not operate on the Gateway to Town Center segment of the Project.

Statutory Solution: Amend the proposed §5309(g)(4) in §3010(d) of TEA-LU as follows:
'(4) SPECIAL RULE FOR ROLLING STOCK COSTS-In addition to amounts allowed pursuant to paragraph (1), a planned extension to a fixed guideway system may include the cost of rolling stock previously purchased if the applicant satisfies the Secretary that only amounts other than amounts of the Government were used and that the purchase was made for use on the extension **or a segment of the system interlined with the extension.** A refund or reduction of the

remainder may be made only if a refund of a proportional amount of the grant of the Government is made at the same time.

Report Solution: It is the intent of the Committee that the term "for use on the extension" in Sec. 5309(g)(4) include vehicles purchased for use on an existing fixed guideway segment that is, in part, interlined with a project extension.

Opportunity 2: Allow Cross-Border Leasing

Issue: Many transit districts have taken advantage of the tax benefits of sales-leaseback arrangements on their depreciable capital assets; resulting in millions of dollars for transit projects and operations. FTA approval for transferring the asset is a pre-requisite for such sales-leaseback arrangements on capital assets procured with Federal funds. Due to concern regarding the loss of tax dollars associated with sales-leaseback arrangements, FTA has ceased approving such arrangements. While domestic sales-leaseback arrangements impact tax collections, cross-border leasing does not. Thus, the ban on cross-border leases cost transit districts millions of dollars, without any benefit to the Treasury. The SB does not address this issue.

Statutory Solution: None.

Report Solution: The Committee encourages the Secretary to consider permitting cross border leasing as a way to provide private funding for public transportation projects and operations without the Federal tax impacts associated with domestic sales-leaseback arrangements.

STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 05-3544, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORING AN UPDATED 2005 REGIONAL POSITION ON THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ACT OF THE 21ST CENTURY (TEA-21)

Date: January 23, 2004

Prepared by: Andy Cotugno

BACKGROUND

The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), adopted by Congress in 1998, expired September 30, 2003 and an extension is scheduled to expire before May 2005. TEA-21 is the federal authorization bill for transportation projects and funding. The authorization bill establishes federal programs, identifies or "earmarks" some specific projects and sets the upper limits on the amount of federal funds the programs and projects are eligible to receive. The act also establishes rules for the distribution of federal transportation funds including apportionment formulas for those programs whose funds are distributed by such methods.

The reauthorization bill will have a direct effect on Metro and the region's jurisdictions in terms of how planning for transportation is performed and how much federal assistance to perform this planning function is made available. There is also a direct impact on which transportation projects are identified as eligible to receive federal funding.

Because the extension of the current reauthorization is set to expire before May 2005, Congress must choose to again extend the current bill or complete the next reauthorization of a federal transportation bill. To favorably influence the federal legislation, it is important to clearly articulate the region's positions during their consideration of the reauthorization bill language.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. **Known Opposition** None known at this time.
2. **Legal Antecedents** TEA-21 is the current federal transportation authorization authority providing Metro the authority to function as a federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). TEA-21 expired September 30, 2003 and was extended by Congress through May 2005. Congress will be considering reauthorization of transportation legislation during its 2005 session.
3. **Anticipated Effects** This resolution will communicate the regional policy position for reauthorization of TEA-21. The policy paper will be used in the regions federal reauthorization activities in Congress.
4. **Budget Impacts** Reauthorization is a significant issue affecting Metro and the Portland region and, as such, this paper and efforts to influence its outcome are a significant work effort for the department. In addition, one of the issues directly affects funding to MPOs including Metro.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Adopt Resolution No. 05-3544.



CITY OF
PORTLAND
OFFICE OF
TRANSPORTATION

Mayor Tom Potter
1120 S.W. 5th Avenue, Suite 800
Portland, Oregon 97204-1914
503-823-5185
FAX 503-823-7576 or 823-7371
TDD 503-823-6868

**Brant
Williams**
Director

**Eileen
Argentina**
System
Management

**Bryant
Enge**
Finance

**Don
Gardner**
Engineering &
Development

**Sam M.
Irving, Jr.**
Maintenance

**Laurel
Wentworth**
Planning

February 8, 2005

MEMORANDUM

TO: Rex Burkholder, Chair, JPACT

FROM: Sam Adams, Commissioner, City of Portland

SUBJECT: Amendment to Resolution No. 05-3544 For the Purpose of Endorsing an Updated 2005 Regional Position on Reauthorization of the Transportation Equity Act of the Twenty-first Century (TEA-21)

The City of Portland is requesting an amendment to the TEA-21 Reauthorization Priorities List; JPACT action on Metro Resolution No. 05-3544 as follows:

1. Consolidate the following two projects.

- | | |
|--|--------|
| a. E. Burnside – Willamette River to East 14 th | \$1.5M |
| b. Portland Eastside Streetcar Extension | \$1.5M |

**New project title and dollar amount:
Burnside Corridor Street Improvements - \$5M.**

The City of Portland respectfully submits this amendment to enable Rep. Blumenauer to earmark both the E. Burnside and the Eastside Streetcar projects more effectively.

2. Please correct on the TEA 21 Metro Area Reauthorization Request List dated 2-4-05, under the heading of Local Project Priorities, "Portland: North Macadam Access \$15.00 M (project) should be amended to read " Portland: I-5/N. Macadam Access \$ 15.00M".

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING) RESOLUTION NO. 05-3548
PORTLAND REGIONAL FEDERAL) Introduced by Councilor Rex Burkholder
TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES FOR)
FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR 2006)
APPROPRIATIONS)

WHEREAS, the Portland metropolitan region relies heavily on various federal funding sources to adequately plan for and develop the region's transportation infrastructure, and

WHEREAS, Metro must comply with a wide variety of federal requirements related to transportation planning and project funding, and

WHEREAS, Metro's Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) has approved Exhibit A to this resolution, entitled, "Portland Region Priorities for FY 06 federal transportation appropriations,"; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Metro Council

1. Approve Exhibit A of this resolution, entitled "Metro Area FY 06 Federal Transportation Appropriations Request List" and directs that it be submitted to the Oregon Congressional delegation.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this ____ day of February, 2005

David Bragdon, Council President

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

Metro Area FY 06 Federal Transportation Appropriations Request List				1-28-05
Project Type/Name	Appropriation Request (\$million)	Source	Purpose	Page
Regional Highway Projects				
Sunrise Project, Unit 2	\$ 3.00	General Provisions Earmark	EIS	
I-205 Auxiliary Lane	\$ 3.00	I-Maintenance	Construction	
I-5 Trade Corridor (ODOT Share)	\$ 5.00	Borders & Corridors	EIS/PE	
I-5/99W Connector	\$ 2.50	General Provisions Earmark	EIS/PE	
ITS Equipment (ODOT)	\$ 1.20	ITS	Construction	
Total	\$ 14.70			
Regional Transit Priorities				
Interstate MAX	\$ 18.12	5309 New Starts	Construction	
Commuter Rail	\$ 37.80	5309 New Starts	Construction	
Bus Expansion and Facility	\$ 8.00	5309 Bus	Expansion	
Streetcar (N. Macadam)	\$ 2.00	HUD	Construction	
SMART Bus/Bus Related	\$ 1.75	5309 Bus	Buses/Construction	
Total	\$ 67.67			
Local Project Priorities				
Portland: I-5/I-405 Loop	\$ 4.00	General Provisions Earmark	Planning	
Portland: Going Street Bridge	\$ 2.00	General Provisions Earmark	Construction	
Portland: North Macadam Access	\$ 15.00	General Provisions Earmark	Construction	
Multnomah: Sellwood Bridge	\$ 4.00	HBR	PE/ROW	
Wilsonville: Barber Street Extension	\$ 2.00	General Provisions Earmark	Construction	
Oregon City: I-205/Hwy 213 Interchange	\$ 1.00	General Provisions Earmark	EIS	
Milwaukie: Lake Road	\$ 3.00	Safe Routes to Schools	PE/CON	
Port/Troutdale: I-84/257th Interchange	\$ 2.00	General Provisions Earmark	Planning	
Gresham: Springwater-US 26 Access	\$ 5.00	General Provisions Earmark	PE/Construction	
Gresham: Fairview Trail	\$ 1.00	TCSP	Construction	
Total	\$ 39.00			
Support for OTA Transit Request				
South Clackamas (Molalla) Transit District	\$ 0.16	5309 Bus	Bus Replacement Vehicle Maintenance & Storage Facility	
City of Sandy Transit	\$ 1.20	5309 Bus	Transit Center	
City of Canby Transit Center	\$ 0.50	5309 Bus		
Total	\$ 1.86			
Support of University Research				
PSU: MultiModal ITS Research	\$ 1.00	ITS	Research Center	
Total	\$ 1.00			
Support for Washington/Clark County Priorities				
I-5 Trade Corridor (WashDOT Share) ¹	\$ 8.00	Borders & Corridors	PE/EIS	
Vancouver Area SMART Trek ¹	\$ 1.50	ITS	Integration & Construction	
West Coast Coalition ¹	\$ 0.50	Hwy Demo	Planning	
Total	\$ 10.00			
Grand Total - Transportation Appropriations	\$ 134.23			
Channel Deepening Project	\$ 40.00	Energy & Water Act	Construction	
Columbia River/RR Swingspan	Language Change	Truman Hobbs	Construction	

¹Request to Washington Congressional Delegation

STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 05-3548, FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING PORTLAND REGIONAL FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES FOR FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR 2006 APPROPRIATIONS

Date: January 21, 2004

Prepared by: Andy Cotugno

BACKGROUND

The region annually produces a position paper that outlines the views of the Metro Council and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), a regional body that consists of local elected and appointed officials, on issues concerning transportation funding that are likely to be considered by Congress during the coming year. This year priorities are focused on both annual appropriations, addressed by this resolution as well as reauthorization of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), addressed by Resolution No. 05-3544, For the Purpose of Endorsing An Updated Regional Position on Reauthorization of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (Tea-21).

The Portland region is pursuing an aggressive agenda to implement a high-capacity transit system. This effort involves implementing three projects concurrently within the next three to five years: finishing Interstate MAX, and starting the Wilsonville to Beaverton commuter rail and I-205/Downtown LRT. Additionally, there are several complementary projects for which the region is requesting funding: bus and bus facility purchases regionwide, Wilsonville Park and Ride, highway projects and others.

Oregon and Washington continue developing a cooperative strategy to address the transportation needs in the I-5 Trade Corridor. The paper outlines the Federal funding needs and sources for continuing this work and requests support for obtaining these funds. Other interstate issues addressed in the paper include Columbia River channel deepening, high-speed rail and support of requests by the State of Washington.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. **Known Opposition** None known.
2. **Legal Antecedents** Projects within the region earmarked for federal funding must be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan, adopted by Metro Resolution No. 03-3380A, For the Purpose of Designation of Adopting the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan as the Federal Metropolitan Transportation Plan to meet Federal Planning Requirements.
3. **Anticipated Effects** Resolution would provide the US Congress and the Oregon Congressional delegation specifically with the region's priorities for transportation funding for use in the federal transportation appropriation process.
4. **Budget Impacts** Metro is involved in planning related to several of the projects included in the priorities paper and must approve many of the requested funding allocations. Failure to obtain funding for one or more of the projects could affect the FY 06-07 Planning Department budget. However, most of the funding requests deal with implementation projects sponsored by jurisdictions other than Metro.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Approve Resolution 05-3548 for submission to the Oregon Congressional delegation for consideration in the Federal Fiscal Year 06 Appropriations Bill.

02-03-05

Metro Area FY 06 Federal Transportation Appropriations Request List

Project Type/Name	Appropriation Request (\$million)	Source	Purpose	Page
Regional Highway Projects				
Sunrise Project, Unit 2	\$ 3.00	General Provisions Earmark	EIS	
I-205 Auxiliary Lane	\$ 3.00	I-Maintenance	Construction	
I-5 Trade Corridor (ODOT Share)	\$ 5.00	Borders & Corridors	EIS/PE	
I-5/99W Connector	\$ 2.50	General Provisions Earmark	EIS/PE	
ITS Equipment (ODOT)	\$ 1.20	ITS	Construction	
Total	\$ 14.70			
Regional Transit Priorities				
Interstate MAX	\$ 18.12	5309 New Starts	Construction	
Commuter Rail	\$ 37.80	5309 New Starts	Construction	
Bus Expansion and Facility	\$ 8.00	5309 Bus	Expansion	
Streetcar (N. Macadam)	\$ 2.00	HUD	Construction	
SMART Bus/Bus Related	\$ 1.75	5309 Bus	Buses/Construction	
Total	\$ 67.67			
Local Project Priorities				
Portland: I-5/I-405 Loop	\$ 4.00	General Provisions Earmark	Planning	
Portland: Going Street Bridge	\$ 2.00	General Provisions Earmark	Construction	
Portland: North Macadam Access	\$ 15.00	General Provisions Earmark	Construction	
Multnomah: Sellwood Bridge	\$ 4.00	HBR	PE/ROW	
Wilsonville: Barber Street Extension	\$ 2.00	General Provisions Earmark	Construction	
Oregon City: I-205/Hwy 213 Interchange	\$ 2.00	General Provisions Earmark	EIS	
Milwaukie: Lake Road	\$ 1.00	Safe Routes to Schools	PE	
Port/Trousdale: I-84/257th Interchange	\$ 2.00	General Provisions Earmark	Planning	
Gresham: Springwater-US 26 Access	\$ 5.00	General Provisions Earmark	PE/Construction	
Gresham: Fairview Trail	\$ 1.00	TCSP	Construction	
Total	\$ 38.00			
Support for OTA Transit Request				
South Clackamas (Molalla) Transit District	\$ 0.16	5309 Bus	Bus Replacement	
City of Sandy Transit	\$ 1.20	5309 Bus	Vehicle Maintenance & Storage Facility	
City of Canby Transit Center	\$ 0.50	5309 Bus	Transit Center	
Total	\$ 1.86			
Support of University Research				
PSU: MultiModal ITS Research	\$ 1.00	ITS	Research Center	
Total	\$ 1.00			
Support for Washington/Clark County Priorities				
I-5 Trade Corridor (WashDOT Share) ¹	\$ 8.00	Borders & Corridors	PE/EIS	
Vancouver Area SMART Trek ¹	\$ 1.50	ITS	Integration & Construction	
West Coast Coalition ¹	\$ 0.50	Hwy Demo	Planning	
Total	\$ 10.00			
Grand Total - Transportation Appropriations	\$ 133.23			
Channel Deepening Project	\$ 40.00	Energy & Water Act	Construction	
Columbia River/RR Swingspan	Language Change	Truman Hobbs	Construction	

¹Request to Washington Congressional Delegation

1-23-05

Metro Area FY 06 Federal Transportation Appropriations Request List

Project Type/Name	Appropriation Request (\$million)	Source	Purpose	Page
Regional Highway Projects				
Sunrise Project, Unit 2	\$ 3.00	General Provisions Earmark	EIS	
I-205 Auxiliary Lane	\$ 3.00	I-Maintenance	Construction	
I-5 Trade Corridor (ODOT Share)	\$ 5.00	Borders & Corridors	EIS/PE	
I-5/99W Connector	\$ 2.50	General Provisions Earmark	EIS/PE	
ITS Equipment (ODOT)	\$ 1.20	ITS	Construction	
Total	\$ 14.70			
Regional Transit Priorities				
Interstate MAX	\$ 18.12	5309 New Starts	Construction	
Commuter Rail	\$ 37.80	5309 New Starts	Construction	
Bus Expansion and Facility	\$ 8.00	5309 Bus	Expansion	
Streetcar (N. Macadam)	\$ 2.00	HUD	Construction	
SMART Bus/Bus Related	\$ 1.75	5309 Bus	Buses/Construction	
Total	\$ 67.67			
Local Project Priorities				
Portland: I-5/I-405 Loop	\$ 4.00	General Provisions Earmark	Planning	
Portland: Going Street Bridge	\$ 2.00	General Provisions Earmark	Construction	
Portland: North Macadam Access	\$ 15.00	General Provisions Earmark	Construction	
Multnomah: Sellwood Bridge	\$ 4.00	HBR	PE/ROW	
Wilsonville: Barber Street Extension	\$ 2.00	General Provisions Earmark	Construction	
Oregon City: I-205/Hwy 213 Interchange	\$ 2.00	General Provisions Earmark	EIS	
Milwaukie: Lake Road	\$ 3.00	Safe Routes to Schools	PE/CON	
Port/Troutdale: I-84/257th Interchange	\$ 2.00	General Provisions Earmark	Planning	
Gresham: Springwater-US 26 Access	\$ 5.00	General Provisions Earmark	PE/Construction	
Gresham: Fairview Trail	\$ 1.00	TCSP	Construction	
Total	\$ 40.00			
Support for OTA Transit Request				
South Clackamas (Molalla) Transit District	\$ 0.16	5309 Bus	Bus Replacement Vehicle Maintenance & Storage Facility	
City of Sandy Transit	\$ 1.20	5309 Bus		
City of Canby Transit Center	\$ 0.50	5309 Bus	Transit Center	
Total	\$ 1.86			
Support of University Research				
PSU: MultiModal ITS Research	\$ 1.00	ITS	Research Center	
Total	\$ 1.00			
Support for Washington/Clark County Priorities				
I-5 Trade Corridor (WashDOT Share) ¹	\$ 8.00	Borders & Corridors	PE/EIS	
Vancouver Area SMART Trek ¹	\$ 1.50	ITS	Integration & Construction	
West Coast Coalition ¹	\$ 0.50	Hwy Demo	Planning	
Total	\$ 10.00			
Grand Total - Transportation Appropriations	\$ 135.23			
Channel Deepening Project	\$ 40.00	Energy & Water Act	Construction	
Columbia River/RR Swingspan	Language Change	Truman Hobbs	Construction	

¹Request to Washington Congressional Delegation

2005-06 JPACT Work Program Topics

Legislative	Joint JPACT/MPAC	Routine	Policy Initiatives
Legislature <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oversight of Lobbying Efforts • JPACT Lobbying Role • Coordination with other MPOs. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • 	
Congressional Visits at JPACT Meeting		•	
Develop regional priorities package <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DC Trip Coordination • High-speed Rail 2010 Olympics Connection 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • 	•
Policy Development			
RTP Update	•		•
2040 Re-Evaluation	•		•
New Urban Area Development Strategy	•		•
Policy Implementation			
Metro Transportation Improvement Program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete Priorities 2006-09 • Refine Criteria for Priorities 2008-11 • MTIP/STIP Coordination 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • 	•
Transportation Finance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Form Finance Committee • Prepare for Possible Ballot Measure 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • 	
Major Corridor Projects in the Region <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sunrise • I-5 Columbia River • I-5/99W • Newberg/Dundee • 20-year Rail Vision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • • • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • • • 	•

2005-06 JPACT Work Program Topics

Partnerships	Joint JPACT/MPAC	Routine	Policy Initiatives
Bi-State Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bridge Project Oversight • Bi-State Cooperation 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • 	
Oregon MPO Coalition		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	
OTC/ODOT Relationship <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oregon Transportation Plan • Sphere of Influence/ACT • West Coast Coalition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • •
LCDC/DLCD Relationship <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transportation Planning Rule • Valley Rule / Greater Region Issues 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • •
JPACT Bylaws		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	

2005-06 JPACT Work Program

2005	Consent	Routine Updates & Discussion	Action
January		Priorities 2006-09 Narrowing Policy Legislative Priorities Bi-State Committee Report	
February		Regional Travel Options (RTO) Report Legislative Priorities Bi-State Committee Report	Legislative Priorities Package
March		Quarterly MPO Summit Update Bi-State Committee Report Finance Committee Report	Priorities 2006-09 Funding Allocation
April	Release published 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)	Damascus Concept Plan Alternatives Bi-State Committee Report Congressional Visit	
May		RTO Marketing Activities Update Bi-State Committee Report	
June		Quarterly MPO Summit Update Bi-State Committee Report Finance Committee Report	

2005-06 JPACT Work Program

July		RTO Rideshare Study Results Bi-State Committee Report	
August		Bi-State Committee Report	2006-09 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Update and Air Quality Conformity Determination
September		Damascus Concept Plan - Alternatives Analysis Conclusions Bi-State Committee Report Quarterly MPO Summit Update Finance Committee Report	
October		2006-07 RTP Update Work Program Bi-State Committee Report Congressional Visit	
November		2006-07 RTP Update Work Program Bi-State Committee Report	
December		Quarterly MPO Summit Update Bi-State Committee Report Finance Committee Report	2006-07 RTO Program Priorities

2005-06 JPACT Work Program

2006	Consent	Routine Updates & Discussion	Action
January		Bi-State Committee Report Legislative Priorities	
February		Bi-State Committee Report Legislative Priorities	Legislative Priorities Package
March		Quarterly MPO Summit Update Bi-State Committee Report Finance Committee Report	
April		Bi-State Committee Report Congressional Visit	
May		Bi-State Committee Report	
June		Quarterly MPO Summit Update Bi-State Committee Report Finance Committee Report	
July		Bi-State Committee Report	
August		Bi-State Committee Report	
September		Quarterly MPO Summit Update Finance Committee Report Bi-State Committee Report	

2005-06 JPACT Work Program

October		Bi-State Committee Report Congressional Visit	
November		Bi-State Committee Report	
December		Quarterly MPO Summit Update Bi-State Committee Report	

February 8, 2005

Mayor Tom Potter
Commissioner Sam Adams
Commissioner Randy Leonard
Commissioner Dan Saltzman
Commissioner Erik Sten



PORTLAND FREIGHT COMMITTEE

Dear Mayor Potter and City Commissioners:

One of the more important subjects the Portland Freight Committee has been examining is the *I-5/I-405 Loop Study* being completed by the City's Office of Transportation and Bureau of Planning. We have had three briefings on the project thus far, and are following the progress of the concepts with great interest. After lengthy discussion, our membership has concluded that we disagree with the approach that the project is taking, and in particular, are frustrated that a decision has been made to defer any action to remediate the problems associated with the I-5/I-84 interchange until a comprehensive study of the entire Loop system is completed. This is Oregon's busiest interchange and its improvement should be a high priority.

The staff of the advisory committee for the Loop Study has recommended against advancing separate projects within the Loop until a full-scale analysis of transportation, land use and economic opportunities is assessed. This process of project advancement would be similar to the I-5 Trade Corridor Partnership.

As we understand the staff recommendation, that means a comprehensive study will be undertaken, followed by a programmatic EIS of the entire system, then additional environmental and other efforts for the discrete projects that make up the system. According to our calculations, under the very best of circumstances, we won't be in a position to request construction funding until 2015-2017.

It should be noted, however, that projects within the I-5 Trade Corridor were advanced while the comprehensive system study was underway (i.e., I-5 North HOV and lane additions on I-5 in North Vancouver). So, a successful precedent has already been set to proceed with discrete projects while planning work continues.

One thing is certain: the interchange is deficient in its capacity to accommodate current demand. It presents a hazardous situation for passenger and commercial vehicles alike. A 2004 study prepared by the American Highway Users Alliance ranks this interchange as the 109th most congested intersection in the country, with over 2 million hours of delay recorded in 2002. Furthermore, these safety and traffic flow problems will grow much worse if all our projections about future transportation conditions are accurate.

Another certainty is that any future Loop Study will point to the seriousness of the traffic flow at this bottleneck, and that any potential fixes would: 1) not impact land use since all adjacent land uses are for transportation purposes; and, 2) be absolutely vital to our

continued economic success. There could be no other answers to those questions, whether they are asked today or two years from now at the end of the loop study. In the meantime, we should be planning a modernized interchange that could be in a position for construction funding in the next Federal Highway Bill.

Like the discrete actions taken on the I-5 Trade Corridor Partnership project – of which the Loop was originally a part -- we strongly suggest that the I-5/I-405 Loop System Study move forward as scheduled ***but that a separate process and effort be established immediately to complete a comprehensive engineering/environmental analysis of the I-5/I-84 interchange that is timed to be “construction-ready” by the year 2008.***

We strongly urge that Portland’s City Council request appropriate federal funding now so that engineering resources will be in place immediately after the necessary planning work and environmental analysis is complete. The I-5 Trade Corridor is a national freight route, extending from Baja to BC. Portland has a responsibility to ensure its segments are updated, improved and safe.

Sincerely,



Ann L. Gardner
Chair



Gary Eichman
Vice Chair

Cc: Rex Burkholder
JPACT

**JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION
SIGN - IN SHEET**

February 10, 2005

NAME	JURISDICTION	INITIALS
Chair Rex Burkholder	Metro Council	RB
Vice Chair Rod Park	Metro Council	RDP
Commissioner Sam Adams	City of Portland (who?)	SAT
<i>Mayor Tom Potter</i>	<i>City of Portland</i>	
Mayor Rob Drake	City of Beaverton, representing Cities of Washington Co.	
<i>Mayor Lou Ogden</i>	<i>City of Tualatin, representing Cities of Washington Co.</i>	
Mr. Matthew Garrett	ODOT - Region 1	MG
<i>Ms. Robin McArthur</i>	<i>ODOT - Region 1</i>	
Ms. Stephanie Hallock	Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality (DEQ)	
<i>Mr. Dick Pedersen</i>	<i>Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality (DEQ)</i>	DP
<i>Ms. Annette Liebe</i>	<i>Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality (DEQ)</i>	
<i>Mr. Andy Ginsburg</i>	<i>Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality (DEQ)</i>	
Mr. Fred Hansen	TriMet	FH
<i>Mr. Neil McFarlane</i>	<i>TriMet</i>	
Commissioner Bill Kennemer	Clackamas County	
<i>Commissioner Martha Schrader</i>	<i>Clackamas County</i>	
Councilor Steve Owens	City of Fairview, representing Cities of Multnomah Co.	
<i>Councilor Dave Shields</i>	<i>City of Gresham, representing Cities of Multnomah Co.</i>	
Councilor Lynn Peterson	City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas Co.	LAP
<i>Mayor James Bernard</i>	<i>City of Milwaukie, representing Cities of Clackamas Co.</i>	
Mayor Royce Pollard	City of Vancouver	
<i>Mr. Dean Lookingbill</i>	<i>SW Washington RTC</i>	
Commissioner Roy Rogers	Washington County	RR
<i>Commissioner Tom Brian</i>	<i>Washington County</i>	
Commissioner Maria Rojo de Steffey	Multnomah County	MR
<i>Commissioner Lonnie Roberts</i>	<i>Multnomah County</i>	
Commissioner Steve Stuart	Clark County	
<i>Mr. Peter Capell</i>	<i>Clark County</i>	
Mr. Don Wagner	Washington State Dept. of Transportation (WSDOT)	DW
Mr. Doug Ficco	Washington State Dept. of Transportation (WSDOT)	
Mr. Bill Wyatt	Port of Portland	
<i>Ms. Susie Lahsene</i>	<i>Port of Portland</i>	
<i>Commissioner Jay Waldron</i>	<i>Port of Portland</i>	JW
Brian Newman	Metro Council	BN

NAME

AFFILIATION

NAME	AFFILIATION
Anela Cohen	Metro
David Bragden	Metro Council
JIM BERNARD	Milwaukie
LAUREL WENTWORTH	CITY OF PORTLAND
Kathy Busse	Washington County
JIM HOWELL	AORCA
John Wiebke	City of Hillsboro
KEVIN SMITH	" "
Jef Dalin	City of Cornelius
John Pitt	Clackamas Co.
Bill [unclear]	Metro
Dave Nordberg	DEQ
Chris Smith	Citizen
Nancy Kraushaar	City of Oregon City
Ron Papsdorf	City of Gresham
Amy Rose	Metro
Richard Meyer	City of Cornelius
Kim Duncan	TriMet
Danella Gowan	City of Wilsonville
Robert MAESTRE	Multnomah Co Transportation

NAME

AFFILIATION

NAME	AFFILIATION
Susie Laksene	Perk of Pattaef
Tom Markgraf	Columbin River Crossing
Dore Williams	PARAMETEX
Doug Fucus	WSDOT
Phil Sedinger	TRIMET
Tom Kloster	METRO
Jed Feybold	"
Karen Schilling	Multnomah County
OLIVIA CLARK	TRIMET
Robin McArthur	ODOT
Robert Liberty	Metro
Graff Reed	TRUST FOR PUBLIC LANDS
Dick Schouten	Wash Co. Bd. of Comm.
Ed Narkausen	Mult. Co.
Doug Menke	THARD
Ron Willoughby	Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District
Paul S. Delympic, Pres. Bd.	Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District
MARK GARRITY	WSDOT

NAME

AFFILIATION

KATHRYN HARRINGTON

CITIZEN WA. CO.

Ann Gardner

Portland Freight Committee

Rob De Groot

ODOT

KRIS STRICKLER

WSDOT

ROBERT BERTINI

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

JOHN CHARLES

Corvallis Policy Inst.

MATTHEW HAMPTON

METRO

Greg Miller

AGC

Deborah Murdock

PSU

Patrick Flanagan

Tualatin Hills Park & Rec

Schedule
2005 Washington D.C Visit
Portland/Vancouver Metropolitan Officials
March 8-10, 2005

Feb 28 5:00 pm JPAET Dry-Run @ Metro

March 8, 2005

5:00 p.m. Arrive in Washington, DC

March 9, 2005

8:00 a.m. Planning meeting
Dirksen Building Cafeteria
Basement Level

9:00 a.m. Meeting with Congressional Staffers
188 Russell Senate Building

10:00 a.m. Senator Ron Wyden (confirmed)
230 Dirksen Office Building
Transportation: Joshua Sheinkman
Contact: 202-224-5244

11:15 a.m. Senator Patty Murray (Tentative)
173 Russell Senate Office Building
Transportation: Dale Learn
Contact: 202-224-2621

Noon Luncheon
Capitol Room SC-6
Guest Speaker

2:30 p.m. Congressman Brian Baird (Confirmed)
1421 Longworth House Office Building
Transportation: Joel Rubin
Contact: 202-225-3536
From Longworth office
Take Elevation down to G-3
Walk to Rayburn – Take 2 escalators
In basement – take stairs up one flight

3:30 p.m. Congressman Peter DeFazio (Confirmed)
2134 Rayburn House Office Building
Transportation: Kathy Dedrick
Contact: 202-225-6416

4:15 p.m. Congressman Earl Blumenauer (Confirmed)
2446 Rayburn House Office Building
Transportation: Tim Daly, LD James Koski, COS, Mariia
Zimmerman
Contact: 202-225-4811

4:45 p.m.

5:30 p.m. Reception
Location: Cannon House Office Building
Room 121

Thursday, March 10, 2005

9:00 a.m. Congresswoman Darlene Hooley (Tentative)
2430 Rayburn House Office Building
Transportation: Mark Dedrick
Contact: 202-225-5711

9:45 a.m. Senator Gordon Smith (Confirmed)
404 Russell Senate Office Building
Transportation: Wally Hsueh
Contact: 202-224-3753

10:30 a.m. Congressman David Wu (Confirmed)
1023 Longworth House Office Building
Transportation: Mary Cunningham
Contact: 202-225-0855

11:15 a.m. Congressman Greg Walden (Confirmed)
1210 Longworth House Office Building
Transportation: Brian Hard
Contact: 202-225-6730

Waiting confirmation from
Senator Murray
Congresswoman Hooley

YOU ARE INVITED

**To a reception honoring the Oregon/Vancouver
Congressional Delegation**

Senator Ron Wyden

Senator Gordon Smith

Senator Patty Murray

Representative Peter DeFazio

Representative Earl Blumenauer

Representative Darlene Hooley

Representative Greg Walden

Representative David Wu

Representative Brian Baird

Hosted by

*Metro, ODOT, TriMet, Port of Portland, City of Portland, City of Wilsonville, City of
Milwaukie, City of Lake Oswego, City of Gresham, City of Hillsboro, City of
Vancouver, Clackamas County, Multnomah County, Washington County, Portland
State University and Oregon Health Sciences University*

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 9, 2005

5:30 – 7:30 P.M.

CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

ROOM 121

Please RSVP by February 28, 2005

503-962-4830

Participants in JPACT DC visit

ODOT

- Jason Tell
- Commissioner Gail Achterman

TriMet

- Fred Hansen
- Olivia Clark

Port of Portland

- Rick Finn – Federal Gov. Relations Manager

Clackamas

- John Rist
- Commissioner Bill Kennemer
- Commissioner Martha Schrader
- Commissioner Larry Sowa

Hillsboro

- Mayor Tom Hughes

Multnomah County

- Karen Schilling
- Mike Pullen, PIO
- Commissioner Lisa Naito

City of Portland

- Laurel Wentworth
- Commissioner Sam Adams
- Brant Williams?

City of Wilsonville

- Mayor Charlotte Lehan
- Danielle Cowan
- Steve Dickey, Director SMART

City of Milwaukie

- Mayor Jim Bernard

City of Lake Oswego

- Councilor Lynn Peterson

City of Gresham

- Ron Papsdorf
- Councilor David Shields

City of Oregon City

- Mayor Alice Norris
- Commissioner Bob Bailey

City of Vancouver

- Thayer Rorabaugh

Metro

- Andy Cotugno
- Richard Brandman
- Councilor Rex Burkholder, Chair JPACT
- Councilor Rod Park, Vice Chair, JPACT
- Randy Tucker

Portland State University

- Larry Wallack, Dean of the College of Urban and Public Affairs
- Deborah Murdock

Washington County

- Kathy Busse
- Dennis Mulvihill
- Commissioner Tom Brian
- Commissioner Roy Rogers
- Gerald Kubiak

OHSU

- Mark Williams

DRAFT
Phase I Recommendation
Highway 217 corridor study
January 2004

1.0 Introduction

The Highway 217 Policy Advisory Committee voted to carry three options forward into phase two on November 17, 2004. The Policy Advisory Committee took a straw poll vote where each member could support three options. The committee quickly reached consensus after the straw poll vote. The committee conclusions and recommendations are summarized below. The complete Highway 217 Corridor Study Phase I Overview Report may be viewed at: <http://www.metro-region.org/article.cfm?ArticleID=11838>

1.1 Project Background

The Highway 217 Corridor Study is developing multi-modal transportation solutions for traffic problems on Highway 217 and the rest of the corridor.

Highway 217 is the major north-south transportation route for the urbanized portion of eastern Washington County. Today, it is generally a four-lane highway with auxiliary (non-continuous) lanes between interchanges. Traffic volumes have grown significantly as Washington County has grown from a primarily agricultural area to a booming high-tech and retail center. Traffic volumes have doubled over the past twenty years.

Nearly every transportation planning effort that has looked at this part of the region during the past decade has identified the need for additional capacity on Highway 217. ODOT's Western Bypass Study, Metro's 2000 Regional Transportation Plan, and the Oregon Highway 217 Initial Improvement Concepts Technical Memorandum, all recognize the need for at least one additional through lane in each direction on Highway 217.

In 2001, Metro prioritized corridors throughout the region that required additional study. Highway 217 was recognized as one of the most crucial corridors for improvement. During the summer of 2003, Metro began work on the Highway 217 Corridor Study with funds from Metro and local jurisdictions. The study was also partially funded through a grant from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to study value-pricing options in this corridor.

1.2 Study Goal

The primary purpose of the corridor study is to provide for mobility to regional destinations served by Highway 217 and to provide access to activity centers within the corridor. The study is considering roadway, transit, bicycle and pedestrian improvements.

The Policy Advisory Committee identified the following overall goal:

Develop transportation improvements that will be implemented in the next 20 years to provide for efficient movement of people and goods through and within the Highway 217 corridor over the next twenty years while supporting economically dynamic and attractive regional and town centers and respecting the livability of nearby communities.

1.3 Study Process

The Highway 217 Corridor Study is being completed in two phases. The first phase developed and analyzed a wide range of multi-modal alternatives. Based on this evaluation, the alternatives will be refined to a smaller set that can be studied in more detail.

Alternatives will be evaluated based on how well they address the study objectives in terms of travel performance, supporting regional economic centers, environmental and neighborhood effects, financial feasibility, cost effectiveness and potential for public support. The study's future year planning horizon is 2025.

The study options include highway, arterial, transit, bike and pedestrian improvements. The options each assume that improvements listed in the Regional Transportation Plan's financially constrained system have been made by 2025.

2.0 Overall Findings

2.1 Overall Conclusion

The first phase found that adding an additional through lane on Highway 217 was necessary to improve mobility for trips to regional destinations. It also found that improving the interchanges on Highway 217 by building braided ramps or consolidated interchanges was important to improving the function and overall mobility on Highway 217. Without interchange improvements, drivers on Highway 217 would continue to experience significant delays even with a new lane.

It is also important to have multi-modal and arterial improvements. Baseline commuter rail, bicycle and arterial improvements are included in each alternative. Additional transit, bicycle and arterial connections are also proposed for further study in Phase II.

The first phase also highlighted an existing bottleneck on I-5 South between Highway 217 and Wilsonville. Improvements to through capacity on Highway 217 exacerbate the congestion anticipated for this section of I-5. Detailed study of this portion of I-5 is needed, but is not within the scope of this corridor planning effort.

2.2 Overall Recommendation

All options proposed for further study include interchange improvements (braided ramps and consolidated interchanges) and an additional through lane on Highway 217. They also include baseline commuter rail, arterial and bicycle improvements.

In addition, the policy advisory committee recommends further study of selected arterials from option 1. This set of arterial improvements will be considered as to how they can help achieve study goals of improving access to activity centers in the corridor and enhancing mobility for regional trips. The arterial alternative includes completion of key bicycle improvements identified in Phase I.

Finally, to the extent possible within study resources, Phase II work will seek to further illuminate how study alternatives relate to both I-5 and Highway 26. In particular, consideration will be given to the bottleneck on I-5 between Highway 217 and Wilsonville. A separate study is needed to fully understand the needs and potential solutions on I-5. The Highway 217 Corridor Study will suggest appropriate next steps regarding this issue as part of its final recommendations.

3.0 Options recommended for further study in Phase II

3.1 Option 3, six lanes plus interchange improvements, includes a new through lane, which will be open to general purpose traffic, as well as interchange improvements. The alternative assumes continuation of ramp meters at all access ramps.

Summary Conclusions

This option improves access for regional trips coming into the corridor. It offers the greatest overall reduction in delay for all drivers on Highway 217 and improves safety from eliminating merge/weave conflicts. It also offers benefits for trucks because it reduced overall congestion. This option has a substantial funding gap.

Recommendation

This option will be studied in phase II. Selected arterial improvements will be analyzed with this option to analyze their benefits to accessing activity centers and enhancing corridor mobility for trips to key regional destinations. Exploration of alternatives for phasing and alternative funding sources will be the primary focus of Phase II.

3.2 Option 5, six lanes with rush-hour toll lanes, includes an additional through lane, which would be managed as a rush hour toll lane, as well as interchange improvements. This alternative assumes ramp meter bypass lanes proximate to entry points. It also includes two express bus routes, which utilize the managed lane.

Summary Conclusions

Option 5 enhances overall access for regional trips to centers within the corridor. It offers a reliable, express trip for drivers in the toll lane and provides some improvement for drivers in the general-purpose lane compared to the base case. This option offers benefits for small trucks that were allowed to use the tolled lane. It also increases transit travel due to the new bus service in the toll lane. Because it is expected to generate significant toll revenues, this option has the smallest funding gap.

Recommendation

This option should be studied in Phase II. In order to reduce merge conflicts associated with accessing the lane, the two intermediate entrances in each direction will be consolidated into a single entrance and exit in each direction. The locations for the intermediate entrance and exit will be studied in Phase II. In addition, potential benefits from additional arterial connections will be considered. A key focus of Phase II work will be on refining the toll revenue projections, developing a realistic phasing strategy and public acceptance.

4.3 Option 6, six lanes with tolled ramp meter bypasses includes an additional through lane, which would be open to all traffic and interchange improvements. This option would provide a toll bypass at the ramp meter to provide a faster option for those willing to pay a toll.

Summary Conclusion

This option offers travel performance similar to option 3, but provides some toll revenues. Less funding from toll revenues is expected in this option than with a tolled lane. Trucks could use the tolled ramp meter bypass making this the option with the most benefits for all trucks regardless of size. It also includes new bus service that would use the ramp meter bypasses.

Recommendation

This option should be studied in Phase II. Particular emphasis should be placed on public acceptance of tolling the ramp bypasses. Also, further analysis of the potential toll revenues and phasing options will be conducted.

4.0 Options not recommended for further study

4.1 Option 1: arterial, transit and interchange improvements did not include a new through lane on Highway 217. It attempted to address corridor travel needs by improving the interchanges on Highway 217 to reduce merge/weave conflicts, improving the arterial network and increasing transit service.

Summary Conclusion

While this options increased transit ridership and improved access for local trips, it did not address regional mobility needs as much as other options. It reduced congestion on surface streets, but did not reduce delays or improve travel times on Highway 217. It was also the most expensive option and involved by far the most environmental and neighborhood impacts.

Recommendation

This option was not selected to move forward as a separate option. However, it did highlight the importance of addressing the merge/weave conflicts on the highway and improving local connections. It also demonstrated the demand for eventual increases in commuter rail service. A smaller set of arterial improvements included in this option will be considered in Phase II for their effectiveness in improving access to centers and providing an alternative for trips utilizing Highway 217.

3.2 Option 2: six lanes without interchange improvements included a new through lane on Highway 217 but did not include interchange improvements to address the merge/weave conflict on Highway 217.

Summary Conclusion

This option demonstrated the importance of the improving the interchanges on Highway 217. While it provided additional capacity, the turbulence caused by merging and weaving traffic would result in significant delays and impair safety.

Recommendation

This option should not be carried forward for further study.

3.3 Option 4: six lanes with carpool lanes included interchange improvements and restricted use of the new lane to carpools and transit.

Summary Conclusion

This option did not increase the number of carpools using Highway 217. It also had little public support. While it provided for a fast trip for carpools, it did not reduce overall delay on the highway.

Recommendation

This option is not recommended for further study.

TVAC
Friday, February 4, 2005
7:30 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.
Triple Conference Room C

AGENDA

I. State Legislature

- Update
- Rex Burkholder at House Transportation and PBA
- Milwaukie LRT
- Connect Oregon

II. Updates

- Oberstar visit
- I-5 Crossing – New Committee
- Commuter Rail

III. Re-Authorization

- John Rist DC Trip Report
- Review of Request List
- New Senate Banking Form

IV. Appropriations

- Deadline – February 9, 2005

V. Delegation Visit – March 8-10

- Agenda
- Participants
- Briefing Material
- 28 Feb. 5 p.m. – Dry Run

New York City

April 13-15, 2005

**WORLD
WATER**

Roundtables 2005

save the date

San Francisco

May 4-6, 2005

LOGISTICS

San Francisco, CA 4
Hyatt Embarcadero
Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA
www.sanfranciscoregency.hyatt.com/
415.788.1234

Registration

Online registration begins on February 2, 2005.

For the East Coast Roundtable go to
www.regonline.com/27033

For the West Coast Roundtable go to
www.regonline.com/27096

Note:

Please note that up to two representatives from each
New Starts project are invited.

For more information on Roundtable logistics, please contact:
Scott Hamvey 817.338.0318 x127 | sh3@thacollaborative.com

M E M O R A N D U M

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



DATE: January 24, 2005
 TO: TPAC and Interested Parties
 FROM: Ted Leybold: Principal Transportation Planner
 SUBJECT: MTIP development and the Transportation Priorities 2006-09 Final Cut List Staff Recommendation

* * * * *

The development of the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program is proceeding on several fronts. JPACT approved comments on the draft STIP at its January meeting. The draft STIP includes proposed funding for transportation projects in the Metro region in the following amounts for federal fiscal years 2006 through 2009:

Draft ODOT 2006-09 STIP (Metro Area)

Highway and Road Modernization (Capacity):	\$205.5 million
Road Safety projects	\$29.3 million
Road Operations, Maintenance & Preservation	\$149.3 million
Bridge projects proposal not yet final (Region One 2004-07 =)	\$85.5 million
Public Transportation (+ Portion of \$21 million statewide for 06/07)	\$23.0 million
Bicycle/Pedestrian (06/07 only):	\$1.6 million
Transportation Enhancements (State wide 2007-08)	\$7.9 million

Additionally, the public transportation agencies TriMet and SMART are anticipating the following federal transportation funding support in 2006 through 2009 to be programmed in the Metropolitan TIP:

Draft Transit 2006-09 STIP (Metro Area)

Operating Assistance	\$130.9 million
Bus & Rail Fleet Maintenance	\$29.3 million
Requested Capital Projects (I-205 LRT, Commuter Rail, Streetcar, Maintenance Facilities) – 2006 only	\$69.3 million

State transportation trust fund pass through revenues to local jurisdictions (approximately 40% of state gas and weight-mile taxes and other fees), and locally generated transportation revenues are not programmed in the MTIP.

Regional flexible funds, local Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) funds are being allocated through the Transportation Priorities 2006-09 competitive application process. JPACT and the Metro Council will program \$62.3 million of transportation projects for fiscal years 2008 and 2009. This will add to the \$54.75 million of these funds previously programmed for 2006 and 2007. Attached are several documents related to the staff recommendation on selection of projects to receive regional flexible funds.

Attached is the draft Resolution and Staff Report that will be presented for JPACT action on March 17th and Metro Council action on March 24th. Exhibit A is a summary of the Transportation Priorities program objectives and policy direction to staff on the development of a recommended set of projects proposed for funding. Exhibit B is the Executive Summary of the Public Comment Report. Exhibit C is the explanation of the Metro staff recommendation. Exhibit D is the draft Conditions of Approval of project funding.

The Metro staff recommendation to TPAC included a base package of projects that most clearly implement the program objectives and policy guidance provided by JPACT and the Metro Council. It included projects in the emphasis modal categories where clear technical score breaks distinguish those projects from lower scoring projects in those categories, program funding at levels consistent with previous allocations, and projects from the non-emphasis categories that best meet the additional policy direction as provided by JPACT and the Council as to when to propose funding for those projects. Consideration of a fair and reasonable contribution from regional flexible fund sources was also given to projects when special circumstances warranted such as large project cost, multiple agency interests or project cost increase responsibility.

Additionally, a list of "Next Tier" projects that represent projects that also addressed the program objectives and policy guidance provided by JPACT and the Metro Council but not as distinctly as the recommended base package of projects was presented for further consideration. From these projects, four add package options were developed by Metro staff for TPAC consideration. The Base Package and Next Tier project recommendations are presented in the table below.

TPAC developed two options based on the Metro staff recommendation. A summary of those options is also summarized below.

Transportation Priorities 2006-09
Base +
Next Tier Optional Adds

Planning & Travel Options

Item	Planning	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Item	Bike/Trail	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Item	Pedestrian	Requested Amount (millions of \$)
Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding		
Ongoing Programs			Ongoing Programs			Ongoing Programs		
PR005	Regional Freight Planning: region-wide	\$0.300	BT1009	Springwater Trail: Southwood Gap SE 10th to SE Umatilla	\$1.629	PD143	Forest Grove Town Center Pedestrian Improvements	\$0.660
PR001	MPO-Required Planning: region-wide	\$1.731	BT071	Marine Dr. Bike Lanes & Trail Gaps: 28th Ave. to 185th	\$0.966	PD054	Milwaukie Town Center: Main/Hatfield/21st	\$0.450
Corridor Planning			Corridor Planning			Corridor Planning		
PR003	Milwaukie LRT Supplemental EIS: Portland central city to Milwaukie town center	\$2.000	BT055	Springwater Trailhead at Main City Park	\$0.310			
PR003	Multi-Use Master Plans: Lake Oswego to Milwaukie, Tongue Trail, Mt. Scott - Scouler's Loop	\$0.300	BT062	MAX Multi-use Path: Cleveland Station to Ruby Junction	\$0.890			
PR002	Next Priority Corridor Study	\$0.500	BT028	Trolley Trail: Artists to Glen Echo (Segments 5-6)	\$0.742			
PR107	Willamette Shoreline - Hwy 43 Transit alternatives analysis: Portland South Waterfront to Lake Oswego	\$0.689	BT012	Rock Creek Trail: Orchard Park to NW Parkers	\$0.675			
Subtotal: \$5.519			Subtotal: \$5.212			Subtotal: \$1.118		
Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut			Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut			Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut		
Program Enhancements			Program Enhancements			Program Enhancements		
PR004	Livable Streets Update: region-wide	\$0.200	BT110	Jennifer St. 106th to 122nd	\$0.550	PD127	Tacoma Street 6th to 23rd	\$1.402
PR006	Bike Model and Interactive Map: region-wide	\$0.291	BT072	Powerline Trail (northern): Schwegback Park to Burnwood Dr. (ROW)	\$0.600	PD106	Rockwood Ped to MAX: 188th Avenue and Burnside	\$1.400
			BT011	Marine Dr. Bike Lanes & Trail Gaps: 6th Ave. to 28th	\$0.685	PD102	SW Capitol Highway (PE) Multnomah to Taylors Ferry	\$0.536
Subtotal: \$8.409			Subtotal: \$1.835			Subtotal: \$3.340		
Mode Category Total: \$5.920			Mode Category Total: \$7.047			Mode Category Total: \$4.458		
Item	Regional Travel Options	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Item	TOD	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Item	Transit	Requested Amount (millions of \$)
Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding		
Program management & administration			Program management & administration			Program management & administration		
TR001	Regional marketing program	\$2.900	TR003	Regional TOD Station Area Program	\$3.000	TR101	I-205 LRT, Commuter R/R, S Waterford Streetcar	\$16.000
TR002	Regional evaluation	\$0.300	TR002	Regional TOD Urban Center Program	\$1.000	TR102	I-205 Supplemental	\$2.600
TR003	TravelSmart	\$0.500	TR003	Site acquisition: Beaverton regional center	\$2.000	TR103	Frequent Bus Capital program	\$2.750
Subtotal: \$4.100			Subtotal: \$6.000			Subtotal: \$21.350		
Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut			Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut			Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut		
TR004	TravelSmart	\$0.500	TR002	Regional TOD Urban Center Program	\$0.500	TR106	Eastside Streetcar (Con)	\$1.000
			TR003	Site acquisition: Beaverton regional center	\$1.000	TR126	South Metro Amtrak Station Phase I	\$1.150
			TR004	Gateway Transit Center Redevelopment	\$0.500			
Subtotal: \$0.500			Subtotal: \$2.000			Subtotal: \$2.150		
Mode Category Total: \$4.600			Mode Category Total: \$8.000			Mode Category Total: \$23.500		

Roads & Bridges

Item	Road Capacity	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Item	Road Reconstruction	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Item	Boulevard	Requested Amount (millions of \$)
Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding		
Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut			Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut			Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut		
RC0214	SW Greenburg Road/Washington Square Dr. to Tedeman	\$1.000	RR1053	Halo Parkway NW Davis to SW Market	\$3.840	BS020	Rose Bigge extension: Crescent St to Hall (PE)	\$0.580
PR017	Boones Ferry Road at Lanewood Street	\$1.400	RR1054	10th Avenue at Highway 8 Intersections	\$0.837	BS051	Sunside Street Bridge to E 14th (PE)	\$1.650
RC1144	Beaverton-Hillsdale Hwy/Olesun/Scholls Ferry intersection (PE)	\$1.411	RR2035	Cleveland St. NE Stark to SE Powell	\$1.540	BS120	Killingsworth: N Commercial to NE MLK (PE)	\$0.400
RC2119	Wood Village Blvd. Artists to Halsey	\$0.815				BS370	Rose Bigge extension: Crescent St to Hall (ROW)	\$1.140
RC1000	SE 172nd Ave Phase I, Sunnyside to Hwy 212 (ROW - \$1.0 million)	\$2.000						
Subtotal: \$5.626			Subtotal: \$6.217			Subtotal: \$3.770		
Mode Category Total: \$6.626			Mode Category Total: \$6.217			Mode Category Total: \$3.770		
Item	Freight	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Item	Large Bridge	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Item	Green Streets	Requested Amount (millions of \$)
Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding		
Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut			Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut			Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut		
FR003	N Lombard Slough overcrossing	\$2.210	BR1012	Seiwold Bridge Replacement: Type, Size & Location Study, Preliminary environmental	\$1.500	GS124	NE Cully Boulevard: Prescott to Killingsworth	\$2.157
FR015	SW Tualatin-Sherwood Road ATMS I-5 to Highway 99W	\$0.341				GS123	Beaver Creek Culverts: Troutdale, Cochran Slank	\$1.700
FR007	N Leadbetter Extension: N Bybee Lake Ct. to Marine Dr.	\$0.900						
FR004	Kinsman Road extension: Barber to Boeckman	\$1.400						
FR008	Freight Data Collection Infrastructure and Archival System: Approximately 50 interchanges region-wide	\$0.179						
Subtotal: \$5.030			Subtotal: \$1.500			Subtotal: \$3.857		
Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut			Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut			Recommended for Further Consideration in Final Cut		
FR007	N Leadbetter Extension: N Bybee Lake Ct. to Marine Dr.	\$0.900	BR1012	Seiwold Bridge Replacement: Type, Size & Location Study, Preliminary environmental	\$1.000			
Subtotal: \$0.900			Subtotal: \$1.000			Subtotal: \$0.000		
Mode Category Total: \$5.930			Mode Category Total: \$2.500			Mode Category Total: \$3.857		

Roads and Bridges Recommended Total: \$13,617
 Planning and Travel Options: \$43,291
 Recommended Total: \$56,908
 Expected 2006-09 Funding Authorized: \$62,228
 Remaining funds to be allocated: \$5,320
 Total Next Tier project cost: \$23,608

The TPAC recommendation included the following two options that include the Base Package recommendation with the following modifications.

**TPAC Recommended Options
Base Package with the following changes:**

Project	Agency	Option 1 (\$ millions)	Option 2 (\$ millions)
Add to Base Package			
Marine Drive Bike Lanes	Portland	\$.685	
Powerline Trail ROW	THPRD	\$.600	
Rockwood Ped to MAX	Gresham	\$.900	
Beaverton TOD Site	Beaverton	\$.650	
Capitol Highway Pedestrian	Portland	\$.538	
Gateway TOD Site	Portland	\$.500	
Eastside Streetcar	Portland	\$ 1.000	
South Metro Amtrak Station	Oregon City	\$ 1.150	\$ 1.00
Bike Model and Interactive Map	Metro		\$.201
Urban Center TOD Program	Metro		\$.500
Sellwood Bridge	Multnomah Co.		\$.500
B-H/Scholls/Oleson	Washington Co.		\$ 1.000
Ledbetter extension	Port of Portland		\$.900
172 nd Avenue	Clackamas Co.		\$ 2.000
Cleveland Avenue	Gresham		\$ 1.000
Subtotal		\$ 6.023	\$ 8.101
Remove from Base Package			
Trolley Trail			(\$.742)
TOD Category			(\$.500)
RTO Category			(\$.500)
Subtotal			(\$ 1.742)
Total Addition to Base		\$ 6.023	\$ 6.359
Total Cost with Base		\$ 62.931	\$ 63.267
Over programmed		\$.703	\$ 1.039

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ALLOCATING \$62.2) RESOLUTION NO. 05-3529
MILLION OF TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES)
FUNDING FOR THE YEARS 2008 AND 2009,) Introduced by Councilor Rex Burkholder
PENDING AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY)
DETERMINATION.)
)
)
)

WHEREAS, Approximately \$62.2 million is forecast to be appropriated to the Metro region through the federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation – Air Quality (CMAQ) transportation grant programs, and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council and Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) are designated by federal legislation as authorized to allocate these funds to projects and programs in the metropolitan region through the Transportation Priorities process, and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council and Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) have provided policy guidance to Metro staff and the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) on the type and balance of projects and programs that are a priority for these funds through Metro Resolution No 02-3206 For the Purpose of Adopting the Policy Direction, Program Objectives, Procedures and Criteria for the Priorities 2003 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) and Allocation of Regional Flexible Funds, adopted July 25, 2002 and further refined at the Metro Council Informal of May 6, 2003, and the JPACT meeting of May 15, 2003, and

WHEREAS, Metro received approximately \$130 million in project and program applications, and

WHEREAS, Those applications have been evaluated by technical criteria within one of twelve modal categories, by a summary of qualitative factors and by a summary of public comments, and

WHEREAS, an extensive public process has provided an opportunity for comments on the merit and potential impacts of the project and program applications between October 15th and December 6th, 2004 and at a public hearing before the Metro Council to respond to a staff and TPAC recommendation of proposed projects and programs to allocate funding, and

WHEREAS, Metro staff and TPAC have provided recommendations to JPACT and the Metro Council on a list of projects and programs to allocate funding in response to the policy direction provided, considering the technical evaluation, qualitative factors, and public comments provided as shown in Exhibit A, and

WHEREAS, JPACT has acted on the recommendations of Metro staff and TPAC and recommended funding for a list of projects and programs identified in Exhibit D, and

WHEREAS, Receipt of these funds are conditioned on completion of requirements listed in Exhibit E to the staff report, and

WHEREAS, The recommended list of projects and programs, along with all of the projects and programs expected to receive federal funding in the 2006 through 2009 fiscal years will be analyzed for

conformity with the State Implementation Plan for air quality and adopted within the Metropolitan Transportation Implementation Plan (MTIP); now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council adopt the recommendation of JPACT on the project and programs to be funded through the Transportation Priorities 2006-09 process as shown in Exhibit A.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this 24th day of March 2005

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

Exhibit A

Transportation Priorities 2006-09 Policy Objectives

The primary policy objective for the Transportation Priorities 2006-09 program is to leverage economic development in priority 2040 land-use areas through investments that support:

2040 Tier I and II mixed-use areas (central city, regional centers, town centers, main streets and station communities)

2040 Tier I and II industrial areas (regionally significant industrial areas and industrial areas), and

2040 Tier I and II mixed-use and industrial areas within UGB expansion areas with completed concept plans

Other policy objectives include:

- emphasize modes that do not have other sources of revenue
- complete gaps in modal systems
- develop a multi-modal transportation system with a strong emphasis on funding bicycle, boulevard, freight, green street demonstration, pedestrian, regional transportation options, transit oriented development and transit projects and programs
- meet the average annual requirements of the State Implementation Plan for air quality for the provision of pedestrian and bicycle facilities

IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAM POLICY OBJECTIVES FOR NARROWING TO FINAL CUT LIST

1. Support economic development in priority land use areas.

In addition to the quantitative technical summary, provide information in the staff report on how each project or modal category of projects addresses:

- link to retention and/or attraction of traded-sector jobs,
- transportation barrier to development in 2040 priority land use areas
- support of livability and attractiveness of the region.

2. Emphasize priority modal categories in the following manner:

- A. Emphasize projects in the bicycle, boulevard, freight, green street demonstration, pedestrian, regional transportation options, transit oriented development and transit categories by:
- proposing the top-ranked projects at clear break points in technical scoring in all of the emphasis categories (with limited consideration of qualitative issues and public comments).
- B. Nominate projects in the road capacity, reconstruction or bridge categories when the project competes well within its modal category for 2040 land use technical score and over all technical score, and the project best addresses (relative to competing candidate projects) one or more of the following criteria:
- project leverages traded-sector development in Tier I or II mixed-use and industrial areas;
 - funds are needed for project development and/or match to leverage large sources of discretionary funding from other sources;
 - the project provides new bike, pedestrian, transit or green street elements that would not otherwise be constructed without regional flexible funding (new elements that do not currently exist or elements beyond minimum design standards).
- C. When considering nomination of applications to fund project development or match costs, address the following:
- Strong potential to leverage discretionary (competitive) revenues.
 - Partnering agencies illustrate a financial strategy (not a commitment) to complete construction that does not rely on large, future allocations from Transportation Priorities funding.
 - Partnering agencies demonstrate how dedicated road or bridge revenues are used within their agencies on competing road or bridge priorities.

3. As a means of further emphasis on implementation of Green Street principles, the following measures should also be implemented:
- Staff may propose conditional approval of project funding to further review of the feasibility of including green street elements, particularly interception and infiltration elements.
 - Strong consideration will be given to funding the Livable Streets Update application in the Planning category. This work would document the latest research and further the training and education of green street implementation in the region.

Summary of Comments by Mode

A total of 1,209 comments were received on the 2006-09 MTIP proposed transportation projects.

Large Bridge Project

A total of 108 comments were received on the **Sellwood Bridge Replacement Study**, with all but one in favor of a new bridge for safer cycling, walking and driving, and more efficient freight routing. The bridge was called “a death trap waiting to happen for cyclists” and vital for transportation connections. Some people wanted a new bridge in a new location, and one person thought the existing bridge should be preserved and widened. All comments agreed that there was an urgent need to do something about the dangerous condition of the Sellwood Bridge.

Bike/Trail Projects

The bike/trail project category received 353 comments, the most comments of any mode category. Comments related to safety and connectivity of multi-use trails in the region.

The Springwater Trail Sellwood Gap: SE 19th to SE Umatilla multi-use trail project received 107 comments, all but one in favor of the project. Many comments related to the elimination of dangerous road crossings on the trail. Cyclists and walkers expressed delight with the trail and their desire to close the gaps for easier, safer trail connections.

The Powerline Trail (North): Schueback Park to Burntwood Drive in Beaverton received 65 comments in favor of continuing this important multi-use trail in a growing area with few parks. The trail was seen as a vital corridor linking homes, shopping and transit while protecting greenspaces and wildlife. In addition, petitions totaling 320 signatures were received in favor of funding this trail project.

The Trolley Trail: Arista to Glen Echo received 57 comments, all but one in favor of completion of this “long awaited” project. Comments mentioned the need for a safe, usable year-around linear park that would foster pride in the community and a leave a legacy for generations. It was also seen as a boon to Milwaukie Center revival.

The Marine Drive Bike Lanes and Trail Gaps: 6th to 185th Avenue project received 47 comments. Most comments were from cyclists who would use it more if proposed safety improvements were made. The trail was seen as providing scenic access along the Columbia River. It could be one of the best in Portland, if improved.

The Rock Creek Trail: Orchard Park to Wilkens project received 26 favorable comments. This trail is seen as the spine of the trail network in Hillsboro; greatly needed in a dense and growing area. It would connect neighborhoods to employment, shopping, light rail, parks and a new library.

The Springwater Trailhead at Main City Park received 21 comments in favor of providing needed facilities and connections to the Springwater Trail and light rail. It would provide a critical missing link in the path network.

The Powerline Trail (South): Barrows to Beef Bend Road project received 16 favorable comments. This trail is seen as providing an important multi-use corridor in an area lacking parks, sidewalks and north/south routes.

Pedestrian Projects

All pedestrian projects received 158 comments relating to safety and pedestrian links.

The Capitol Highway: Multnomah to Taylors Ferry project received 59 comments asking for relief from a congested area devoid of paved sidewalks or shoulders on the roads. Safety was seen as a problem for walkers and cyclists, now using a dirt "goat" path. The path is seen as a vital link to schools, shopping, recreation and residential areas. One person said improving this path was a misuse of government funds.

The Milwaukie Town Center: Main/Harrison/21st project received 48 favorable comments. Most were printed postcards that requested funding for a project that enhances the town center's livability and creates a pedestrian link to nearby parks. Some comments stressed safety improvements needed to reduce risks and improve mobility.

The Tacoma Street: 6th to 21st Avenue project received 21 comments, most in favor of further improving safety and aesthetics on this street for pedestrians and bicyclists. Three comments were against this project, partly because of proposed curb extensions.

Road Reconstruction Projects

All road reconstruction projects received 101 comments, with the most interest in Lake Road and Naito Parkway improvements.

The Lake Road: 21st to Hwy 224 project received 57 comments in favor of safety improvements to improve driving conditions and protect children with sidewalks and bike lanes. This project was seen as a multi-modal link that would help revive Milwaukie and improve connections to Clackamas Regional Center.

The Naito Parkway: NW Davis to SW Market project received 25 comments, most in favor of reconstructing this street. Most comments expressed the need for street repair, sidewalks and bike lanes to increase traffic flow in an important part of downtown Portland next to Waterfront Park.

Boulevard Projects

All boulevard projects received 84 comments, with Burnside Street receiving the most comments for improvements leading to economic development and greater access.

The Burnside Street: Bridge to E. 14th project received 44 comments, most in support of safety improvements for cyclists, walkers and autos. One person stated the need to transform the area into a Gateway to the City, called for in the Central City Plan. Others supported the project as important to business and economic growth. A few comments against the project called for traffic calming signals for bikes, and adjacent one-way streets.

The **Cornell Road: Saltzman to 119th project** received 20 favorable comments to help make it safer for bikes. One person said it was a miserable intersection that needed high priority funding. Others said the street had dangerous traffic with no bike lanes. Safe, healthy bike routes were requested for westside cycling.

The **Killingsworth: 1-5 Overpass & N Commercial to NE MLK project** received 16 comments, most in favor of improving the safety and access of this “long ignored” street. The project was seen as filling a missing link and promoting further residential and commercial growth in the area. One comment was against curb extensions.

Planning Projects

All planning projects received 142 comments relating to the need for further planning for freight, trails, livable streets, bike information and transit.

Bike Model and Interactive Map Regionwide received 43 comments, most in favor of the “Map Quest for bikes” project. Comments highlighted the usefulness as roads change; the convenience of trip planning and the assistance in finding safer routes. One person said it is a great, low cost idea. One comment said it is not a priority because it is not hard to read a paper map.

The **Willamette Shoreline – Hwy 43 Transit project** received 39 comments, most in favor of funding this planning project. Bicyclists support the project for more bike lanes and less car traffic to dodge on Hwy. 43. This corridor is seen as being at or near capacity, with traffic increasing with development. Action is seen as critical for safety and access between the South Waterfront area and Lake Oswego. One person said there is little support in Lake Oswego for a rail line.

Multi-Use Path Master Plans, Lake Oswego to Milwaukie received 36 comments in favor of this planning project. Most comments wanted essential links in the trails system for livability, access, safety and recreation opportunities. A non-motorized river crossing was requested between Lake Oswego and Milwaukie.

Transit Projects

All transit projects received 72 comments regarding the need for transportation links and access around the region.

The **Eastside Streetcar project** received 24 comments, most in support of the streetcar line for livability, access and economic development throughout the Central Eastside area, including Lloyd Center, Oregon Convention Center and OMSI. Comments against the project said it would increase auto congestion and it ignored the Hawthorne Bridge as a more cost-effective crossing.

South Metro Amtrak Station received 18 comments, most in favor of the enhancements to the existing train station and increased parking space. The project is seen as important for improving the popularity of Amtrak and supporting rail transport. Comments against the project stated that Amtrak should fund it and questioned whether it would ease auto congestion.

Transit Oriented Development Projects

All TOD projects received 74 comments, most with praise for the program for helping to fund mixed-use transit-oriented projects around the region.

The **Regional TOD Urban Center Program** received 24 comments in support of mixed-use projects in urban centers but not along light rail. One small developer was very happy with TOD as “a smart way to get smart growth.”

The **Regional TOD LRT Station Area Program** received 25 comments, almost all in support of this tool to develop higher density projects and promote creative land development.

Freight Projects

Fifty-four comments were received on the freight projects, with the N. Leadbetter Extension, Kinsman Road Extension and the Freight Data Collection projects each receiving 12 comments. Most comments requested completion of the projects for safety and better freight movement.

Road Capacity Projects

All the road capacity projects received 40 comments, with the most comments (13) in support of the SE 172nd Ave. Phase I: Sunnyside to Hwy 212 project to increase traffic flow and aid economic development in the area.

Green Streets Projects

Fifteen comments were received on the Green Streets projects, with the most comments (11) on the NE Cully Boulevard project, which was seen as unsafe and in need of sidewalks for school children.

Regional Travel Options Projects

Eight comments were received on the Regional Travel Options programs and projects. The Three Travel Smart projects received 5 comments and the RTO Base program received 2 comments.

General Comments

Some comments and suggestions were received that did not relate to a specific MTIP project. A total of 33 comments were general in nature. Some requested making bike paths and lanes safer and supporting bike commuters. Other comments related to the need for repairing and expanding roads for auto and freight movement.

Exhibit C

Transportation Priorities 2006-09: *Investing in the 2040 Growth Concept*

Explanation of Metro Staff Project/Program Recommendations

Following is a summary of the rationale used by Metro staff to implement the policy direction provided by JPACT and the Metro Council in developing a Final Cut List recommendation as shown in Exhibit D. The summary is organized by mode category.

Bike/Trail

- The top six technically ranked projects were nominated for inclusion in the final cut list base package. The fourth, fifth and sixth ranked projects had similar technical scores while there is a more pronounced break point between the sixth and seventh ranked project.
- The Marine Drive trail gaps project was initially reduced in recommended funding in the Base package by the amount that project was thought likely to receive through the state Transportation Enhancement (TE) funding program. Subsequent communication with the TE staff indicates the project is not likely to receive funding through that program. TPAC recommended this funding be restored in the Option 1 add package.
- The Trolley Trail project was reduced in recommended funding in the Base package by half to allow coordination with the area sewer districts for the potential use of the trail right-of-way for a sewer trunk line. Slowing the rate of funding for this project would allow better construction coordination and the potential for shared construction costs. The Option 2 package would eliminate all funding consideration for this project in this funding cycle.
- Right-of-way for the Powerline Trail from Scheupback Park to Burntwood Drive is included in the Option 1 package to help secure the undeveloped Mt. Williams property where the project is located prior to the expiration of a purchase option owned by a consortium seeking to secure the property for park and trail use.
- The projects included in the Base package will meet progress needed on air quality Transportation Control Measures of 5 miles per biennium. Proposed projects would provide 6.79 miles of bicycle trail projects. However, the location of the 2.3 miles of MAX multi-use path project is located in the Gresham regional and Rockwood town centers and therefore is eligible to meet required pedestrian improvements. As proposed funding for the Pedestrian improvements may not meet air quality TCM requirements (further definition is needed for the Forest Grove Town Center project) a portion of the MAX path project may be needed to meet the pedestrian projects need. Elimination of funding for the Trolley Trail project for the base package recommendation of segments 4 and 5 would eliminate 1.2 miles from the bike improvements provided.

Exhibit C

Response to Policy Guidance

In addition to the technical score that reflects a quantitative measure of the policy guidance, the Metro staff recommendation within the bicycle modal category addresses the following policy guidance.

Economic development in priority land use areas

- Link to retention and/or attraction of traded-sector jobs

- Address transportation barrier to development in 2040 priority land use areas

None of the projects in the bicycle/trail category remove or reduce a congestion barrier that is preventing development in a 2040 priority land use area. However, all of the projects, other than the Springwater Trailhead project, would provide an alternative mode option to priority land use areas that have or are forecast to have congestion.

- Support livability and attractiveness of the region.

The development of a regional bike system and bike access to 2040 priority land use areas contribute to the economic vitality of the region by increasing bike trips that do not require more land intensive and costly auto parking spaces in those areas where efficient use of land is most critical. The provision of a well-designed network of bicycle facilities also contributes to the overall livability and attractiveness to both companies and work force to locate in the region.

Emphasize modes that do not have other sources of revenue

On-street bicycle projects, outside of vehicle capacity or reconstruction projects that are required to build bike facilities, only have the dedicated funding of a state program that allocates approximately \$2.5 million per year to bicycle and pedestrian projects on state facilities. Off-street trails are one of several eligible project types that compete for statewide Transportation Enhancement grants of approximately \$4 million per year. Additionally, one percent of state highway trust fund monies passed through to local jurisdictions must be spent on the construction or maintenance of bicycle or pedestrian facilities.

Complete gaps in modal systems

The bicycle projects recommended for further consideration all complete gaps in the existing bicycle network. While the Springwater Trailhead project does not strictly complete a gap in the provision of a bike trail or lane, it does provide needed user facilities on the trail system that do not exist today.

Develop a multi-modal transportation system

This is a modal emphasis category for the Transportation Priorities program.

Meet the average annual requirements of the State air quality implementation plan

The bicycle and trail projects recommended for further consideration would provide 8.65 miles of a required 5 miles of new bicycle facilities for the two-year funding period. This

Exhibit C

assumes the MAX multi-use path project in Gresham would be applied to meeting requirements for the provision of pedestrian facilities and is included in the calculation of that category.

Boulevard

- The top three technically ranked projects were nominated for further consideration as there is a clear break point between the third and fourth ranked projects.
- As the Rose Biggi project is adjacent to the TOD acquisition site in Beaverton that is also recommended for funding, only preliminary engineering is recommended in the base package to reserve availability of resources for other areas of the region. PE is the minimum effort necessary to sustain momentum on the extension of the road north to Hall Boulevard.
- The Burnside Street project may receive a federal earmark that would complete PE funding for this project phase.
- Recommended funding for the Killingsworth project is reduced by the amount the project is likely to receive through the state Transportation Enhancement funding program. This recommendation may be revisited as the TE funding award process progresses. PE funding is recommended for the remaining segment between N Commercial and NE MLK Boulevard.

Response to Policy Guidance

In addition to the technical score that reflects a quantitative measure of the policy guidance, the Metro staff recommendation within the boulevard modal category addresses the following policy guidance.

Economic development in priority land use areas

- Link to retention and/or attraction of traded-sector jobs
The Boulevard projects recommended support the redevelopment of adjacent properties to higher-density mixed-uses. Office and commercial space in these mixed-use areas may serve traded-sector employment and locates that employment in the regions priority development areas that are well served by existing urban infrastructure.

- Address transportation barrier to development in 2040 priority land use areas
None of the projects in the boulevard category remove or reduce a congestion barrier that is preventing development in a 2040 priority land use area. However, all of the projects would enhance the trip end experience for users of alternative modes to access priority land use areas that have or are forecast to have congestion.

- Support livability and attractiveness of the region.
The recommended projects are a direct investment in priority 2040 mixed land use areas and support further economic development in those areas by providing the facilities and

Exhibit C

amenities necessary to support higher densities of development, a mix of land use types and higher percentage of trips by alternative modes and by enhancing land values in the vicinity of the project.

Emphasize modes that do not have other sources of revenue

While elements of Boulevard projects are eligible for different sources of transportation funding, they have no source of dedicated funding to strategically implement these types of improvements in priority 2040 land use areas.

Complete gaps in modal systems

The recommended projects add new or enhance existing pedestrian and some bike facilities to the regional network. The Rose Biggi project would construct a new collector level motor vehicle connection within a regional center to meet regional guidance on street connectivity.

Develop a multi-modal transportation system

This is a modal emphasis category for the Transportation Priorities program.

Meet the average annual requirements of the State air quality implementation plan

The Boulevard projects recommended for further consideration would only provide preliminary engineering funds and therefore not contribute to the required 5 miles of new bicycle facilities and 1.5 miles of pedestrian facilities for the two-year funding period.

Large Bridge

- The Sellwood Bridge type, size and location study and preliminary environmental work is proposed for funding in the base package in the amount of \$1.5 million.
- The recommendation for further consideration of this project is based on this project best meeting the policy direction for inclusion of projects in the non-emphasis categories. The project has the potential for regional flexible funds to seed local and state project development funds that could then leverage a large allocation from federal and state Bridge Replacement funds to reconstruct the Sellwood Bridge. ODOT Region One is proposing \$1.5 million in STIP funding for this project with the County providing \$2.1 million of matching funds. These funds will be used to solicit \$12.8 million additional funds, currently under recommendation by the state bridge committee to the Oregon Transportation Commission for PE and right-of-way costs. The total effort will be used to solicit additional HBRR and other federal funds in the future to complete construction of the project.
- An additional \$500,000 is recommended in the Option 2 package to solicit discussion on the need for additional Transportation Priorities funding to secure the \$12.8 million of HBRR Local Bridge funds.

Exhibit C

Response to Policy Guidance

In addition to the technical score that reflects a quantitative measure of the policy guidance, the Metro staff recommendation within the large bridge modal category addresses the following policy guidance.

Economic development in priority land use areas

- Link to retention and/or attraction of traded-sector jobs

The Sellwood Bridge project supports the redevelopment of the South Waterfront and Tacoma main street and the greater North Milwaukie industrial area. Industrial, office and commercial space in these mixed-use areas may serve traded-sector employment and locates that employment in the regions priority development areas that are well served by existing urban infrastructure.

- Address transportation barrier to development in 2040 priority land use areas.

Due to bridge cracking, the Sellwood Bridge is currently closed to all vehicles greater than 10,000 lbs gross vehicle weight. This represents a significant barrier to the attractiveness for any business development in the vicinity of the bridge that would rely on truck access.

- Support livability and attractiveness of the region.

With one 4-foot sidewalk occluded by light and sign posts, narrow travel lanes and no bike lanes, the current bridge is a significant barrier to access to the network of multi-use paths and bicycle lanes in the area. A new bridge provide greater connectivity between the east and west sides of the Willamette River.

Emphasize modes that do not have other sources of revenue

Bridge projects receive dedicated sources of revenue from federal and state funding sources. Award of these funds is done on a competitive process and allocation of regional flexible funds would be intended to develop enough project detail to effectively compete for those sources of revenue.

Complete gaps in modal systems

Meets the narrowing policy objectives of and providing new pedestrian and bicycle facilities that do not exist and are not likely to be constructed without programming of regional flexible funds. The project would also reopen the bridge to freight and transit traffic that is currently rerouted to the Ross Island Bridge approximately 2.5 miles to the north.

Develop a multi-modal transportation system

This is not a modal emphasis category for the Transportation Priorities program. However, a new bridge would provide new bicycle lanes, replace a single side substandard sidewalk, provide local freight access and serve two regional bus routes that can no longer use the current bridge.

Exhibit C

Meet the average annual requirements of the State air quality implementation plan

As a replacement or reconstruction project, this project does not address this policy goal.

Green Streets

- The top technically ranked green street demonstration projects for street and culvert retrofits are recommended for the final cut list base package. While these were the only candidate applicants in these categories, both are strong projects and worthy of funding.
- The Cully Boulevard project will provide improvements in a 2040 mixed-use main street located in a low-income and minority community and will provide technical data on water quantity/quality improvements associated with green street techniques.
- The Beaver Creek Culverts project will support recovery of endangered species, removing barriers associated with transportation facilities and will leverage a large local match and state restoration grant (70% of total project cost). To balance the program, funding is recommended to be reduced by \$470,000 to a regional share of \$1,000,000. The reduction would need to be made up from other sources or by a reduction in work scope.

Response to Policy Guidance

In addition to the technical score that reflects a quantitative measure of the policy guidance, the Metro staff recommendation within the green street modal category addresses the following policy guidance.

Economic development in priority land use areas

- Link to retention and/or attraction of traded-sector jobs

The Cully Street project would support the redevelopment of adjacent properties to higher-density mixed-uses. Office and commercial space in these mixed-use areas may serve traded-sector employment and locates that employment in the regions priority development areas that are well served by existing urban infrastructure. Additionally, green street design principals and the removal of fish barrier culverts are part of the region's management plan to address the listing of several native fish species under the federal endangered species act. Demonstrating programmatic implementation of the management plan is important to staying in compliance with the act and preventing lawsuits or federal actions that could hinder future ability to attract traded sector jobs to the region.

- Address transportation barrier to development in 2040 priority land use areas
Neither of the applications address a specific transportation congestion barrier to development in a 2040 priority land use area. However, the Cully project would provide on-street parking, sidewalks and bicycle lanes that are lacking today and deter access and investment in the area.
- Support livability and attractiveness of the region.

Exhibit C

The Cully Street demonstration project supports the economic development of a mixed-use main street. As a demonstration project for innovative stormwater management techniques in the public right-of-way, the project has the potential to promote a less costly, environmentally sensible means of managing stormwater runoff region wide. The Beaver Creek culverts retrofit project support economic development by supporting the provision of wildlife within an urban area, increasing its attractiveness to companies and work force to locate in the area.

Emphasize modes that do not have other sources of revenue.

There are no sources of dedicated revenue to support the demonstration of innovative stormwater management techniques in the public right-of-way. There are state grants available through the Oregon Water Enhancement Board to restore stream habitat, including retrofit or replacements of culverts. However, these grants require local match funds and are competitive relative to the needs and range of project eligibility.

Complete gaps in modal systems.

As a demonstration project category, Green Streets projects do not directly address this policy.

Develop a multi-modal transportation system

This is a modal emphasis category for the Transportation Priorities program.

Meet the average annual requirements of the State air quality implementation plan.

As a demonstration project category, Green Streets projects do not directly address this policy.

Freight

- All or a portion of the top five technically ranked projects are recommended for further consideration by Metro staff in the freight category. There was a clear break point in the technical score between the fifth and sixth ranked projects.
- The Base package proposes to split with the Port of Portland the increase in project costs discovered subsequent to application for and the proposed award of OTIA III funds to the N Leadbetter railroad over crossing project. Option 2 restores full funding of the cost increase to the project.

Exhibit C

Response to Policy Guidance

In addition to the technical score that reflects a quantitative measure of the policy guidance, the Metro staff recommendation within the freight modal category addresses the following policy guidance.

Economic development in priority land use areas

- Link to retention and/or attraction of traded-sector jobs

The Lombard Slough over crossing project is the central freight connector through the region's largest regionally significant industrial area with 190 companies and 8,000 industrial jobs. If the Lombard Slough over crossing is weight limited in the future, it would require an 11 mile out-of-direction travel between South Rivergate, where many traded-sector companies are located, and Terminal 6, the region's only inter-modal container terminal. The Leadbetter extension project would provide grade-separated access over a rail spur from a large traded-sector employer (Columbia Sportswear) and developing industrial land to the entrance of Terminal 6, extending the capacity of the existing warehouse facility and number of potential employees located there.

- Address transportation barrier to development in 2040 priority land use areas

Without the Lombard Slough bridge improvement, a 113 acre vacant parcel, one of 25 industrial sites of statewide significance identified by the Governor's Industrial lands Task Force and the potential for an additional 1,000 new jobs (scenario of recent Vestas proposal), would not be able to fully develop. The Leadbetter extension project would increase attractiveness to three developable parcels in the vicinity by creating an alternative to increasing number and length of delays caused by rail traffic blockage. The Tualatin-Sherwood ATMS project would improve operating efficiencies of a congested major freight route connecting a large industrial area, including several hundred acres of vacant industrial land brought into the UGB in 2002 and 2004, with I-5 and 99W. The Kinsman Road project would create a new extension from an existing regional freight road connector and provide new access for 175 acres of vacant industrial land in west Wilsonville that is awaiting development until local concurrency requirements for road capacity can be met.

- Support livability and attractiveness of the region.

By supporting the retention and expansion of traded-sector companies that can grow jobs independent of local economic conditions and supply high-wage jobs, freight projects as a category support the livability and attractiveness of the region.

The freight data collection infrastructure would provide data that would allow more accurate tracking and forecasting of truck movements to better understand freight transportation needs in the region.

Emphasize modes that do not have other sources of revenue

The five recommended freight projects are road capacity, reconstruction or operations projects. These projects are eligible for eligible to be funded through state trust fund and

Exhibit C

pass through revenues. The OTIA III process has also dedicated \$100 million of statewide funding to these types of projects.

Complete gaps in modal systems

The Lombard slough over-crossing project would prevent the closure of freight traffic on the regional freight system. The Kinsman Road and Leadbetter projects would provide new connections to the motor vehicle system.

Develop a multi-modal transportation system

This is a modal emphasis category for the Transportation Priorities program.

Meet the average annual requirements of the State air quality implementation plan

As capacity, reconstruction or operational projects, this project category does not address this policy goal.

Planning

On-Going

- MPO Required Planning is recommended for funding. This funding continues the practice of previous allocations (adjusted 3% annually for inflation) to the Metro planning department for the provision of regional transportation planning services necessary to carry out MPO functions. Use of regional flexible funds for this purpose began as an alternative to collection of dues from local transportation agencies.
- Regional Freight Planning is recommended for funding. Funding for regional freight planning services began in FFYs 2004 and 2005 as freight and economic development became prominent regional and political issues. This allocation would fund these services for 2006 through 2009.

Corridor Planning

- The Milwaukie light rail Supplemental EIS is recommended for funding at \$2.0 of its \$3.725 million cost from regional flexible funds. This effort is needed to make the project eligible to receive federal funds.
- The Willamette Shoreline – Highway 43 Transit alternatives analysis is proposed for funding. Preliminary engineering phase is not recommended at this time but should await further development of a strategy for corridor improvements through the AA process.
- Three of the four Multi-Use master plans (Lake Oswego to Milwaukie, Tonquin Trail, and the Mt. Scott to Scouter's Loop trail) are recommended for funding. These trail projects span multiple local jurisdictions that need technical support to prepare trails to enter preliminary engineering and continue efforts provided at Metro to developing regional trail projects through implementation of the Greenspaces bond measure. The Sullivan's Gulch trail is not recommended for funding as it was not indicated as a local priority to the city of Portland and to the degree of cooperation and effort that will be needed to complete master planning work for this project.

Exhibit C

- The Next Priority Corridor analysis is recommended for funding. This work would address the fourth corridor from regional flexible funds of the 18 corridor plans the state Department of Land Conservation and Development requires the region to complete as part of the adoption of the Regional Transportation Plan. JPACT has requested ODOT also contribute to the completion of a second corridor study in this time frame conditioned on regional funding of one corridor study.

Planning Enhancements

- The Bicycle Interactive Map and Model Update is recommended for funding in the Option 2 package.

Response to Policy Guidance

In addition to the technical score that reflects a quantitative measure of the policy guidance, the Metro staff recommendation within the planning category addresses the following policy guidance.

Economic development in priority land use areas

- Link to retention and/or attraction of traded-sector jobs

None of the candidate planning activities claimed a direct link to the retention or attraction of a specific traded-sector business to the region. However, planning activities are necessary to ensure federal funding eligibility and adequate transportation services to the region, both essential to retaining and attracting traded-sector businesses to the region in general.

- Address transportation barrier to development in 2040 priority land use areas

The 2000 RTP allows development in the region's priority 2040 mixed-use areas even when motor vehicle congestion is forecast in the peak hour as long as certain conditions exist, one of which is the availability of frequent transit service. The Milwaukie LRT Supplemental EIS and the Willamette Shoreline AA are steps in providing reliable frequent transit service to the Central City and Milwaukie and Lake Oswego town centers, key pieces of investment to ensuring the allowance of future development to proceed in those areas. Other planning activities proposed for funding support economic development by ensuring the 2040 priority land use areas are adequately served by transportation services and that requirements are met to allow state and federal funding to be allocated to projects serving those areas.

- Support livability and attractiveness of the region.

Transportation planning activities support the livability and attractiveness of the region by ensuring the transportation system adequately serves the comprehensive land use plans of the region and local communities.

Exhibit C

Emphasize modes that do not have other sources of revenue

General planning transportation activities, but not specific corridor planning activities, are supported through limited federal planning revenues, though not enough to cover planning services provided to the region.

Complete gaps in modal systems

Planning activities identify and direct funding to projects that complete gaps in modal systems.

Develop a multi-modal transportation system

Planning activities identify and direct funding to projects that develop multi-modal systems. This is an emphasis category for the Transportation Priorities program.

Meet the average annual requirements of the State air quality implementation plan

While used to develop, coordinate and report on the implementation of the annual requirements, planning does not construct new facilities to meet State air quality plan requirements.

Pedestrian

- The top two technically ranked projects are recommended for funding on the final cut list base package as there is a clear break in the technical scoring between the second and third ranked projects and no clear break between the third and fifth ranked projects.
- \$900,000 is recommended for the Rockwood Pedestrian to MAX project is in the Option 1 package.
- The Capitol Highway (PE) pedestrian project is recommended for funding in the Option 1 package.
- The ODOT Preservation Supplement request is a result of regional policy request to ODOT. The funding amount from regional flexible funds would provide cost sharing with ODOT Region 1 from funding proposed in the draft STIP outside of their preservation program to provide pedestrian and potentially bicycle and transit improvements in conjunction with their preservation work. It appears at this time that ODOT will be able to provide pedestrian improvement treatments on the two urban preservation projects (Powell Boulevard: 50th to I-205, and NW Yeon) with existing STIP revenues. A preliminary cost analysis of adding bicycle lanes on SE Powell between 71st and 82nd Avenues, consistent with the Portland TSP, was cost prohibitive at between \$5 and \$7 million as a preservation supplement project.

Response to Policy Guidance

In addition to the technical score that reflects a quantitative measure of the policy guidance, the Metro staff recommendation within the pedestrian modal category addresses the following policy guidance.

Exhibit C

Economic development in priority land use areas

- Link to retention and/or attraction of traded-sector jobs

The Pedestrian projects recommended support the redevelopment of adjacent properties to higher-density mixed-uses. Office and commercial space in these mixed-use areas may serve traded-sector employment and locates that employment in the regions priority development areas that are well served by existing urban infrastructure.

- Address transportation barrier to development in 2040 priority land use areas

The 2000 RTP allows development in the region's priority 2040 mixed-use areas even when motor vehicle congestion is forecast in the peak hour as long as certain conditions exist, one of which is the availability of a well connected local street system to support walking trips within the mixed-use area. The Forest Grove and Milwaukie town center pedestrian projects are steps in providing pedestrian access on their well connected downtown street networks, key pieces of investment to ensuring the allowance of future development to proceed in those areas.

- Support livability and attractiveness of the region.

the pedestrian projects recommended contribute to the economic vitality of the Forest Grove and Milwaukie mixed-use areas by providing access by users who would not require more land intensive and costly auto parking spaces.

Emphasize modes that do not have other sources of revenue

Pedestrian projects outside of vehicle capacity or reconstruction projects that are required to build bike facilities only have dedicated funding limited to a state program that allocates approximately \$2.5 million per year or as one of several eligible project types that compete for statewide Transportation Enhancement grants of approximately \$4 million per year. Additionally, one percent of state highway trust fund monies passed through to local jurisdictions must be spent on the construction or maintenance of bicycle or pedestrian facilities.

Complete gaps in modal systems

The pedestrian projects recommended for further consideration all complete gaps, either with new facilities or upgrading substandard facilities, in the existing pedestrian network.

Develop a multi-modal transportation system

This is a modal emphasis category for the Transportation Priorities program.

Meet the average annual requirements of the State air quality implementation plan

The pedestrian projects recommended for further consideration would provide .26 miles (+ Forest Grove – still confirming length of project) of a required 1.5 miles of new pedestrian facilities within mixed-use areas for the two-year funding period. The MAX multi-use path project, evaluated in the Bike/Trail category could contribute a portion of its 2.32 miles of pedestrian improvement to meet air quality plan requirements for the provision of pedestrian facilities as it is located in the Gresham regional and Rockwood town centers.

Exhibit C

Road Capacity

- The SW Greenberg Road project in the Washington Square regional center is recommended for funding as the top tier road capacity project with a clear break point in project score between it and the next tier of projects (#2 through #5). The \$1 million request would complete project funding of local resources and prior regional award of PE funds for a total project cost of \$5 million.
- The Beaverton-Hillsdale/Scholls Ferry/Oleson Road intersection project is located in the Raliegh Hills town center. Funding is recommended for a portion of the PE costs in the Option 2 package. Funding would be conditioned on the completion of some planning work for the large portion of the town center area to be impacted by the right-of-way acquisition process. The county is seeking to use progress on PE work to solicit state and federal funds for right-of-way and construction.
- Right-of-way acquisition costs of \$2 million is recommended for funding of the 172nd Avenue project in the Option 2 package. This would address the \$1.0 million estimated right-of-way costs and a start on construction costs. This project is located in the newly expanding urban area on the east side of Happy Valley. The application will leverage \$10 million of County funds to complete construction of the project. The County has begun master planning of the area surrounding this project and anticipates designating much of it as Regionally Significant Industrial Area to serve as a job base for Happy Valley. This is also the only project proposed for funding in the recently expanded urban growth boundary area, which when master planning is completed, is one of the priority land use emphasis areas. This funding is recommended to be conditioned on completion of the Damascus master plan and for the project design to be consistent with implementation of the master plan.

Response to Policy Guidance

In addition to the technical score that reflects a quantitative measure of the policy guidance, the Metro staff recommendation within the road capacity modal category addresses the following policy guidance.

Economic development in priority land use areas

- Link to retention and/or attraction of traded-sector jobs

The SE 172nd Avenue project will provide the primary arterial access to the future Rock Creek industrial area. Forecasts of expected traded-sector jobs will be available upon completion of the Damascus concept plan.

The B-H/Scholls project would support the redevelopment of adjacent properties to higher-density mixed-uses. Office and commercial space in these mixed-use areas may serve traded-sector employment and locates that employment in the regions priority development areas that are well served by existing urban infrastructure. No specific link to the retention or attraction of traded-sector jobs was provided by the project applicant.

Exhibit C

- Address transportation barrier to development in 2040 priority land use areas
Upon completion of the Damascus concept plan, the SE 172nd Avenue project will address the primary urban infrastructure need to development of the future Rock Creek industrial area. The Beaverton-Hillsdale/Scholls Ferry/Oleson intersection project, if tied to the development of a Raleigh Hills town center planning effort, is of a scale and impact to provide significant redevelopment opportunities in that area. The Wood Village Boulevard project would provide new access and development opportunity in the Wood Village town center.
- Support livability and attractiveness of the region.

Emphasize modes that do not have other sources of revenue

Road capacity projects are supported through pass through state trust fund revenues to local jurisdictions, system development charges and some local taxes or improvement districts. However, some jurisdictions have maintenance needs that are larger than state pass-through revenues and which generally take priority over capacity projects.

Complete gaps in modal systems

Other than the Wood Village Boulevard project, which would complete a gap in the motor vehicle street system between Halsey and Arata Road, these projects expand existing motor vehicle connections. New connections to complete gaps in the pedestrian and bicycle system would be provided with these projects, however.

Develop a multi-modal transportation system

This is not a modal emphasis category for the Transportation Priorities program. However, all of these projects would provide new or upgrade substandard pedestrian and bicycle facilities on these roads (current Greenburg Road has existing sidewalks but no bike lanes).

Meet the average annual requirements of the State air quality implementation plan

These projects do not address this policy goal.

Road Reconstruction

- The Cleveland Street project is recommended for funding at \$1 million in the Option 2 package. If funded, it would be necessary to work with the City of Gresham to define a phase of the project that could be completed with this amount or additional sources secured. This project demonstrated strong connections to the development of the Gresham regional center and adds sidewalk, bicycle and transit elements that are currently missing from the existing facility. It also strongly incorporates green street elements, providing another demonstration project for the region.

Response to Policy Guidance

Exhibit C

In addition to the technical score that reflects a quantitative measure of the policy guidance, the Metro staff recommendation within the road reconstruction modal category addresses the following policy guidance.

Economic development in priority land use areas

- Link to retention and/or attraction of traded-sector jobs

The Cleveland Street project would support the redevelopment of adjacent properties in the regional center to higher-density mixed-uses. Office and commercial space in these mixed-use areas may serve traded-sector employment and locates that employment in the regions priority development areas that are well served by existing urban infrastructure.

- Address transportation barrier to development in 2040 priority land use areas
- Support livability and attractiveness of the region.

Emphasize modes that do not have other sources of revenue

Road reconstruction projects are supported through pass through state trust fund revenues to local jurisdictions, system development charges and some local taxes or improvement districts. However, some jurisdictions have maintenance needs that are larger than state pass-through revenues and which generally take priority over reconstruction projects.

Complete gaps in modal systems

The recommended project does not complete gaps in the existing motor vehicle system but provides new pedestrian and bicycle facilities, completing gaps in those modal systems.

Develop a multi-modal transportation system

This is not a modal emphasis category for the Transportation Priorities program. However, the project would provide new or upgrade substandard pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

Meet the average annual requirements of the State air quality implementation plan

These projects do not address this policy goal.

Regional Travel Options

- The Regional Travel Options program is recommended for further consideration at the level of funding needed to implement the programs strategic plan, with the exception of providing vanpool capital assistance, in the base funding package.
- \$500,000 is recommended to be eliminated from the RTO Program in the Option 2 package. No specific guidance on which portion of the program to eliminate was provided.

Response to Policy Guidance

Exhibit C

In addition to the technical score that reflects a quantitative measure of the policy guidance, the Metro staff recommendation within the regional travel options category addresses the following policy guidance.

Economic development in priority land use areas

- Link to retention and/or attraction of traded-sector jobs

- Address transportation barrier to development in 2040 priority land use areas

The RTO program is regional in scope and therefore markets and provides travel option services, reducing congestion region wide.

- Support livability and attractiveness of the region.

Emphasize modes that do not have other sources of revenue

These programs are not supported by other sources of dedicated transportation revenues although they do leverage funding from private Transportation Management Associations and other grants.

Complete gaps in modal systems

The RTO program does not construct projects and therefore does not address this policy goal.

Develop a multi-modal transportation system

This is a policy emphasis category for the Transportation Priorities program. RTO projects contribute to the development of a multi-modal system by educating and providing incentives to reduce trips or use existing pedestrian, bicycle and public transit facilities.

Meet the average annual requirements of the State air quality implementation plan

While the RTO programs promote use of the facilities provided by the requirements, it does not specifically address this policy goal.

Transit Oriented Development (TOD)

- The TOD rail station area and urban centers programs are recommended for funding equal to the previous allocation.
- The Beaverton TOD site acquisition project is also recommended for funding at \$2 million, equal to the previous allocation to the Gresham Civic station site in the previous allocation. This would be a \$1 million cut from the requested amount. It is recommended that the City of Beaverton investigate use of other sources to match the large regional contribution to the project. \$500,000 of this cut would be restored in the Option 1 package.
- The Gateway TOD site would be funded for \$500,000 in the Option 1 package.

Exhibit C

- The urban centers program is recommended for an additional \$500,000 in the Option 2 package but the same \$500,000 is recommended to be eliminated from the TOD category, with no specific recommendation on what project or program to reduce, in the Option 2 package.

Response to Policy Guidance

In addition to the technical score that reflects a quantitative measure of the policy guidance, the Metro staff recommendation within the transit oriented development category addresses the following policy guidance.

Economic development in priority land use areas

- Link to retention and/or attraction of traded-sector jobs

- Address transportation barrier to development in 2040 priority land use areas
The TOD program and recommended projects address market development barriers to development in 2040 priority mixed-use land use areas.

- Support livability and attractiveness of the region.

The TOD program and recommended projects support implementation of regional and local comprehensive plans by supporting mixed-use development at densities and with amenities beyond what the current market will bear in emerging mixed-use areas.

Emphasize modes that do not have other sources of revenue

While urban renewal and other programs facilitate new development, transit oriented development projects are specifically designed to increase the efficiency of the regions investment in the transit system and is not supported by other sources funding.

Complete gaps in modal systems

The TOD program and projects do not address this policy goal.

Develop a multi-modal transportation system

This is a modal policy emphasis category for the Transportation Priorities program. TOD projects contribute to the development of a multi-modal system by increasing the density and design of development in areas well served by existing pedestrian, bicycle and public transit facilities. This increases the use of those facilities and makes them more cost-effective.

Meet the average annual requirements of the State air quality implementation plan

While the TOD programs promote use of the facilities provided by the requirements, it does not specifically address this policy goal.

Exhibit C

Transit

- The existing commitments (by Metro Resolution) to rail transit projects in the region are recommended for funding.
- The Frequent Bus program is recommended for funding at a rate equal to the previous allocation amount.
- The Eastside Streetcar is recommended for funding in the Option 1 package.
- The South Metro Amtrak station is recommended for funding at \$1.15 million in the Option 1 package and for \$1 million in the Option 2 package.

Response to Policy Guidance

In addition to the technical score that reflects a quantitative measure of the policy guidance, the Metro staff recommendation within the transit modal category addresses the following policy guidance.

Economic development in priority land use areas

- Link to retention and/or attraction of traded-sector jobs

Office and commercial space in the mixed-use areas served by these transit projects may serve traded-sector employment and locates that employment in the regions priority development areas that are well served by existing urban infrastructure.

- Address transportation barrier to development in 2040 priority land use areas

The 2000 RTP allows development in the region's priority 2040 mixed-use areas even when motor vehicle congestion is forecast in the peak hour as long as certain conditions exist, one of which is the availability of frequent transit service. The existing rail commitments and the Frequent Bus capital improvement program are steps in providing reliable frequent transit service to mixed-use and industrial areas region-wide, key pieces of investment to ensuring the allowance of future development to proceed in those areas.

- Support livability and attractiveness of the region.

The development of a comprehensive regional transit system with frequent and reliable access to 2040 priority land use areas contribute to the economic vitality of the region by increasing trips that do not require more land intensive and costly auto parking spaces in those areas where efficient use of land is most critical. The provision of a well-designed network of transit facilities also contributes to the overall livability and attractiveness to both companies and work force to locate in the region.

Emphasize modes that do not have other sources of revenue

The existing rail commitments and the Eastside Streetcar fund applications are used to leverage large federal grants to construct those projects. Currently, TriMet general fund revenues are committed to transit service as a means of not having to cut bus service hours and to start new light rail service during the on-going recession. While this was a

Exhibit C

resource allocation choice, on-street capital improvements for the Frequent Bus program now come solely from the Transportation Priorities program. The south Amtrak station improvements are not eligible for any other source of transportation revenues.

Complete gaps in modal systems

The rail commitment s and Eastside Streetcar projects extend high frequency service to new areas consistent with the RTP and local Transportation System Plans, however, they do not strictly fill in gaps within the existing rail network. Frequent Bus improvements will allow new frequent bus service connecting gaps in the existing system.

Develop a multi-modal transportation system

This is a modal policy emphasis category for the Transportation Priorities program. Transit projects contribute to the development of a multi-modal system by providing higher efficiency transit service in the corridors served by those projects.

Meet the average annual requirements of the State air quality implementation plan

While the rail commitment and Frequent Bus program do not result directly in the provision of additional service hours as required by the air quality implementation plan, they do contribute to service efficiencies that can then be reallocated to providing additional transit service.

Exhibit D

Transportation Priorities 2006-09: *Investing in the 2040 Growth Concept*

Conditions of Program Approval

Bike/Trail

All projects will meet Metro signage and public notification requirements.

(Bk2052) The MAX multi-use path project funding is conditioned on the demonstration of targeted public outreach activities in the project design phase and construction mitigation phase to the significant concentration of Hispanic and low-income populations in the vicinity of the project.

(Bk3072) The Powerline Trail (Schuepback Park to Burntwood Drive) funding is conditioned on the execution of the purchase option of the Mt. Williams property for use of right-of-way for the project. If the purchase option is not executed, Metro may rescind the funds for future reallocation.

Boulevard

All projects will meet Metro signage and public notification requirements.

All projects will meet street design guidelines as defined in the *Creating Livable Streets* guide book (Metro; 2nd edition; June 2002).

projects will incorporate stormwater design solutions (in addition to street trees) consistent with Section 5.3 of the *Green Streets* guide book and plant street trees consistent with the planting dimensions (p 56) and species (p 17) of the *Trees for Green Streets* guide book (Metro: 2002).

(Bd3020) The Rose Biggi project funding is conditioned on the demonstration of targeted public outreach activities in the project design phase and construction mitigation phase to the significant concentration of Hispanic and low-income populations in the vicinity of the project.

(Bd1051) The E Burnside project funding is conditioned on the demonstration of targeted public outreach activities in the project design phase and construction mitigation phase to the significant concentration of low-income population in the vicinity of the project.

(Bd1260) The Killingsworth project funding is conditioned on the demonstration of targeted public outreach activities in the project design phase and construction mitigation phase to the significant concentration of Black and low-income populations in the vicinity of the project.

Large Bridge

(RR1012) Funding of the Sellwood Bridge project is contingent on the programming \$1.5 million of STIP funding and Multnomah County prioritizing the Sellwood Bridge as the first priority large bridge project for receipt of HBRR funds after completion of the Sauvie Island bridge in 2007.

Freight

(Fr4063): Funding of the N Lombard project is contingent on the demonstration of a financial strategy that does not rely on large (> \$2 m) future contributions from the Transportation Priorities process.

(Fr4087): Funding for the Ledbetter over crossing project is contingent on the programming of \$6 million in ODOT OTIA III funding and \$2 million of local match by the Port of Portland to the project.

The N Lombard and N Ledbetter over crossing project funding is conditioned on the demonstration of targeted public outreach activities in the project design phase and construction mitigation phase to the significant concentration of Black population in the vicinity of the project.

Green Streets

All projects will meet Metro signage and public notification requirements.

All projects will meet street design guidelines as defined in the *Creating Livable Streets* and *Green Streets* guidebooks (Metro; June 2002).

(GS1224): The Cully Boulevard project funding is conditioned on the demonstration of targeted public outreach activities in the project design phase and construction mitigation phase to the significant concentration of Black, Hispanic and low-income populations in the vicinity of the project. It is also conditioned on provision of results of the water quantity and quality testing as described in the project application.

Planning

(PI0002): The RTP Corridor Plan – Next Priority Corridor is conditioned on a project budget and scope being defined in the appropriate Unified Work Program.

Pedestrian

All projects will meet Metro signage and public notification requirements.

All projects will meet street design guidelines as defined in the *Creating Livable Streets* guidebook (Metro; 2nd edition; June 2002).

Road Capacity

All projects will meet Metro signage and public notification requirements.

All projects will meet street design guidelines as defined in the *Creating Livable Streets* guidebook (Metro; 2nd edition; June 2002).

(RC7001) The 172nd Avenue project funding is conditioned on a project design that implements the transportation guidelines and recommendations of an adopted Damascus concept plan. Based on the results of the plan, the County may request a different arterial improvement location or scope.

(RC 1184) The Beaverton-Hillsdale/Scholls Ferry/Oleson Road intersection PE funding is conditioned on the provision of a redevelopment plan being completed for the area encompassed by the project construction impacts in conjunction with PE activities. A general scope for such redevelopment plan will be further defined prior to the March 17th JPACT meeting. Demonstration of a financial strategy (not a commitment) for funding of right-of-way and construction that does not rely on large future allocations from regional flexible funds is also required prior to programming of awarded funds.

Road Reconstruction

All projects will meet Metro signage and public notification requirements.

All projects will meet street design guidelines as defined in the *Creating Livable Streets* guidebook (Metro; 2nd edition; June 2002).

(RR2035) Cleveland Avenue is conditioned on the provision of green street elements as described in the project application.

Regional Travel Options

Transit Oriented Development (TOD)

All projects will meet Metro signage and public notification requirements.

(TD8005): Upon completion of a full funding grant agreement, station areas of the I-205 MAX and Washington County commuter rail are eligible for TOD program project support.

Transit

Capital projects will meet Metro signage and public notification requirements.

Allocations to Interstate MAX, South Corridor planning and priority project development, Washington County commuter rail, and North Macadam development per Metro Resolution Nos. 99-2442, 99-2804A and 03-3290 will be limited to actual interest and finance costs accrued and not those forecasted for cost estimating purposes as defined within the resolutions. Residual revenues will be reallocated through a subsequent MTIP update or amendment.

(TR1106) The Eastside Streetcar project funding is conditioned on the demonstration of targeted public outreach activities in the project design phase and construction mitigation phase to the significant concentration of low-income population in the vicinity of the project. It is also conditioned on the securing of other funding to complete the preliminary design and engineering costs of the project.

STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 05-3529, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ALLOCATING \$62.2 MILLION OF TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES FUNDING FOR THE FEDERAL FISCAL YEARS 2008 AND 2009 PENDING AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY DETERMINATION.

Date: January 7, 2004

Prepared by: Ted Leybold

BACKGROUND

The Transportation Priorities 2006-09; Investing in the 2040 Growth Concept program allocates transportation funding to Metro area transportation agencies from two federal grant programs; the Surface Transportation and Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality programs. The Metro region is forecast to receive \$60.5 million from these sources in the federal fiscal years of 2008 and 2009. Previous allocations have identified projects and programs to receive funds during the fiscal years of 2006 and 2007.

Prior to the application process, an outreach process identified a general policy direction for the allocation of these funds. The primary objective of the program as adopted by the Metro Council is to leverage economic development through investments that support Region 2040 centers, industrial areas and urban growth boundary expansion areas that have completed concept plans. Other policy objectives include emphasizing modes that do not have other sources of dedicated revenue, completing gaps in modal systems and developing a multi-modal transportation system.

Metro expects to distribute approximately \$62.2 million in regional flexible funds during the Transportation Priorities process. Table 1 demonstrates the new funds forecast to be available for projects and programs.

Table 1: New Regional Flexible Funds Available for Programming

	2006	2007	2008	2009
STP			\$16,811,716	\$16,860,254
CMAQ			\$13,540,123	\$13,579,087
Interstate Transfer	\$1,728,000			
Total			\$30,351,849	\$30,439,341

More than 70 project and program applications were received requesting more than \$140 million. A technical ranking of projects was completed for the project applications within twelve modal categories. This technical analysis, along with qualitative considerations was used to inform a decision process to select a first cut of project and program applications for public comment. Public comments were received for all applications and the first cut list between October 15th and December 16th 2004.

Further policy direction was provided by the Metro Council and JPACT to direct staff on how to narrow the First Cut List to a draft staff recommended Final Cut List. The direction included honoring past commitments for these funds and continuing funding of Metro planning. The direction also included funding projects in all 2040 mixed-use and industrial land areas and emphasizing non-road or bridge projects in mixed-use areas to maximize development and multi-modal objectives. Finally, all projects

and programs were to be screened based on their relationship to the implementation of mixed-use and/or industrial area plans and development using the 2040 technical score and qualitative issues identified in project applications or through public comments.

The staff recommended Final Cut List and an explanation of the recommendation is attached as Exhibit C. The draft conditions of program approval, directing applicants on tasks to be completed as a condition of receiving funds, is attached as Exhibit E.

Attached are the following updated Transportation Priorities 2006-2009 documents:

Exhibit A: Summary of program policy goals and objectives and policy direction from Metro Council and JPACT to technical staff on how to narrow the First Cut List to a 100% Cut List.

Exhibit B: Technical evaluation and qualitative factors summary

Exhibit C: Executive summary of the public comment report. The complete public comment report may be down loaded form the Metro website (www.metro-region.org), or will be mailed on request (call Francine Floyd at 503-797-1839) and will be available at the JPACT meeting.

Exhibit D: Metro staff recommended Final Cut List of projects and programs provided for review and public comment at the January 28, 2004 TPAC meeting, February 17, 2004 public hearing, March 17, 2004 JPACT meeting and March 24, 2004 Metro Council meeting.

Exhibit E: Explanation of Metro Staff Project/Program Recommendations

Exhibit F: Draft recommendation outlining the conditions to be met to allow obligation of Transportation Priorities funds for each project or program recommended for funding.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. **Known Opposition** None known at this time.
2. **Legal Antecedents** This resolution allocates transportation funds in accordance with the federal transportation authorizing legislation (currently known as the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century or TEA-21). The allocation process is intended to implement the Transportation Priorities 2006-09 program policies as defined by Metro Resolution No. 05-3529.
3. **Anticipated Effects** Adoption of this resolution would instigate an air quality conformity analysis of the effects of implementing these projects and programs for compliance with the State Implementation Plan for air quality.
4. **Budget Impacts** Adoption of the resolution would begin staff analysis of the air quality impacts of implementing the list of projects and programs as provided for in the Unified Work Program.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Approve the resolution as recommended.

M E M O R A N D U M

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



METRO

DATE: February 7, 2005
TO: Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation and Interested Parties
FROM: Ted Leybold: Principal Transportation Planner
SUBJECT: TPAC Recommendation and Public Hearing on Transportation Priorities 2006-09 Final Cut List

* * * * *

This memorandum and attachments supplements the materials you received in your JPACT mailing packet regarding the TPAC recommendation on the Transportation Priorities Final Cut List.

Following the policy direction provided by the Council and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), Metro staff released a draft recommendation to TPAC on the award of transportation funds. The recommendation was structured into a "base package" of projects that most clearly reflects the policy direction provided, representing approximately 85% of the funds available. A series of potential add packages to allocate the remaining 15% of funds were recommended for further consideration from a "next tier" of candidate projects that also meet policy direction but not as clearly as the projects in the base package.

The Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) acted on the Metro Staff recommendation Friday, February 4th and recommended two options for further consideration. JPACT will be briefed on the TPAC recommendation February 10th and there will be a joint Metro Council/JPACT public hearing February 17th at 5:00 pm in the Council Chamber.

Attachment 1 - Table 1 summarizes the Metro staff recommendation of candidate projects to include in a base package and a next tier of projects to be considered for inclusion in potential add packages to the base program. The add packages would allocate the remaining 15% of available funds and represent remaining policy choices for decision makers where the application of existing policy direction by technical staff is not already clear.

TPAC recommended two options for public comment, and JPACT and Metro Council consideration. Those options are summarized in Attachment 1 - Table 2 and listed in total in Attachment 1 - Tables 3 and 4.

The JPACT mailing contained an error that has been corrected in these attachments. TPAC recommended option B included right-of-way funding for the Powerline Trail (north) project. Total cost for Option B is also corrected.

A summary of all TPAC actions is also attached for your information.

Candidate project descriptions and a summary of the TPAC recommendation is available by contacting Metro at 503-797-1839 or on the Metro website at: <http://www.metro-region.org/>

Summary of TPAC Actions
February 4th, 2005
Transportation Priorities 2006-09
Final Cut Recommendation

Metro staff introduced its recommendation for the Transportation Priorities 2006-09 Final Cut list of projects and programs to be funded. The recommendation included a base package of projects that best met the program policy guidance provided by JPACT and the Metro Council, a list of “next tier” of technically ranked projects that addressed the policy objectives but not as definitively as the base package, and a list of four potential add packages of projects from the next tier list that represented different policy choices of how to allocate the remaining funds after funding the base package. The base package and next tier project list is included in this mailing as Attachment 1 – Table 1.

The add packages presented included an option that allocated funds to a group of projects that focused on alternative modes, two options that focused on roads and a package that included projects across all of the modes.

TPAC members were then asked to discuss their preferences on projects, potential add packages and how they wished to proceed with the process of developing a recommendation to JPACT. After discussion of member perspectives on these issues, which included the merits of several additional add packages, there was a general consensus to move and vote on presenting JPACT with two add packages to the Metro staff recommended base package, if the committee could vote to define and support two packages. One package would be oriented towards alternative modes, the other towards compromise proposals submitted by Washington County and Clackamas County and Cities of Clackamas County.

A motion was made to take up as one add-package option an alternative mode oriented package as introduced by Chris Smith. Mr. Smith accepted friendly amendments to add the Capitol Highway pedestrian (PE) project, eliminate partial funding of PE on the Willamette Shoreline transit improvement, and to reflect the actual funding necessary for completion of the Marine Drive bike lanes and trail gaps project. After discussion, this add package was approved by the committee with two no votes by the Clackamas and Washington County representatives. This option is summarized in Attachment 1 – Table 2 and listed in whole in Attachment 1 – Table 3.

A motion was then made to consider as a second add-package an option of projects submitted to the committee by the representatives of the Clackamas County and Cities of Clackamas County. This add package as proposed also included cuts in funding to 3 projects/programs in the Metro staff recommended base package. A motion was made to amend this option by reducing the proposed funding to the Southeast 172nd Avenue project from \$3 million to \$2 million and adding \$900,000 to fully fund the North Ledbetter extension project. The proposed amendment passed on a vote of 8 to 6 with Clackamas County, citizen James Castaneda, citizen Greg Diloreto, Washington County, Multnomah County and Cities of Clackamas County representative voting no on the

amendment. A vote was then taken to approve the Option 2 package as amended. The vote passed 13 to 1 with Clackamas County voting no.

A motion was then made to consider as a third add-package the Metro staff recommended "Road 2" option. This motion was defeated by a vote of 11 to 3 with the ODOT, Cities of Washington County and Multnomah County representatives voting yes.

A motion was then made to consider another add-package consisting of \$900,000 to N Ledbetter extension, \$685,000 to Marine Drive bike lanes and trail gaps, \$1.14 million for right-of-way for the Rose Biggi extension, an additional \$1.25 million to the Sellwood Bridge, and \$1.25 million to Southeast 172nd Avenue. This motion was defeated 11 to 3 with ODOT, the Port of Portland, Cities of Washington County and Multnomah County representatives voting yes.

Finally, a motion to approve the recommendation of the two options as whole package for JPACT consideration was made. This motion passed by a vote of 13 to 1 with Clackamas County representatives voting no.

Attachment 1 – Table 2

**TPAC Recommended Options
Base Package with the following changes:**

Project	Agency	Option A (\$ millions)	Option B (\$ millions)
Add to Base Package			
Marine Drive Bike Lanes and Trail Gaps	Portland	\$.685	
Powerline Trail North (ROW)	THPRD	\$.600	\$.600
Rockwood Pedestrian to MAX	Gresham	\$.900	
Site acquisition: Beaverton regional center TOD	Beaverton	\$.650	
Southwest Capitol Highway Pedestrian (PE)	Portland	\$.538	
Gateway Transit Center TOD	Portland	\$.500	
Eastside Streetcar	Portland	\$1.000	
South Metro Amtrak Station: Phase II	Oregon City	\$1.150	\$1.000
Bike Model and Interactive Map	Metro		\$.201
TOD Urban Center Program	Metro		\$.500
Sellwood Bridge	Multnomah Co.		\$.500
Southwest B-H/Scholls/Oleson intersection (PE)	Washington Co.		\$1.000
North Ledbetter extension	Port of Portland		\$.900
Southeast 172 nd Avenue	Clackamas Co.		\$2.000
Cleveland Avenue	Gresham		\$1.000
Subtotal		\$6.023	\$7.701
Remove from Base Package			
Trolley Trail			(\$.742)
TOD Category			(\$.500)
RTO Category			(\$.500)
Subtotal			(\$1.742)
Total Addition to Base		\$6.023	\$5.959
Total Cost with Base		\$62.931	\$62.867
Over programmed		\$.703	\$.639

Score	Planning		Score	Bike/Trail		Score	Pedestrian	
	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Recommended for Funding		Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Recommended for Funding		Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Recommended for Funding
Planning & Travel Options								
Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding		
Ongoing Programs			83 BK1009 Springwater Trail-Sellwood Gap: SE 19th to SE Umatilla			80 P8162 Forest Grove Town Center Pedestrian Improvements		
NA	P8005	Regional Freight Planning: region wide	\$0.300	82 BK4011 Marne Dr. Bike Lanes & Trail Gaps: 6th Ave to 185th	\$1.651	88 P8054 Milwaukee Town Center: Main/Harrison/21st	\$0.450	
NA	P8001	MPO Required Planning: region wide	\$1.731	81 BK2055 Springwater Trailhead at Main City Park	\$0.310	75 P82105 Rockwood Ped to MAX: 188th Avenue and Burnside	\$0.000	
Corridor Planning			76 BK2059 MAX Multi-use Path: Cleveland Station to Ruby Junction			74 P81202 SW Capitol Highway (PE): Multnomah to Taylors Ferry		
NA	P1003	Milwaukee LRT Supplemental EIS: Portland central city to Milwaukee town center	\$2.000	75 BK3018 Trolley Trail: Arista to Glen Echo (Segments 5-8)	\$0.742			
NA	P8053	Multi-Use Master Plans: Lake Oswego to Milwaukee, Tonquin Trail, Mt. Scott-Scouter's Loop	\$0.300	73 BK3017 Rock Creek Trail: Orchard Park to NW Wilkens	\$0.675			
NA	P8002	Next Priority Corridor Study	\$0.500	85 BK3072 Powerline Trail (north): Schuepbach Park to Burnwood Dr. (ROW)	\$0.600			
NA	P1017	Willamette Shoreline - Hwy 43 Transit alternatives analysis: Portland South Waterfront to Lake Oswego	\$0.685					
Subtotal: \$5.519			Subtotal: \$6.497			Subtotal: \$2.548		
Not Currently Recommended for Funding			Not Currently Recommended for Funding			Not Currently Recommended for Funding		
Program Enhancements			47 BK5110 Jennifer St: 106th to 122nd			78 P81227 Tacoma Street: 6th to 21st		
NA	P8004	Living Streets Update: region wide	\$0.200	BK5026 Trolley Trail: Arista to Glen Echo (Segments 7-8)	\$0.742	44 P81019 Transit Safe Street Crossings	\$0.500	
NA	P8006	Bike Model and Interactive Map: region wide	\$0.201	53 BK3072 Powerline Trail (north): Schuepbach Park to Burnwood Dr. (PE/Con)	\$1.842	NA P88007 ODOT Preservation Supplement (Powell: 50th to I-205)	\$0.500	
NA	P8005	Fuller Road at I-205	\$0.500	63 BK6051 Washington Square Regional Center Trail: Hwy. 217 to Fanno Creek Trail	\$1.258	68 P81050 SE Hawthorne: 20th to 50th	\$0.622	
Corridor Planning			59 P8053 Multi-Use Master Plans: Lake Oswego to Milwaukee, Tonquin Trail, Mt. Scott-Scouter's Loop			63 P83021 SW Scholls Ferry Road: Raleigh Hills town center		
NA	P1017	Willamette Shoreline - Hwy 43 Transit alternatives analysis: Portland South Waterfront to Lake Oswego	\$1.350			59 P82093 SW Murray Blvd (west side only): TV Hwy to Fannington (+ bike lane)	\$0.923	
NA	P1003	Milwaukee LRT Supplemental EIS: Portland central city to Milwaukee town center	\$1.725			49 P82209 SE 129th Sidewalks and bike lane: Scott Creek Ln. to Mountain Gate Rd.	\$0.707	
NA	P8016	I205-Hwy 213 Interchange Reconnaissance Study	\$0.300			75 P82105 Rockwood Ped to MAX: 188th Avenue and Burnside	\$0.500	
NA	P8121	Tualatin Valley Highway Corridor Study: Hwy 217 to Baseline Road	\$1.900					
Subtotal: \$6.466			Subtotal: \$4.390			Subtotal: \$5.790		
Mode Category Total: \$11.985			Mode Category Total: \$10.887			Mode Category Total: \$8.338		
Regional Travel Options			TOD			Transit		
Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding		
Program management & administration			86 T88005 Regional TOD LRT Station Area Program			NA T1301 I-205 LRT, Commuter Rail, S Waterfront Streetcar		
Regional marketing program			85 T88002 Regional TOD Urban Center Program			NA T1402 I-205 Supplemental		
Regional evaluation			86 T88003 Site acquisition: Beaverton regional center			83 T88025 Frequent Bus Capital program		
1 TravelSmart project			81 T88004 Gateway Transit Center Redevelopment			81 T1106 Eastside Streetcar (Cont)		
Subtotal: \$4.700			Subtotal: \$7.150			57 T15126 South Metro Amtrak Station Phase II		
Not Currently Recommended for Funding			Not Currently Recommended for Funding			Not Currently Recommended for Funding		
4 TravelSmart projects			85 T88002 Regional TOD Urban Center Program			78 P88038 SW Ash Street extension		
Regional Vanpool fleet			86 T88003 Site acquisition: Beaverton regional center					
Subtotal: \$2.503			89 T88005 Regional TOD LRT Station Area Program			Subtotal: \$0.651		
Mode Category Total: \$6.603			Mode Category Total: \$9.000			Mode Category Total: \$24.351		
Road Capacity			Road Reconstruction			Boulevard		
Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding		
NA	P82014	SW Greenburg Road/Washington Square Dr to Tedeman	\$1.000			102 BK2223 Rose Bigg extension: Crescent St to Hall (PE)	\$0.530	
Subtotal: \$1.000			Subtotal: \$0.000			97 BK2055 Burnside Street: Bridge to E 14th (PE)	\$1.650	
Not Currently Recommended for Funding			Not Currently Recommended for Funding			Not Currently Recommended for Funding		
Boones Ferry Road at Lanewood Street			81 P81055 Mario Parkway NW: Davis to SW Market			84223 Rose Bigg extension: Crescent St to Hall (ROW)		
85	P81194	Beaverton-Hillsdale Hwy/Oleson Scholls Ferry intersection (PE)	\$2.900	91 P81064 10th Avenue at Highway 8 Intersections	\$0.937	84222 Rose Bigg extension: Crescent St to Hall (Cont)	\$2.127	
85	P81110	Wood Village Blvd: Arista to Halsey	\$0.815	88 P82236 Cleveland St: NE Stark to SE Powell	\$1.540	841251 Burnside Street: Bridge to E 14th (PE)	\$1.710	
82	P81760	SE 112nd Ave. Phase I, Sunnyside to Hwy 212 (ROW)	\$2.000	84 P85017 Lake Rd: 21st to Hwy 224	\$1.894	841252 Killingsworth: I-5 Overpass	\$0.895	
80	P81200	SE 112nd Ave. Phase I, Sunnyside to Hwy 212 (Cont)	\$2.300			841253 Killingsworth: N Commercial to NE MLK (Cont)	\$1.379	
80	P81123	Crackamas County ITS: Safety and operational improvements at 4 railroad crossings	\$0.500	81 P81211 NE 242nd Ave: Stark to Glisan	\$0.540	841254 Corner Road: Seitzman to Hillier	\$0.335	
Subtotal: \$7.525			Subtotal: \$2.594			Subtotal: \$5.036		

Attachment 1- Table 3

TPAC Recommendation Option A

Roads & Bridges	56	RC5114	NE 28th Avenue, East Main to Grant	\$1,682	57	BA0169	E Baseline: 10th to 20th	\$2,447						
	Subtotal:				\$11,597	Subtotal:				\$12,533				
	Mode Category Total:				\$12,597	Mode Category Total:				\$15,163				
	Sum		Freight	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Sum		Large Bridge	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Sum		Green Streets	Requested Amount (millions of \$)		
Recommended for Funding					Recommended for Funding					Recommended for Funding				
	79	FR4063	N Lombard Slough overcrossing	\$2,210		71	RR1012	Sellwood Bridge Replacement, Type, Size & Location Study, Preliminary environmental	\$1,500		88	GS1224	NE Cully Boulevard, Prescott to Killingsworth	\$2,457
	77	FR1016	SW Tualatin-Sherwood Road ATMS, I-5 to Highway 99W	\$0,341							93	GS2123	Beaver Creek Culverts: Troutdale, Cochran, Stark	\$1,000
	68	FR4067	N Leadbetter Extension: N Bybee Lake Ct to Marine Dr.	\$0,900										
	67	FR4066	Kinsman Road extension, Barber to Boeckman	\$1,400										
	65	FR0000	Freight Data Collection Infrastructure and Archive System, Approximately 50 interchanges region wide	\$0,179										
Subtotal:				\$5,030	Subtotal:				\$1,500	Subtotal:				\$3,457
Not Currently Recommended for Funding					Not Currently Recommended for Funding					Not Currently Recommended for Funding				
		FR4087	N Leadbetter Extension: N Bybee Lake Ct to Marine Dr.	\$2,100		RA1012	Sellwood Bridge Replacement: Type, Size & Location Study, Preliminary environmental	\$2,100			GS2123	Beaver Creek Culverts, Troutdale, Cochran, Stark	\$0,470	
	61	FR2074	NE Sandy Blvd, (PE/ROW) 207th to 233th	\$0,630										
		FR4063	N Lombard Slough overcrossing	\$2,210										
	65	FR8065	SW Herman Road: Teton to 108th Avenue	\$2,000										
Subtotal:				\$6,940	Subtotal:				\$2,100	Subtotal:				\$0,470
Mode Category Total:				\$11,970	Mode Category Total:				\$3,600	Mode Category Total:				\$3,927

Roads and Bridges Recommended Total	\$13,617
Planning and Travel Options	\$49,314
Recommended Total:	\$62,931
Expected 2008-09 Funding Authorized	\$62,228

Street	Planning	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Street	Bike/Trail	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Street	Pedestrian	Requested Amount (millions of \$)			
Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding					
Ongoing Programs			Ongoing Programs			Ongoing Programs					
NA	PR005	Regional Freight Planning: region wide	\$0.300	93	BR1008	Springwater Trail-Seilwood Gap, SE 19th to SE Umatilla	\$1.829	90	PR3193	Forest Grove Town Center Pedestrian Improvements	\$0.860
NA	PR001	MPO Required Planning: region wide	\$1.731	87	BR4011	Marine Dr. Bike Lanes & Trail Gaps: 28th Ave. to 185th	\$0.966	88	PR5054	Milwaukee Town Center; Main/Harrison/21st	\$0.450
Corridor Planning			Corridor Planning			Corridor Planning					
NA	PR1003	Milwaukee LRT Supplemental EIS: Portland central city to Milwaukee town center	\$2.000	76	BR2052	MAX Multi-use Path: Cleveland Station to Ruby Junction	\$0.890				
NA	PR053	Multi-Use Master Plans: Lake Oswego to Milwaukee, Tonquin Trail, Mt. Scott -Scouter's Loop	\$0.300	73	BR2012	Rock Creek Trail: Orchard Park to NW Wilkens	\$0.675				
NA	PR002	Next Priority Corridor Study	\$0.500	65	BR2072	Powerline Trail (north): Schuepback Park to Burnwood Dr. (ROW)	\$0.600				
NA	PR1017	Willamette Shoreline - Hwy 43 Transit alternatives analysis: Portland South Waterfront to Lake Oswego	\$0.688								
Program Enhancements			Program Enhancements			Program Enhancements					
NA	PR6000	Bike Model and Interactive Map: region wide	\$0.201								
Subtotal: \$5.720			Subtotal: \$5.070			Subtotal: \$1.110					
Not Currently Recommended for Funding			Not Currently Recommended for Funding			Not Currently Recommended for Funding					
Corridor Planning			Corridor Planning			Corridor Planning					
NA	PR053	Multi-Use Master Plans: Lake Oswego to Milwaukee, Tonquin Trail, Mt. Scott -Scouter's Loop	\$0.290	67	BR1110	Jennifer St: 106th to 122nd	\$0.550	78	PR1227	Tacoma Street: 6th to 21st	\$1.402
	PR1017	Willamette Shoreline - Hwy 43 Transit alternatives analysis: Portland South Waterfront to Lake Oswego	\$1.350	86	BR5026	Trolley Trail: Arata to Glen Echo	\$1.484	75	PR2105	Rockwood Ped to MAX: 188th Avenue and Burnside	\$1.400
NA	PR1003	Milwaukee LRT Supplemental EIS: Portland central city to Milwaukee town center	\$1.725	84	BR2072	Powerline Trail (north): Schuepback Park to Burnwood Dr. (PE/Con)	\$0.900	74	PR1202	SW Capitol Highway (PE), Multnomah to Taylors Ferry	\$0.538
NA	PR016	I205/Hwy 213 Interchange Reconnaissance Study	\$0.300	63	BR4057	Washington Square Regional Center Trail: Hwy 217 to Fanno Creek Trail	\$1.256	44	PR1019	Transit Safe Street Crossings	\$0.500
NA	PR121	Tualatin Valley Highway Corridor Study: Hwy 217 to Baseline Road	\$1.900	53	BR6020	Powerline Trail (South): Barrows to Beef Bend Rd.	\$0.942	NA	PR007	ODOT Preservation Supplement (Powell: 50th to I-205)	\$0.500
Program Enhancements			Program Enhancements			Program Enhancements					
NA	PR004	Livable Streets Update: region wide	\$0.200	82	BR4011	Marine Dr. Bike Lanes & Trail Gaps 6th Ave. to 28th	\$0.685	60	PR1090	SE Hawthorne: 20th to 50th	\$0.822
NA	TR0005	Fuller Road at I-205	\$0.500					63	PR1021	SW Scholls Ferry Road: Raleigh Hills town center	\$0.436
Subtotal: \$8.265			Subtotal: \$5.617			Subtotal: \$7.228					
Mode Category Total: \$11.985			Mode Category Total: \$10.887			Mode Category Total: \$8.338					
Street	Regional Travel Options	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Street	TOD	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Street	Transit	Requested Amount (millions of \$)			
Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding					
NA		Program management & administration	\$0.340	98	TR0005	Regional TOD LRT Station Area Program	\$2.500	NA	TR1001	I-205 LRT, Commuter Rail, S Waterfront Streetcar	\$16.000
NA		Regional marketing program	\$2.460	95	TR0002	Regional TOD Urban Center Program	\$1.500	NA	TR1002	I-205 Supplemental	\$2.600
NA		Regional evaluation	\$0.300	88	TR0003	Site acquisition: Beaverton regional center	\$2.000	93	TR005	Frequent Bus Capital program	\$2.750
NA		I TravelSmart project	\$0.500					67	TR126	South Metro Amtrak Station, Phase II	\$1.000
Subtotal: \$3.600			Subtotal: \$6.000			Subtotal: \$22.350					
Not Currently Recommended for Funding			Not Currently Recommended for Funding			Not Currently Recommended for Funding					
NA		4 TravelSmart projects	\$2.000	95	TR0002	Regional TOD Urban Center Program	\$0.500	81	TR1006	Eastside Streetcar (Con)	\$1.000
NA		Regional marketing program	\$0.500	88	TR0003	Site acquisition: Beaverton regional center	\$1.000	57	TR124	South Metro Amtrak Station Phase II	\$0.150
NA		Regional Vanpool fleet	\$0.503	81	TR0004	Gateway Transit Center Redevelopment	\$0.500	26	TR0010	SW Ash Street extension	\$0.851
Subtotal: \$3.003			Subtotal: \$3.000			Subtotal: \$2.601					
Mode Category Total: \$6.603			Mode Category Total: \$9.000			Mode Category Total: \$24.351					
Street	Road Capacity	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Street	Road Reconstruction	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Street	Boulevard	Requested Amount (millions of \$)			
Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding					
74	RC1014	SW Greenburg Road/Washington Square Dr. to Tiedeman	\$1.000	98	RR0011	Cleveland St. NE Stark to SE Powell	\$1.200	72	BR1014	Rose Bggn extension: Crescent St. to Hall (PE)	\$2.800
55	RC1184	Beaverton-Hillsdale Hwy/Oleson Scholls Ferry intersection (PE)	\$1.000					27	BR1014	Burnside Street, Bridge to E. 14th (PE)	\$1.650
62	RC1000	SE 172nd Ave./Phase I, Sunnyside to Hwy 212 (ROW)	\$2.000					28	BR1011	Killingsworth: 74 Commercial to NE Mult. (PE)	\$0.400
Subtotal: \$4.000			Subtotal: \$1.000			Subtotal: \$2.634					
Not Currently Recommended for Funding			Not Currently Recommended for Funding			Not Currently Recommended for Funding					
65	RC127	Boones Ferry Road at Lanewood Street	\$1.400	64	RR1050	Nano Parkway/11V Cars to SW Market	\$3.840	83	BR1012	Rose Bggn extension: Crescent St. to Hall (RC/W)	\$1.140
RC1184	Beaverton-Hillsdale Hwy/Oleson Scholls Ferry intersection (PE)	\$1.500	91	RR1144	10th Avenue at Highway & Intersections	\$0.837	83	BR1012	Rose Bggn extension: Crescent St. to Hall (Con)	\$0.287	
61	RC110	Wood Village Blvd. Arata to Halsey	\$0.815	93	RR1011	Cleveland St. NE Stark to SE Powell	\$0.540	83	BR1011	Burnside Street, Bridge to E. 14th (PE)	\$1.710

Planning & Travel Options

Attachment 1- Table 4

TPAC Recommendation
Option B

Mode	Freight		Large Bridge		Green Streets						
	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	% of Total	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	% of Total	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	% of Total					
	Recommended for Funding		Recommended for Funding		Recommended for Funding						
RC1000	SE 172nd Ave. Phase I, Sunnyside to Hwy 212 (Con)	\$2,300	84	RR5037	Lake Rd. 21st to Hwy 224	\$1,384	Bd1260	Killingsworth I-5 Overpass	\$0,035		
46	RC5103	Clackamas County ITS: Safety and operational improvements at 4 railroad crossings	\$0,500	81	RR2001	NE 242nd Ave., Stark to Gisan	\$0,840	6d1260	Killingsworth N Commercial to NE MLK (Con)	\$1,679	
58	RC3114	NE 28th Avenue, East Main to Grant	\$1,582	79	RR1208	NW 23rd Avenue: Burnside to Lovejoy	\$2,694	69	Bd1884	Cornell Road: Saltzman to 119th	\$2,535
	Subtotal:	\$8,557			Subtotal:	\$10,635		57	Bd1269	E Baseline 10th to 20th	\$2,447
	Mode Category Total:	\$12,597			Mode Category Total:	\$11,635			Subtotal:	\$12,533	
									Mode Category Total:	\$15,163	
Mode	Freight		Large Bridge		Green Streets						
	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	% of Total	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	% of Total	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	% of Total					
	Recommended for Funding		Recommended for Funding		Recommended for Funding						
79	F14063	N Lombard Slough overcrossing	\$2,210	71	RP1012	Sellwood Bridge Replacement, Type, Size & Location Study, Preliminary environmental	\$2,000	88	GS1224	NE Cully Boulevard: Prescott to Killingsworth	\$2,451
77	F13016	SW Tualatin-Sherwood Road ATMS I-5 to Highway 99W	\$0,341					93	GS1123	Beaver Creek Culverts, Troutdale, Cochran, Stark	\$1,000
68	F14081	N Leadbetter Extension: N Bybee Lake Ct to Marine Dr.	\$1,800								
67	F16086	Kinsman Road extension: Barber to Boeckman	\$1,400								
65	F18008	Freight Data Collection Infrastructure and Archive System: Approximately 50 interchanges region wide	\$0,179								
	Subtotal:	\$5,930			Subtotal:	\$2,000				Subtotal:	\$3,457
	Not Currently Recommended for Funding		Not Currently Recommended for Funding		Not Currently Recommended for Funding						
61	F12074	NE Sandy Blvd (PE/ROW): 207th to 238th	\$0,630	RR1012	Sellwood Bridge Replacement, Type, Size & Location Study, Preliminary environmental	\$1,600	GS2123	Beaver Creek Culverts, Troutdale, Cochran, Stark	\$0,470		
	F14063	N Lombard Slough overcrossing	\$2,210								
	F14087	N Leadbetter Extension: N Bybee Lake Ct. to Marine Dr.	\$1,200								
45	F16065	SW Herman Road: Teton to 108th Avenue	\$2,000								
	Subtotal:	\$6,040			Subtotal:	\$1,600				Subtotal:	\$0,470
	Mode Category Total:	\$11,970			Mode Category Total:	\$3,600				Mode Category Total:	\$3,927

Roads and Bridges Recommended Total \$19,017
 Planning and Travel Options \$43,850
 Recommended Total \$62,867
 Expected 2008-09 Funding Authorized \$62,228

Attachment 1 – Table 2

**TPAC Recommended Options
Base Package with the following changes:**

Project	Agency	Option A (\$ millions)	Option B (\$ millions)	Clackamas Co. & Cities Option B-1 (\$ millions)
Add to Base Package				
Marine Drive Bike Lanes and Trail Gaps	Portland	\$.685		
Powerline Trail North (ROW)	THPRD	\$.600	\$.600	\$.600
Rockwood Pedestrian to MAX	Gresham	\$.900		
Site acquisition: Beaverton regional center TOD	Beaverton	\$.650		
Southwest Capitol Highway Pedestrian (PE)	Portland	\$.538		
Gateway Transit Center TOD	Portland	\$.500		
Eastside Streetcar	Portland	\$ 1.000		
South Metro Amtrak Station: Phase II	Oregon City	\$ 1.150	\$ 1.000	\$ 1.000
Bike Model and Interactive Map	Metro		\$.201	\$.201
TOD Urban Center Program	Metro		\$.500	\$.500
Sellwood Bridge	Multnomah Co.		\$.500	\$.500
Southwest B-H/Scholls/Oleson intersection (PE)	Washington Co.		\$ 1.000	\$ 1.000
North Ledbetter extension	Port of Portland		\$.900	\$.900
Southeast 172 nd Avenue	Clackamas Co.		\$ 2.000	\$ 2.742
Cleveland Avenue	Gresham		\$ 1.000	\$ 1.000
Subtotal		\$6.023	\$7.701	\$8.443
Remove from Base Package				
Trolley Trail			(\$.742)	(\$.742)
TOD Category			(\$.500)	(\$.500)
COP/Port of Portland				(\$.900)
RTO Category			(\$.500)	(\$.500)
Subtotal			(\$1.742)	(\$2.642)
Total Addition to Base		\$6.023	\$5.959	\$5.801
Total Cost with Base		\$62.931	\$62.867	\$62.709
Over programmed		\$.703	\$.639	\$.481

Score	Planning		Score	Bike/Trail		Score	Pedestrian					
	Requested Amount (millions of \$)			Requested Amount (millions of \$)			Requested Amount (millions of \$)					
	Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding					
	Ongoing Programs		93	Bk1009	Springwater Trail-Sellwood Gap, SE 19th to SE Umatilla	\$1,629	90	Pd3183	Forest Grove Town Center Pedestrian Improvements	\$0,660		
n/a	PI0005	Regional Freight Planning: region wide	\$0,300	82	Bk4011	Marine Dr. Bike Lanes & Trail Gaps: 6th Ave to 185th	\$1,651	88	Pd5054	Milwaukie Town Center: Main/Harrison/21st	\$0,450	
n/a	PI0001	MPO Required Planning: region wide	\$1,731	81	Bk2055	Springwater Trailhead at Malin City Park	\$0,310	75	Pd2105	Rockwood Ped to MAX: 188th Avenue and Burnside	\$0,900	
	Corridor Planning			MAX Multi-use Path: Cleveland Station to Ruby Junction		\$0,890	74	Pd1202	SW Capitol Highway (PE): Multnomah to Taylors Ferry	\$0,538		
n/a	PI1003	Milwaukie LRT Supplemental EIS: Portland central city to Milwaukie town center	\$2,000	75	Bk5026	Trolley Trail: Arista to Glen Echo (Segments 5-6)	\$0,742					
n/a	PI5053	Multi-Use Master Plans: Lake Oswego to Milwaukie, Tonquin Trail, Mt. Scott -Scouter's Loop	\$0,300	73	Bk3012	Rock Creek Trail: Orchard Park to NW Wilkens	\$0,675					
n/a	PI0002	Next Priority Corridor Study	\$0,500	65	Bk3072	Powerline Trail (north), Schuepback Park to Burnwood Dr. (ROW)	\$0,600					
n/a	PI1017	Willamette Shoreline - Hwy 43 Transit alternatives analysis: Portland South Waterfront to Lake Oswego	\$0,688									
	Subtotal:		\$5,519		Subtotal:		\$6,497		Subtotal:		\$2,548	
	Not Currently Recommended for Funding			Not Currently Recommended for Funding			Not Currently Recommended for Funding					
	Program Enhancements			Jennifer St: 106th to 122nd		\$0,550	78	Pd1227	Tacoma Street: 6th to 21st	\$1,402		
n/a	PI0004	Livable Streets Update: region wide	\$0,200	8k5026	Trolley Trail: Arista to Glen Echo (Segments 7-8)	\$0,742	44	Pd1019	Transit Safe Street Crossings	\$0,500		
n/a	PI8000	Bike Model and Interactive Map: region wide	\$0,201	53	Bk3072	Powerline Trail (north): Schuepback Park to Burnwood Dr. (PE/Con)	\$1,842	n/a	Pd8007	ODOT Preservation Supplement (Powell: 50th to I-205)	\$0,500	
n/a	TD0005	Fuller Road at I-205	\$0,500	63	Bk8057	Washington Square Regional Center Trail: Hwy 217 to Fanno Creek Trail	\$1,256	68	Pd1080	SE Hawthorne: 20th to 50th	\$0,822	
	Corridor Planning			Multi-Use Master Plans: Lake Oswego to Milwaukie, Tonquin Trail, Mt. Scott -Scouter's Loop		\$0,290	63	Pd3021	SW Scholls Ferry Road: Raleigh Hills town center	\$0,436		
n/a	PI5053	Multi-Use Master Plans: Lake Oswego to Milwaukie, Tonquin Trail, Mt. Scott -Scouter's Loop	\$0,290	n/a	PI1017	Willamette Shoreline - Hwy 43 Transit alternatives analysis: Portland South Waterfront to Lake Oswego	\$1,350	59	Pd3093	SW Murray Blvd (west side only): TV Hwy to Farmington (+ bike lane)	\$0,923	
n/a	PI1017	Willamette Shoreline - Hwy 43 Transit alternatives analysis: Portland South Waterfront to Lake Oswego	\$1,350	n/a	PI1003	Milwaukie LRT Supplemental EIS: Portland central city to Milwaukie town center	\$1,725	49	Pd5209	SE 129th Sidewalks and bike lane: Scott Creek Ln to Mountain Gate Rd.	\$0,707	
n/a	PI5016	1205-/Hwy 213 Interchange Reconnaissance Study	\$0,300	n/a	PI5016	1205-/Hwy 213 Interchange Reconnaissance Study	\$0,300	75	Pd2105	Rockwood Ped to MAX: 188th Avenue and Burnside	\$0,500	
n/a	PI3121	Tualatin Valley Highway Corridor Study: Hwy 217 to Baseline Road	\$1,900									
	Subtotal:		\$6,466		Subtotal:		\$4,390		Subtotal:		\$5,790	
	Mode Category Total:		\$11,985		Mode Category Total:		\$10,887		Mode Category Total:		\$8,338	
Score	Regional Travel Options		Score	TOD		Score	Transit					
Requested Amount (millions of \$)		Requested Amount (millions of \$)		Requested Amount (millions of \$)		Requested Amount (millions of \$)						
	Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding					
n/a	Program management & administration		\$0,340	68	TD8005	Regional TOD LRT Station Area Program	\$3,000	n/a	Tr1001	I-205 LRT, Commuter Rail, S Waterfront Streetcar	\$16,000	
n/a	Regional marketing program		\$2,960	95	TD0002	Regional TOD Urban Center Program	\$1,000	n/a	Tr1002	I-205 Supplemental	\$2,600	
n/a	Regional evaluation		\$0,300	68	TD0003	Site acquisition: Beaverton regional center	\$2,650	93	Tr8035	Frequent Bus Capital program	\$2,750	
n/a	1 TravelSmart project		\$0,500	81	TD0004	Gateway Transit Center Redevelopment	\$0,500	81	Tr1108	Eastside Streetcar (Con)	\$1,000	
	Subtotal:		\$4,100		Subtotal:		\$7,150	57	Tr5126	South Metro Antrak Station:Phase II	\$1,150	
	Not Currently Recommended for Funding			Not Currently Recommended for Funding			Not Currently Recommended for Funding					
n/a	4 TravelSmart projects		\$2,000	95	TD0002	Regional TOD Urban Center Program	\$1,000	28	RC8038	SW Ash Street extension	\$0,851	
n/a	Regional Vanpool Fleet		\$0,503	68	TD0003	Site acquisition: Beaverton regional center	\$0,350					
	Subtotal:		\$2,503	98	TD8005	Regional TOD LRT Station Area Program	\$0,500					
	Mode Category Total:		\$6,603		Mode Category Total:		\$9,000		Mode Category Total:		\$24,351	
Score	Road Capacity		Score	Road Reconstruction		Score	Boulevard					
Requested Amount (millions of \$)		Requested Amount (millions of \$)		Requested Amount (millions of \$)		Requested Amount (millions of \$)						
	Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding					
74	RC8014	SW Greenburg Road:Washington Square Dr. to Tiedeman	\$1,000									
	Subtotal:		\$1,000		Subtotal:		\$0,000	102	Bd3020	Rose Biggi extension: Crescent St. to Hall (PE)	\$0,580	
	Not Currently Recommended for Funding			Not Currently Recommended for Funding			Not Currently Recommended for Funding					
65	Pd6127	Boones Ferry Road at Lanewood Street	\$1,400	91	RR1053	Naito Parkway: NW Davis to SW Market	\$3,840	Bd3020	Rose Biggi extension: Crescent St. to Hall (Con)	\$2,087		
65	RC1184	Beaverton-Hillsdale Hwy/Oleson/Scholls Ferry intersection (PE)	\$2,900	91	FR2166	10th Avenue at Highway 8 Intersections	\$0,837	Bd1051	Burnside Street: Bridge to E 14th (PE)	\$1,710		
65	RC2110	Wood Village Blvd.: Arata to Halsey	\$0,815	98	RR2035	Cleveland St., NE Stark to SE Powell	\$1,540	Bd1260	Killingsworth: I-5 Overpass	\$0,935		
62	RC7000	SE 172nd Ave:Phase I; Sunnyside to Hwy 212 (ROW)	\$2,000	84	RR5037	Lake Rd: 21st to Hwy 224	\$1,884	Bd1260	Killingsworth: N Commercial to NE MLK (Con)	\$1,679		
	RC7000		SE 172nd Ave:Phase I; Sunnyside to Hwy 212 (Con)	\$2,300	81	RR2001	NE 242nd Ave.: Stark to Glisan	\$0,840	89	Bd3184	Cornell Road: Saltzman to 119th	\$2,535
46	RC5103	Clackamas County ITS: Safety and operational improvements at 4 railroad crossings	\$0,500	70	RR1209	NW 23rd Avenue: Burnside to Lovejoy	\$2,694	87	Bd3169	E Baseline: 10th to 20th	\$2,447	
55	RC3114	NE 26th Avenue: East Main to Grant	\$1,682									
	Subtotal:		\$11,597		Subtotal:		\$11,635		Subtotal:		\$12,533	
	Mode Category Total:		\$12,597		Mode Category Total:		\$11,635		Mode Category Total:		\$15,163	
Score	Freight		Score	Large Bridge		Score	Green Streets					
Requested Amount (millions of \$)		Requested Amount (millions of \$)		Requested Amount (millions of \$)		Requested Amount (millions of \$)						
	Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding			Recommended for Funding					
79	FR4083	N Lombard: Slough overcrossing	\$2,210	71	RR1012	Sellwood Bridge Replacement: Type, Size & Location Study, Preliminary environmental	\$1,500	88	GS1224	NE Cully Boulevard: Prescott to Killingsworth	\$2,457	
77	FR3018	SW Tualatin-Sherwood Road ATMS: I-5 to Highway 99W	\$0,341					93	GS2123	Beaver Creek Culverts: Troutdale, Cochran, Stark	\$1,000	
68	FR4087	N Leadbetter Extension: N Bybee Lake Ct. to Marine Dr.	\$0,900									
67	FR6096	Kinsman Road extension: Barber to Boeckman	\$1,400									
65	FR8008	Freight Data Collection Infrastructure and Archive System: Approximately 50 interchanges region wide	\$0,179									
	Subtotal:		\$5,030		Subtotal:		\$1,500		Subtotal:		\$3,457	
	Not Currently Recommended for Funding			Not Currently Recommended for Funding			Not Currently Recommended for Funding					
n/a	FR4087		N Leadbetter Extension: N Bybee Lake Ct. to Marine Dr.	\$2,100	RR1012	Sellwood Bridge Replacement: Type, Size & Location Study, Preliminary environmental	\$2,100					
61	FR2074	NE Sandy Blvd. (PE/ROW): 207th to 238th	\$0,630									
	FR4083		N Lombard: Slough overcrossing	\$2,210								
45	FR6085	SW Herman Road: Teton to 108th Avenue	\$2,000									
	Subtotal:		\$6,940		Subtotal:		\$2,100		Subtotal:		\$0,470	
	Mode Category Total:		\$11,970		Mode Category Total:		\$3,600		Mode Category Total:		\$3,927	

Roads and Bridges Recommended Total \$13,617
 Planning and Travel Options \$49,314
 Recommended Total: \$62,931
 Expected 2008-09 Funding Authorized: \$62,228

Mode Category	Planning		Bike/Trail		Pedestrian		
	Recommended for Funding	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Recommended for Funding	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Recommended for Funding	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	
Ongoing Programs			93 BK1009 Springwater Trail-Sailwood Gap: SE 19th to SE Umatilla	\$1,629	90 PD1163 Forest Grove Town Center Pedestrian Improvements	\$0.660	
n/a PI0005 Regional Freight Planning: region wide	\$0.300		82 BK4011 Marine Dr. Bike Lanes & Trail Gaps: 28th Ave. to 185th	\$0.966	68 PD0504 Milwaukee Town Center: Main/Harrison/21st	\$0.450	
n/a PI0001 MPO Required Planning: region wide	\$1.731		81 BK2055 Springwater Trailhead at Main City Park	\$0.310			
Corridor Planning			76 BK2052 MAX Multi-use Path: Cleveland Station to Ruby Junction	\$0.890			
n/a PI1003 Milwaukee LRT Supplemental EIS: Portland central city to Milwaukee town center	\$2.000		73 BK3012 Rock Creek Trail: Orchard Park to NW Wilkens	\$0.675			
n/a PI5053 Multi-Use Master Plans: Lake Oswego to Milwaukee, Tonquin Trail, Mt. Scott -Scouter's Loop	\$0.300		65 BK3072 Powerline Trail (north): Schuepback Park to Burntwood Dr. (ROW)	\$0.600			
n/a PI0002 Next Priority Corridor Study	\$0.500						
n/a PI1017 Willamette Shoreline - Hwy 41 Transit alternatives analysis: Portland South Waterfront to Lake Oswego	\$0.888						
Program Enhancements							
n/a PI8000 Bike Model and Interactive Map: region wide	\$0.201						
	Subtotal:	\$5.720		Subtotal:	\$5.070	Subtotal:	\$1.110
Not Currently Recommended for Funding							
Corridor Planning			67 BK5110 Jennifer St: 106th to 122nd	\$0.550	78 PD1227 Tacoma Street: 6th to 21st	\$1.402	
n/a PI5053 Multi-Use Master Plans: Lake Oswego to Milwaukee, Tonquin Trail, Mt. Scott -Scouter's Loop	\$0.290		84 BK5026 Trolley Trail: Arista to Glen Echo	\$1.484	75 PD2106 Rockwood Ped to MAX: 188th Avenue and Burnside	\$1.400	
n/a PI1017 Willamette Shoreline - Hwy 42 Transit alternatives analysis: Portland South Waterfront to Lake Oswego	\$1.350		83 BK3072 Powerline Trail (north): Schuepback Park to Burntwood Dr. (PE/Con)	\$0.900	74 PD1202 SW Capitol Highway (PE): Multnomah to Taylors Ferry	\$0.538	
n/a PI1003 Milwaukee LRT Supplemental EIS: Portland central city to Milwaukee town center	\$1.725		63 BK6057 Washington Square Regional Center Trail, Hwy. 217 to Fanno Creek Trail	\$1.256	44 PD1019 Transit Safe Street Crossings	\$0.500	
n/a PI5016 I205/Hwy 213 Interchange Reconnaissance Study	\$0.300		53 BK6020 Powerline Trail (South): Barrows to Beef Bend Rd.	\$0.942	n/a PD8007 ODOT Preservation Supplement (Powell: 50th to I-205)	\$0.500	
n/a PI3121 Tualatin Valley Highway Corridor Study: Hwy 217 to Baseline Road	\$1.900		82 BK4011 Marine Dr. Bike Lanes & Trail Gaps: 6th Ave. to 28th	\$0.685	68 PD1080 SE Hawthorne: 20th to 50th	\$0.822	
Program Enhancements					63 PD3021 SW Scholls Ferry Road: Raleigh Hills town center	\$0.436	
n/a PI0004 Livable Streets Update: region wide	\$0.200				59 PD3093 SW Murray Blvd (west side only): TV Hwy to Farmington (+ bike lane)	\$0.923	
n/a TD0005 Fuller Road at I-205	\$0.500				49 PD5209 SE 129th Sidewalks and bike lane: Scott Creek Ln. to Mountain Gate Rd.	\$0.707	
	Subtotal:	\$6.265		Subtotal:	\$5.817	Subtotal:	\$7.228
Mode Category Total:	\$11.985		Mode Category Total:	\$10.887	Mode Category Total:	\$8.338	
Mode Category	Regional Travel Options		TOD		Transit		
	Recommended for Funding	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Recommended for Funding	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Recommended for Funding	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	
n/a Program management & administration	\$0.340		98 TD8005 Regional TOD LRT Station Area Program	\$2.500	n/a TR1001 I-205 LRT, Commuter Rail, S Waterfront Streetcar	\$16.000	
n/a Regional marketing program	\$2.460		95 TD0002 Regional TOD Urban Center Program	\$1.500	n/a TR1002 I-205 Supplemental	\$2.600	
n/a Regional evaluation	\$0.300		88 TD0003 Site acquisition: Beaverton regional center	\$2.000	93 TR6035 Frequent Bus Capital program	\$2.750	
n/a 1 TravelSmart project	\$0.500				57 TR5126 South Metro Amtrak Station: Phase II	\$1.000	
	Subtotal:	\$3.600		Subtotal:	\$6.000	Subtotal:	\$22.350
Not Currently Recommended for Funding							
n/a 4 TravelSmart projects	\$2.000		95 TD0902 Regional TOD Urban Center Program	\$0.500	41 TR1106 Eastside Streetcar (Con)	\$1.000	
n/a Regional marketing program	\$0.500		88 TD0903 Site acquisition: Beaverton regional center	\$1.000	57 TR5126 South Metro Amtrak Station: Phase II	\$0.150	
n/a Regional Vanpool fleet	\$0.503		61 TD0904 Gateway Transit Center Redevelopment	\$0.500	28 RC8038 SW Ash Street extension	\$0.851	
	Subtotal:	\$3.003		Subtotal:	\$3.000	Subtotal:	\$2.001
Mode Category Total:	\$6.603		Mode Category Total:	\$9.000	Mode Category Total:	\$24.351	
Mode Category	Road Capacity		Road Reconstruction		Boulevard		
	Recommended for Funding	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Recommended for Funding	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Recommended for Funding	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	
74 RC6014 SW Greenburg Road: Washington Square Dr. to Tiedeman	\$1.000		88 RR2035 Cleveland St.: NE Stark to SE Powell	\$1.000	102 BD3020 Rose Biggi extension: Crescent St. to Hall (PE)	\$0.580	
85 RC1164 Beaverton-Hillsdale Hwy/Oleson/Scholls Ferry intersection (PE)	\$1.000				97 BD1051 Burnside Street: Bridge to E 14th (PE)	\$1.650	
82 RC7000 SE 172nd Ave: Phase I, Sunnyside to Hwy 212 (ROW)	\$2.000				95 BD1260 Killingsworth: N Commercial to NE MLK (PE)	\$0.400	
	Subtotal:	\$4.000		Subtotal:	\$1.000	Subtotal:	\$2.630
Not Currently Recommended for Funding							
85 PD8127 Boones Ferry Road at Lanewood Street	\$1.400		91 RR4053 Naito Parkway: NW Davis to SW Market	\$3.840	63 BD3020 Rose Biggi extension: Crescent St. to Hall (ROW)	\$1.140	
RC1164 Beaverton-Hillsdale Hwy/Oleson/Scholls Ferry intersection (PE)	\$1.900		91 FR3166 10th Avenue at Highway 8 Intersections	\$0.837	83 BD3020 Rose Biggi extension: Crescent St. to Hall (Con)	\$2.087	
65 RC2110 Wood Village Blvd.: Arata to Hulsey	\$0.815		88 RR2035 Cleveland St.: NE Stark to SE Powell	\$0.540	81 BD1051 Burnside Street: Bridge to E 14th (PE)	\$1.710	
RC7000 SE 172nd Ave: Phase I, Sunnyside to Hwy 212 (Con)	\$2.300		84 RR5037 Lake Rd. 21st to Hwy 224	\$1.884	81 BD1260 Killingsworth: I-5 Overpass	\$0.935	
46 RC5103 Clackamas County ITS: Safety and operational improvements at 4 railroad crossings	\$0.500		81 RR2001 NE 242nd Ave.: Stark to Gisan	\$0.840	81 BD1260 Killingsworth: N Commercial to NE MLK (Con)	\$1.679	
56 RC3114 NE 28th Avenue: East Main to Grant	\$1.682		70 RR1209 NW 23rd Avenue: Burnside to Lovejoy	\$2.694	69 BD3164 Cornell Road: Saltzman to 119th	\$2.535	
	Subtotal:	\$8.597		Subtotal:	\$10.635	Subtotal:	\$12.533
Mode Category Total:	\$12.597		Mode Category Total:	\$11.635	Mode Category Total:	\$15.163	
Mode Category	Freight		Large Bridge		Green Streets		
	Recommended for Funding	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Recommended for Funding	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	Recommended for Funding	Requested Amount (millions of \$)	
79 FR4063 N Lombard: Slough overcrossing	\$2.210		71 RR1012 Sellwood Bridge Replacement: Type, Size & Location Study, Preliminary environmental	\$2.000	88 GS1224 NE Cully Boulevard: Prescott to Killingsworth	\$2.457	
77 FR0016 SW Tualatin-Sherwood Road ATMS: I-5 to Highway 99W	\$0.341				93 GS2123 Beaver Creek Culverts: Troutdale, Cochran, Stark	\$1.000	
68 FR4087 N Leadbetter Extension: N Bybee Lake Cl. to Manne Dr.	\$1.800						
67 FR6066 Kinaman Road extension: Barber to Boeckman	\$1.400						
65 FR8008 Freight Data Collection Infrastructure and Archive System: Approximately 50 interchanges region wide	\$0.179						
	Subtotal:	\$5.930		Subtotal:	\$2.000	Subtotal:	\$3.457
Not Currently Recommended for Funding							
61 FR2074 NE Sandy Blvd. (PE/ROW): 207th to 238th	\$0.630		RR1012 Sellwood Bridge Replacement: Type, Size & Location Study, Preliminary environmental	\$1.600	GS2123 Beaver Creek Culverts: Troutdale, Cochran, Stark	\$0.470	
FR4063 N Lombard: Slough overcrossing	\$2.210						
FR4087 N Leadbetter Extension: N Bybee Lake Cl. to Marine Dr.	\$1.200						
45 FR6065 SW Herman Road: Tejon to 108th Avenue	\$2.000						
	Subtotal:	\$6.040		Subtotal:	\$1.600	Subtotal:	\$0.470
Mode Category Total:	\$11.970		Mode Category Total:	\$3.600	Mode Category Total:	\$3.927	
					Roads and Bridges Recommended Total:	\$19.017	
					Planning and Travel Options Recommended Total:	\$43.850	
					Expected 2008-09 Funding Authorized:	\$62.867	
						\$62.228	

Planning & Travel Options

Roads & Bridges

February 10, 2005

John VanLandingham, Chair
Land Conservation and Development Commission
635 Capitol St., NE
Suite 150
Salem, OR 97301-2540

Dear Chair VanLandingham:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed amendments to the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). We commend the joint OTC/LCDC Transportation Subcommittee for producing these amendments in such a short time frame, and support the Commission's effort to focus this first round of amendments on the critical issues raised by the Jaqua vs. City of Springfield case. In our prior comments we have argued that the Jaqua case is simply a call for "fine tuning" amendments to the TPR, and not a major overhaul that would undermine the many valuable provisions contained in the rule. With some notable exceptions discussed below, the public comment draft of the TPR meets this test.

"Going Slow" on New TPR Provisions

The January 3, 2005 public comment draft of the TPR generally focuses on amendments that respond to the Jaqua ruling, and we believe will prevent this case from creating a de facto concurrency requirement in the TPR. However, the provisions to apply a special test for system adequacy along Interstate highway corridors goes beyond the Jaqua remedies, and represents a major shift in policy. While we support the state's interest in protecting the integrity of the Interstate system, we also believe this goal can be more effectively met through other strategies outside this round of rulemaking.

As the map in Attachment B illustrates, the effects on the Metro region, alone, is sweeping and undermines the ability of the region to develop many of the compact urban centers called out in the Region 2040 plan that happen to be located near the Interstate highway system. Implementation of this provision would be further complicated in the Metro region by the fact that almost all of the interstate system has been designated for "refinement planning" under the TPR, and thus has no specific transportation improvements called out in the Regional Transportation Plan until this work is completed. *The LCDC should defer action on this component of the proposed TPR amendments to a separate round of rulemaking, where the effects of the new language can be fully evaluated.*

More specific comments on these new provisions for Interstate highways are outlined in Attachment A. Instead of these proposed additions to the TPR, we recommend that the OTC consider amendments to the Oregon Highway Plan to create a two-tiered process for establishing interchange management plans for all Interstate Highway access points within MPO areas, and key access points in other areas. The process would include:

1. Inventorying, evaluating and ranking by relative importance the interchanges within an MPO area for their significance in providing access to the interstate system. This evaluation and ranking would consider relative vulnerability to land use changes that could compromise the function of an interchange.
2. Development of individual Interchange Management Plans for existing and planned facilities, according to ranking of importance. Interchange Management Plans would include an element to be adopted in local and regional TSPs, establish a geographic extent for the management plan and would provide a framework for specific mitigation improvements and programs needed to protect the function of the interchange and adjacent Interstate Highway segment.

Protecting Existing TPR Provisions

Our recommendation to limit the proposed TPR amendments to remedies that respond solely to the Jaqua case are rooted in our concern that a broader overhaul of the rule could threaten critical provisions that should not be compromised. While in the Metro region, the acknowledged 2000 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) exceeds many of the TPR provisions, the rule still functions as an important backstop for our adopted plans. To this extent, we do not support changes to the rule that would weaken the following key elements of the RTP:

- **Level of Service Policy** – the Metro region adopted a graduated level of service policy in 2000 that balances mobility needs and funding realities. Unrealistic standards would have produced \$14 billion in road projects over 20 years, compared to \$1.5 billion in available capital during the 20-year planning period. The new policy maintains mobility on major freight corridors, while relying on travel alternatives in major commute corridors. The resulting road improvements needed to implement the policy total just over \$4 billion over 20 years, and are part of a more multi-modal transportation system that has broad land use and air quality benefits for the region.

Metro needs the TPR provisions that give Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) the authority to adopt comprehensive level of service standards for metropolitan areas. For the Metro region, this provision prevents the adoption of local, potentially conflicting policies by

the dozens of overlapping state and local transportation providers here, and ensures a consistent approach to road sizing for the major routes that often span these jurisdictional boundaries.

- **Parking Policy** – Parking minimum and maximum standards were adopted by Metro in 1996, and have since been incorporated into local codes for the 24 cities and three counties in the region. The policy is driven by a desire to reduce the construction of excess parking in an effort to minimize land consumption – particularly in mixed-use centers. A second component of the parking policy is to develop large parking lots with “street-like” features, such as curbs, sidewalks, street trees, with the goal of allowing parking lots to gradually infill over time with new structures. Several major parking lots have been successfully developed with these features in recent years, including the Jantzen Beach and Eastport Plaza redevelopments, Gresham Station, and a number of other large sites. These successes demonstrate that the TPR parking provisions are both attainable and effective, and should be retained in the rule without major changes.
- **Street Connectivity** – Metro’s Livable Streets program also included a street connectivity study that demonstrated the close relationship between poorly connected local street systems and resulting congestion and delay on adjacent major streets. This study led to new regional connectivity standards in 1996 for new residential and mixed use developments, with maximum street spacing of 530 feet, and limits on cul-de-sac length of 200 feet. These standards have since been adopted in local plans and codes across the region. The TPR provisions and state Local Street Guidelines provide an important foundation for these regional standards.
- **New Throughways** – In response to the 2040 Growth Concept, and subsequent update to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) in 2000, four strategic new throughways were identified to ensure mobility in rapidly growing areas of the region. These include:
 - Tualatin Valley Highway
 - I-5 to 99W Connector
 - McLoughlin/224 Corridor
 - Sunrise Corridor

The Tualatin Valley Highway and McLoughlin/224 corridors represent consolidation projects, where the RTP calls for improving mobility on existing highways through incremental access consolidation and interchange improvements. The I-5 to 99W Connector and Sunrise Corridor project represent new facilities that would replace existing state routes. All four projects require a corridor refinement plan under the Transportation Planning Rule. For these, and other, major travel

corridors, the TPR provides a critical forum for identifying major corridor improvements as part of the regional planning process.

- **Mode Targets** – The 2000 RTP employs an alternative strategy for addressing the TPR requirement to reduce per capita vehicle miles traveled (VMT/capita). The Metro region uses a series of 2040 mode targets that are based on land use types and expected non-auto travel patterns that will result from the 2040 Growth Concept. For each land use type, the mode target consists of the combined transit, walk, bike and shared ride travel as a portion of overall travel. Metro recently received a TGM grant to explore additional strategies for reaching the targets, and to better measure the effectiveness of these strategies at meeting the targets. The study may result in recommended fine-tuning of the TPR in order to best support any needed changes to the regional policy on modal targets.
- **Street Design Program** – Metro’s Livable Streets program was developed in 1996 as a strategy to retrofit existing major streets and construct new streets to meet the modal demands of the 2040 Growth Concept. This marked the first time that land use plans were used to define street design details. Metro published “Creating Livable Streets” to promote the new policy, and has also implemented the program with more than \$20 million allocated to over a dozen “boulevard” retrofit projects across the region. Metro relies in the TPR provisions for promoting travel options as an important foundation for these street retrofit improvements that add transit, pedestrian and bicycling facilities to existing routes.

ODOT Incentives for Regional Planning

The recent state review of metropolitan planning also reports that the Metro region is the only one of six federally recognized metropolitan areas in the state to adopt a coordinated land use and transportation strategy that satisfies the TPR. While this is due, in part, to Metro’s unique regional planning authority, the reality is that our policies are largely developed through regional consensus, and enacted through local ordinances. We believe that the other MPOs could be encouraged to find consensus without a structure like Metro if transportation funding incentives were provided by ODOT.

For example, Metro has actively used federal flexible (STP) and CMAQ funding to promote transportation projects that provide travel options to driving alone. More than \$25 million has been allocated annually from these sources since the mid 1990s to fund transit, pedestrian, bicycle, demand management, transit-oriented development and boulevard projects.

We propose that a similar strategy be used to encourage other MPOs in the state to adopt coordinated regional land use and transportation plans like that in place in the Metro region, and called for in the TPR. ODOT could allocate flexible funds at the state level to similar projects when they occur in an MPO area that has completed a coordinated regional plan, providing an important incentive to MPOs that would represent a modest share of the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). We encourage the LCDC and OTC to explore this concept as part of the current joint subcommittee discussion.

State Role in Greater Metro Area Planning

Metro has worked to achieve Area Commission on Transportation (ACT) status with the Oregon Transportation Commission over the past two years, without success. While we believe that we can effectively communicate on many ACT issues without being recognized as such, we also see a need for the LCDC and OTC to step up involvement in regional planning issues that extend beyond federal MPO boundaries. Two examples include the greater Metro region, where our travelshed includes many cities located outside our planning boundary, and the Corvallis-Albany-Lebanon triangle, where the cities are linked by disparate employment and housing opportunities, placing a growing strain on transportation facilities.

Metro does not advocate for extensive rulemaking on this front as part of the TPR update. Instead, we support a new provision for consultation among agencies that share a daily travelshed, with ODOT and DLCD staff convening stakeholders for this purpose. We also support a separate, larger examination of whether a "Valley Goal" is needed to better evaluate the incremental effect of individual urban growth boundary and transportation project decisions on the long-term urbanization of the Willamette Valley.

We look forward to continued participation and comment as rulemaking and legislation proceeds, and as other portions of the TPR are reviewed in coming months. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important rulemaking.

Sincerely,

Rex Burkholder
JPACT Chair

David Bragdon
Metro Council

cc: Members of the LCDC
Lane Shetterly, Department of Land Conservation and Development
Members of the Oregon Transportation Commission
Bruce Warner, Oregon Department of Transportation

Attachment 'A'

Specific Comments on Draft TPR Amendments

The January 3, 2005 public comment draft of the proposed TPR revisions represents a good effort in providing the needed fine-tuning to address the Jaqua decision. Upon reviewing the draft amendments, we recommend further revisions to the public comment draft, as follows:

Section 1 - Defining "Significant Effect"

The following minor revisions to the draft TPR amendments would help clarify how "significant effect" is defined:

Section 660-012-0060 (1)(b) Change standards implementing travel function to be inconsistent with a functional classification system, or

Section 660-012-0060 (1)(c)(A) Allow land uses types or levels of development ~~land-uses~~ that would result in levels of travel or access that are inconsistent with the functional classification...

Section 2 - Local Remedies

We support the proposed amendments to this section without changes - particularly the added provision to allowed conditions of approval to be applied.

Section 3 - Mitigating Impacts

We support the proposed amendments to this section without further change.

Section 4 - Evaluating the Effects of an Amendment

The following proposed revisions reflect our concerns over (1) the inappropriate inclusion of amendments that go beyond the needed remedy to the Jaqua decision, (2) the lack of specific guidance for ODOT in managing existing and planned interchanges in the context of plan amendments, and (3) the role of ODOT in certifying whether a proposed change will impact the system:

660-012-0060 (4) Determinations under sections (1) - (3) of this rule shall be coordinated with affected transportation facility and service providers and other affected local governments.

~~(a) Except when the amendment involves property within one-half mile of an existing or planned interchange on an Interstate Highway in~~ determining whether an amendment has a significant effect on an existing or planned transportation facility under section 1(c) of this rule, local governments shall rely on existing transportation facilities and services and the following planned transportation facilities, improvements and services:

(A) Transportation facilities, improvements or services that are funded for construction or implementation in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program, Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program or other locally or regionally adopted transportation improvement program or capital improvement plan or program of a transportation service provider.

(B) Transportation facilities, improvements or services that are authorized in a local transportation system plan and for which a funding plan or mechanism is in place or approved. These include, but are not limited to, transportation facilities, improvements or services for which: transportation systems development charge revenues are being collected; a local improvement district or reimbursement district has been established or will be established prior to development; a development agreement has been adopted; or conditions of approval to fund the improvement have been adopted.

(C) Transportation facilities, improvements or services in a metropolitan planning organization (MPO) area that are part of the area's ~~federally approved, financially constrained~~ adopted regional transportation system plan.

~~(D) Improvements to state highways that are included as improvements in a regional or local transportation system plan or comprehensive plan when ODOT provides a written statement that the improvements are reasonably likely to be provided within the planning period.~~

660-12-0060 (4)(b) When the amendment involves property within one-half mile of an existing or planned interchange on an Interstate Highway, as measured from the center point of the interchange, in determining whether an amendment has a significant effect on an existing or planned transportation facility under section 1(c) of this rule, local governments shall rely on existing transportation facilities and services and the planned transportation facilities, improvements and services in (a)(A) through (C) of this section.

~~However, if ODOT provides a written statement that the amendment would not adversely impact the interchange, then local governments may also rely on the improvements identified in subsections (a)(D) and (E) of this section.~~

Section 5 - Definitions

660-012-0005 Definitions

Transportation facility - physical improvements that serve one or more modes of travel, including motor vehicles, transit, bicycles and pedestrians.

Attachment 'B'

Map: Areas affected by the Interstate Highway protection provisions in the Draft Oregon Transportation Planning Rule amendments.

[note: this map is under development, and will be provided at the February 10 JPACT meeting]