

5-22-2008

Meeting Notes 2008-05-22

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact

Recommended Citation

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation, "Meeting Notes 2008-05-22" (2008). *Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation*. Paper 462.

http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact/462

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

A G E N D A

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232-2736
TEL 503-797-1916 | FAX 503-797-1930



METRO

MEETING:	JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION		
DATE:	May 22, 2008		
TIME:	7:30 A.M.		
PLACE:	Council Chambers, Metro Regional Center		
7:30 AM	1.	CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM	Rex Burkholder, Chair
7:32 AM	2.	INTRODUCTIONS	Rex Burkholder, Chair
7:35 AM	3.	CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS	
7:40 AM	4.	COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR & COMMITTEE MEMBERS	Rex Burkholder, Chair
	5.	ACTION ITEMS	
7:45 AM	5.1	* <u>Senate Bill 566 – ACTION REQUESTED</u>	Jason Tell
	6.	INFORMATION ITEMS	
8:15 AM	6.1	* Transportation Finance:	
		• Report from Regional Transportation Authority Subcommittee	Lynn Peterson
		• Report from Regional Lobby group on State package	Andy Shaw
9:00 AM	7.	ADJOURN	Rex Burkholder, Chair

Upcoming JPACT Meetings: Thurs., June 12, 2008, from 7:30 – 9:00 a.m. at the Metro Council Chambers

- * Material available electronically.
- ** Material to be emailed at a later date.
- # Material provided at meeting.
All material will be available at the meeting.

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

DATE: May 1, 2008

TO: NWACT, JPACT, TPAC

FROM: Rian Windsheimer, ODOT – Region 1
Policy and Development Manager

SUBJECT: Senate Bill 566 & Statewide Transportation Improvement Program Report

Project List Development

Senate Bill 566, passed by the Oregon Legislature in 2007, directs the OTC to “... conduct a study to evaluate Oregon’s highway system, with input from highway users, local governments and the Federal Highway Administration. The purpose of the study is to identify specific highway projects required to reduce traffic congestion, improve freight mobility and enhance safety.”

In order to be responsive to the legislature, the ODOT’s Deputy Director has asked Region 1 to provide a list of highway projects that the Region would be able to deliver if we assumed a \$52 million annual allocation of modernization program funds over the 2010 to 2015 timeframe. In identifying modernization and operations projects for consideration, ODOT and its partners must utilize the OTC approved STIP criteria and eligibility factors (attached), as well as demonstrate that:

- 1) The project reduces traffic congestion, improves freight mobility and enhances safety;
- 2) The projects identified for construction must meet STIP project readiness criteria by the end of the 2016 fiscal year; and
- 3) The transportation improvements identified for development must meet the project readiness criteria by 2022.

Large Unfunded Projects

Region 1 has also been asked to work with partners to identify large modernization projects that are beyond the scope of the \$52 million / per year allocation. Such large projects must be expected to cost at least \$100 million and be identified in a local Transportation System Plan and/or Regional Transportation Plan.

The projects identified for inclusion on this list do not have to meet other STIP criteria.

Current Status

Region 1 prepared a straw list of projects based on ODOT projects in the Federal RTP and projects currently under development in the STIP. The list was presented at the Northwest Area Commission on Transportation and TPAC for their discussion and consideration.

On May 1st the NWACT unanimously voted to approve the recommended list of projects.

At a special TPAC meeting on May 2nd the group agreed to endorse the project list, with the understanding that ODOT would call out the need for additional project development funding for the Glencoe Interchange, the Springwater Interchange, and one of the large unfunded projects.

In order to meet the SB 566 mandate, Region 1 must submit its list of projects by May 31, 2008.

Draft List of Projects for ODOT Region 1 Response to SB 566

Project	Project Description	In MPO	In A Plan	County	Congestion Relief	Safety Improvement	Freight Mobility	Meets STIP Criteria	OFAC RANK 08-11 STIP	Phase in Current STIP	Scoping Estimated Cost (\$2008)	Funds in STIP	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
I-205 South to I-5 South Auxiliary Lane	Constructs acceleration lanes at merge of I-205/I-5 for improved operations.	Yes	Metro RTP (2008-2017)	Clack/Wash	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1	not programmed	\$13m	N/A	15	16	16	16	17	18
I-84 East to I-205 North Auxiliary Lane	Extend exit lane from I-84 to I-205 back to Halsey exit to allow traffic to exit the mainline I-84 sooner so as to not block the outer travel lane.	Yes	Metro RTP (2008-2017)	Multnomah	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/R	not programmed	\$13m	N/A	14	15	16	16	17	18
Northbound Airport Way to I-205 North	Address congestion at the Airport Way Interchange	Yes	Metro RTP (2008-2017)	Multnomah	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1	programmed for development in current STIP	\$47m	\$8m	44	46	48	50	53	55
Delta Park - Phase II	Replace Denver Viaduct, reconstruct local road connections, new signalization. Purpose of the Delta Park projects is to relieve congestion, improve safety and operations and efficiency of existing highway in the project area.	Yes	Metro RTP (2008-2017)	Multnomah	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1	programmed for development in current STIP	\$82m	\$1.219m	89	92	96	100	104	108
Troutdale Interchange at I-84 / Phase 1	Build first phase of Marine Drive Extension as refined through current IAMP work. (Current assumption is 2 lanes Marine Drive Extension.)	Yes	Metro RTP (2008-2017)	Multnomah	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1	programmed for IAMP and conceptual design	\$28m	\$0.723m	30	32	33	34	35	36
State Highway Preservation Enhancements	Safety and Freight Focused Enhancements to Preservation Projects	Yes	NA	Multnomah, Clackamas, Washington, Columbia, Hood River	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/R	not programmed	\$18m	N/A	3	3	3	3	3	3
Mobility Corridor Intelligent Transportation Systems and Operations	ITS and Operational improvements within Mobility Corridors that provide a benefit to the State System	Yes	NA	Multnomah, Clackamas, Washington, Columbia, Hood River	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/R	not programmed	\$18m	N/A	3	3	3	3	3	3
US 26 @ Staley's Junction	Replace existing at-grade intersection with new grade separated interchange	No	Consistent with Wash Co TSP	Washington	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	2	programmed for development in current STIP	\$22m	\$12m	10	12	13	15	17	18
Button Junction Intersection Improvement on Hwy 35	Intersection improvement	No	Consistent with Hood River County TSP	Hood River	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	2	not programmed	\$7m	N/A	8	8	9	9	9	10
Swedetown Road Bridge Replacement on US 30	Widen bridge to 4 lanes to match existing configuration in Clatskanie	No	Consistent with Clatskanie TSP	Columbia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/R	not programmed	\$9m	N/A	12	12	13	14	15	16
US 26 - Additional Lane West from Government Camp	Add a westbound travel lane (4th lane) from W. Govt Camp Loop Road approximately 1.2 miles to tie into an existing 4 lane section. The project may need to include re-alignment of the W. Govt Camp Lop Road-US 26 intersection and modifications to the Ski Bowl approaches.	No	In Clack County Rural TSP	Clackamas	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/R	not programmed	\$25m	N/A	28	29	30	31	32	34
												Total	16	37	150	15	41	56
												Cumulative Total	16	53	203	218	259	315
												Funding Availability	53	105	158	210	263	315
												Projected Cash Flow	37	52	-45	-8	4	0

* Should one of the above projects not be funded, or if additional funding were to be made available, the region would prioritize project development funding for the US:26 Glencoe Road Interchange, US:26 Springwater Interchange and/or one of the large projects on the \$100m+ list.

List of large unfunded projects with estimated costs over \$100 Million

Project	Project Description	In Local TSP?	2035 RTP Financially Constrained System Project Assumption	RTP Policy Direction	Included in 2035 RTP Air Quality Conformity?	In STIP	Current STIP funding	Plan/ Environmental	PE	ROW	Construction	Total Estimated Cost (Range in Millions, 2008 \$)	
Columbia River Crossing	To implement preferred alternative from the EIS	yes	Funding for Oregon portion of PE and ROW	Corridor need identified; implement multi-modal Columbia River Crossing EIS recommendations	Yes	Environmental document in 2009, funded through planning, some PE and ROW funding available	\$ 35,777,000					\$3,100	\$4,200
I-5/I-84 Interchange	Improve function of I-5 at the I-5/I-84 Interchange	yes	Funding for ROW	Corridor need identified; complete master plan for I-5/I-405 loop to define short- and long-term recommendations	Yes	Continue Planning & Analysis Work	\$ 400,000	\$2	\$50	n/a	\$310-500	\$360	\$550
I-5/OR99W Connector	To implement outcome of regional process looking at I-5/99W.	yes	Funding for PE and ROW	Need for improved regional connection between OR 99W and I-5 identified; implement corridor refinement plan recommendations	Yes	Environmental document in 2009, funded through planning, some PE funding available	\$ 25,762,000	\$10	\$150	\$100	\$540-1,240	\$800	\$1,500
Sunrise Corridor	To implement the outcome of the Sunrise SDEIS covering from I-205 to Rock Creek Junction.	yes	Funding for PE and ROW from I-205 to 172nd Avenue and funding for construction from I-205 to 122nd Avenue	Highway 212 corridor need identified; implement Sunrise Project EIS recommendations; conduct Sunrise Parkway EIS and Highway 212 Corridor Refinement Plan (Rock Creek Junction to US 26)	Yes	Environmental document in 2009, funded through planning, some PE funding available	\$ 57,061,000	Funded	\$150	\$150-175M	\$800-1,200	\$1,100	\$1,500
OR 217 Braided Ramps: Beaverton-Hillsdale Hwy to Allen	Build braided ramps from BH to Allen to improve capacity and operations on OR 217, further planning/environmental required	yes	Construction funding to braid OR 217 ramps between Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway and Allen Boulevard in both directions	Project included in RTP	Yes	Project development.	\$ 416,000					\$250	\$300
Sellwood Bridge	To implement outcome of Sellwood Bridge EIS	yes	Partial funding for PE, ROW and construction	Corridor need identified; implement Sellwood Bridge EIS recommendations	No	Environmental document in 2009, funded through planning, some PE funding available	\$ 26,030,000					\$300	\$450
Sunrise Parkway	To implement outcome of Highway 212 Corridor Refinement Plan.	yes	Widening Highway 212 to five lanes with boulevard design	Corridor need identified in RTP; Highway 212 corridor need identified in RTP and Damascus/Boring Concept Plan; conduct Sunrise Parkway EIS and Highway 212 Corridor Refinement Plan (Rock Creek Junction to US 26)	No	Corridor Refinement Study	\$ 1,000,000	Planning Funded				\$100+	
I-84/US 26 Connector	To implement outcome of I-84/US 26 Connector Corridor Plan	yes	Interim improvements to 242nd Avenue / US 26 and long-term new interchange at Springwater/US 26	Corridor need identified; complete corridor refinement study to determine short- and long-term recommendations	No	"Next Corridor" funding has not yet been prioritized	\$ -					\$100+	
I-205 Corridor	Corridor Plan Required to Identify and Prioritize Corridor Needs	no	Various improvements in corridor	Corridor need identified; complete corridor refinement study to examine long-term transit, TSM and road improvements.	No	"Next Corridor" funding has not yet been prioritized	\$ -					\$100+	
I-5 South	Corridor Plan Required to Identify and Prioritize Corridor Needs	no	Various improvements in corridor	Corridor need identified; complete corridor refinement study to determine short- and long-term recommendations for motor vehicle, truck and transit	No	"Next Corridor" funding has not yet been prioritized	\$ -					\$100+	

DATE: April 30, 2008

TO: JPACT and Interested Parties

FROM: Lynn Peterson, Chair, Clackamas County Commission

SUBJECT: Regional Transportation Authority Subcommittee Update

The Regional Transportation Authority Subcommittee that JPACT asked me to chair has now held three productive meetings to explore regional solutions to fund critical regional transportation needs. I thought it would be helpful to provide JPACT with an update on this process and to seek your feedback on our discussions thus far.

Regional Framework

The group quickly came to the conclusion that new funding is required, not necessarily a new governance structure. As a region, we have a number of methods through which to raise and govern new transportation revenues. While the Subcommittee has continued to meet under the RTA name, the discussion has really been about developing a regional package and supporting the state's efforts to enact a state-level funding proposal.

The Subcommittee has developed a conceptual framework for a regional funding proposal (see attached) that makes two key assumptions:

1. A state transportation funding package is enacted that includes both local road maintenance and state highway modernization components; and
2. The region will encourage and support the efforts of local governments to collect additional funding for maintenance and preservation through revenue sources such as local transportation utility fees.

Within this context, new regional funding would support projects of regional and local significance that will not be funded by either new state funding, or local maintenance revenues.

State Funding Package

On a parallel track, a group of regional lobby staff has been meeting to develop regional priorities for a state transportation funding package which is being developed through committees the Governor has appointed. A discussion draft of those priorities is attached.

Principles for Agreement on a Regional Transportation Package

The Portland Metropolitan Region's leaders agree to pursue a transportation funding proposal following the 2009 legislative session within the following framework:

1. The proposal will be brought to the voters as a single, regional measure covering the entire tri-county area, so that transportation needs within the UGB and in rural areas outside the UGB can be addressed.
2. A. The target for placing the proposal on the ballot is May 2010. This will allow time after the 2009 legislative session for the region's leaders to craft a specific ballot proposal that can win voter approval.

B. A firm decision is needed by July 2009 on whether or not to refer a regional ballot measure in order to allow local jurisdictions the time to refer their own measures if a regional measure does not advance.
3. The funding source is an increase in the vehicle registration fee, seeking to raise more than \$1 billion over twenty years.
4. The proposal will fund:
 - A. Several large projects throughout the region. Funds will be allocated on a proportionate-use or economic importance basis (e.g. funds from each county will be contributed based on use of the facility by county residents).
 - B. City and county projects. Projects and distribution of funds within each county will be based on funds raised from residents in that county. Projects will be determined by each county and its cities.
 - C. Alternative mode-supporting facilities (sidewalks and other pedestrian facilities, bike lanes, boulevards, etc). Projects and distribution of funds within each county will be based on funds raised from residents in that county. Projects will be determined by each county and its cities.
 - D. Freight-mobility projects. The amount of funding for these projects will be linked to cost responsibility from freight carriers.
5. Some large projects under 4A. may require bond financing, but projects under 4B. and 4C. will be funded on a cash-flow basis.
6. Cities, the three counties, Metro, and TriMet will enter into intergovernmental agreements to meet the requirements of ORS 801.041.
7. A companion transit proposal will be developed to ensure that voters can consider a balanced funding package.
8. With the passage of a ballot measure, MTIP funds will be flexed to fund non-road projects (projects that cannot be funded with highway-related funds), focused on Metro Planning, TOD, RTO, ITS, Regional Trails, and Regional Rail projects.

Short List of State Legislative Transportation Priorities

Policy

Do No Harm: Do not enact preemptions of local government revenue-raising authority. The transportation funding challenge will require new funding commitments at all levels of government.

50-30-20 Funding Distribution: Protect the established state funding formula to ensure distribution of new state-wide transportation resources at 50 percent to the state, 30 percent to counties, and 20 percent to cities (“50-30-20”).

Protect Existing Assets: Oregon should protect the billions of dollars of existing transportation assets by prioritizing maintenance and preservation. New modernization projects should be funded from the state’s 50% share of new resources.

Remove Local Restrictions: Remove the requirement that county-approved vehicle registration fees must be agreed to by neighboring counties in the region.

Remove Willamette Bridge Tolling Restrictions: Eliminate existing statutory restrictions on local authority to establish tolls on Willamette River bridges in the region.

New Revenues

Road Maintenance and Construction: New state investments in our transportation system are desperately required to address backlogged maintenance and critical safety and mobility projects. A 12-cent gas tax merely returns the buying power of the fuel tax to 1993 levels.

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| ➤ Raise the Gas Tax 14¢ | \$400 million per year |
| ➤ Double the VRF to \$54 | \$150 million per year |
| ➤ Index the Gas Tax to inflation | +\$20 million per year |

Invest in Transit: Devote new resources (including new lottery funds) to expanding light rail, commuter rail, streetcar, and other public transit services and facilities that support the state’s CO₂ emissions reduction goals and efficient land use.

- **New Commitment to Transit:** The state needs to identify a new, ongoing state funding stream to support transit.
- **Flexible Funds:** Instruct ODOT to use all flexible federal funds for public transit (flex more funds for bus purchases statewide, elderly & disabled, etc.).
- **Elderly and disabled transit:** Support transit services and provide independence for Oregon’s growing elderly and disabled (E&D) population by increasing funding for the state’s E&D transit program.

ConnectOregon III: The state’s successful multi-modal investment program should be continued with a third round of project funding.

Materials following this page were distributed at the meeting.

2008 JPACT Work Program

5/22/08

January 2009	<p>July 10, 2008</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCT Plan Briefing • Milwaukie LRT Preferred Alternative – Approval • Columbia River Crossing Preferred Alternative – Approval • Air Quality Update
February 2009	<p>August 14, 2008</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTP Funding Framework – Discussion • Oregon Transportation Research Center – Program Overview
March 2009	<p>September 11, 2008</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional Flexible Fund Allocation, Step 2 – Briefing • Intro ODOT TIP Projects • I-5/99W Preferred Alternative RTP Amendment • Lake Oswego to Portland DEIS Funding Plan
April 2009	<p>October 9, 2008</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Release MTIP for public comment • Adopt regional position on state funding strategy • RTP Scenarios Analysis Report – Joint JPACT/MPAC Discussion (Date TBD)
<p>May 8, 2008</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transportation Finance Options – Discussion • Regional Flexible Fund Allocation, Step 1 – Action • Regional Flexible Fund Allocation – Step 2: Local Distribution Ranking Criteria <p>May 22, 2008</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SB 566 Program – Approval • Transportation Finance Options – Discussion 	<p>November 13, 2008</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wash., DC Trip – Debrief last year; prepare for next year • RTP Scenarios Analysis Recommended and Policy Refinements – Joint JPACT/MPAC Discussion (Date TBD) <p>MTIP Hearings</p>
<p>June 12, 2008</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Milwaukie Preferred Alternative – Briefing • Columbia River Crossing – Briefing • 2008-11 STIP Modernization "cut" package – Approval • State Transportation Finance Package – Preliminary Direction • Performance-based Growth Management • TriMet 5-year TIP Comments • RTP Evaluation Framework – Discussion <p>Reg. Flex Fund Application Deadline</p>	<p>December 11, 2008</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sellwood Bridge Preferred Alternative RTP Amendment • Sunrise Project Preferred Alternative RTP Amendment • Adopt regional position on federal funding strategy • Confirm RTP system develop-principles and criteria



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

May 21, 2008

Rex Burkholder
JPACT Chair
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, Oregon 97232

Dear Councilor Burkholder:

The question was asked at the last JPACT meeting whether the Columbia River Crossing Project (CRC) is in compliance with NEPA standards, rules, and practices with specific mention to the discontinuing the Portland Sponsors Council (PSC).

The PSC was an advisory group established early in the process to facilitate coordination with the sponsoring agencies (ODOT, WSDOT, TriMet, CTRAN, RTC, Metro, City of Vancouver and City of Portland). The sponsoring agencies representatives agreed that the group was redundant with other advisory groups participating in the project and decided to discontinue meeting.

The agencies represented on the PSC continue to participate on the CRC project through the groups such as the Task Force, Sponsoring Agency Senior Staff, Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Group, Urban Design Advisory Group, and are an integral part of the Project Development Team who meets bi-weekly.

As federal leads for the project, Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration oversee compliance with the NEPA process. Both lead agencies have concurred with CRC's process for compliance with NEPA, including an early legal review of the DEIS from both attorneys.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "John Osborn".

John Osborn, PE
Project Director

List of large unfunded projects with estimated costs over \$100 Million

Project	Project Description	In Local TSP?	2035 RTP Financially Constrained System Project Assumption	RTP Policy Direction	Included in 2035 RTP Air Quality Conformity?	In STIP	Current STIP funding	Plan/ Environmental	PE	ROW	Construction	Total Estimated Cost (Range in Millions, 2008 \$)	
Columbia River Crossing	To implement preferred alternative from the EIS	yes	Funding for Oregon portion of PE and ROW	Corridor need identified; implement multi-modal Columbia River Crossing EIS recommendations	Yes	Environmental document in 2009, funded through planning, some PE and ROW funding available	\$ 35,777,000					\$3,100	\$4,200
I-5/I-84 Interchange	Improve function of I-5 at the I-5/I-84 Interchange	yes	Funding for ROW	Corridor need identified; complete master plan for I-5/I-405 loop to define short- and long-term recommendations	Yes	Continue Planning & Analysis Work	\$ 400,000	\$2	\$50	n/a	\$310-500	\$360	\$550
I-5/OR99W Connector	To implement outcome of regional process looking at I-5/99W.	yes	Funding for PE and ROW	Need for improved regional connection between OR 99W and I-5 identified; implement corridor refinement plan recommendations	Yes	Environmental document in 2009, funded through planning, some PE funding available	\$ 25,762,000	\$10	\$150	\$100	\$540-1,240	\$800	\$1,500
Sunrise Corridor	To implement the outcome of the Sunrise SDEIS covering from I-205 to Rock Creek Junction.	yes	Funding for PE and ROW from I-205 to 172nd Avenue and funding for construction from I-205 to 122nd Avenue	Highway 212 corridor need identified; implement Sunrise Project EIS recommendations; conduct Sunrise Parkway EIS and Highway 212 Corridor Refinement Plan (Rock Creek Junction to US 26)	Yes	Environmental document in 2009, funded through planning, some PE funding available	\$ 57,061,000	Funded	\$150	\$150-175M	\$800-1,200	\$1,100	\$1,500
OR 217 Braided Ramps: Beaverton-Hillsdale Hwy to Allen	Build braided ramps from BH to Allen to improve capacity and operations on OR 217, further planning/environmental required	yes	Construction funding to braid OR 217 ramps between Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway and Allen Boulevard in both directions	Project included in RTP	Yes	Project development.	\$ 416,000					\$250	\$300
Sellwood Bridge	To implement outcome of Sellwood Bridge EIS	yes	Partial funding for PE, ROW and construction	Corridor need identified; implement Sellwood Bridge EIS recommendations	No	Environmental document in 2009, funded through planning, some PE funding available	\$ 26,030,000					\$300	\$450
Sunrise Parkway	To implement outcome of Highway 212 Corridor Refinement Plan.	yes	Widening Highway 212 to five lanes with boulevard design	Corridor need identified in RTP; Highway 212 corridor need identified in RTP and Damascus/Boring Concept Plan; conduct Sunrise Parkway EIS and Highway 212 Corridor Refinement Plan (Rock Creek Junction to US 26)	No	Corridor Refinement Study	\$ 1,000,000	Planning Funded				\$100+	
I-84/US 26 Connector	To implement outcome of I-84/US 26 Connector Corridor Plan	yes		Corridor need identified; complete corridor refinement study to determine short- and long-term recommendations	No	"Next Corridor" funding is has not yet been prioritized	\$ -					\$100+	
I-205 Corridor	Corridor Plan Required to Identify and Prioritize Corridor Needs	no		Corridor need identified; complete corridor refinement study to determine short- and long-term recommendations	No	"Next Corridor" funding is has not yet been prioritized	\$ -					\$100+	
I-5 South	Corridor Plan Required to Identify and Prioritize Corridor Needs	no		Corridor need identified; complete corridor refinement study to determine short- and long-term recommendations	No	"Next Corridor" funding is has not yet been prioritized	\$ -					\$100+	

* Components of the projects listed above may be completed for less than \$100m and may have independent utility.

JPACT SB 566 Motion

1. Recognizes the legislature has directed OTC to recommend projects to be considered for funding for a transportation funding package that may be considered by the '09 legislature.
2. Recognizes the OTC has defined the task as modernization projects consistent with STIP criteria.
3. Endorses the project list developed by ODOT Region 1 and finds it consistent with advancing projects now under development in the STIP consistent with the newly adopted RTP.
4. Recognizes the list of potential projects was over \$100 million that are beyond the financial capacity of this exercise, many of which are going through a planning or project development process to define the specific scope to include in the RTP.

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORSING) RESOLUTION NO. 08-3921
REGIONAL PRIORITIES FOR STATE)
TRANSPORTATION FUNDING) Introduced by Councilor Rex Burkholder
LEGISLATION)

WHEREAS, an efficient and adequately funded transportation system is critical to ensuring a healthy economy and livable communities throughout the state of Oregon; and

WHEREAS, the Portland metropolitan region has become a national model for how strategic transportation investments combined with regional land use planning can improve community livability and environmental quality while supporting a strong economy; and

WHEREAS, despite the important investments that have been made possible since 2001 by three Oregon Transportation Improvement Acts and two "ConnectOregon" multimodal packages, the state and the Portland region remain several billion dollars short of what is needed to adequately address essential transportation needs over the next 20 years; and

WHEREAS, investments in maintaining and expanding transportation facilities in the Portland region are especially critical in light of the fact that the region's population is expected to grow by approximately one million people by 2030; and

WHEREAS, freight volumes are expected to increase even more quickly than population over that same time period; and

WHEREAS, additional funding to address these transportation needs will create or sustain thousands of jobs and help stimulate the economy of the region and the state; and

WHEREAS, it is critical that we plan and fund the region's transportation system in such a way as to confront the challenge posed by global climate change; and

WHEREAS, it is in the interest of local governments inside Metro to jointly seek additional transportation funding from the 2009 Oregon Legislature; and

WHEREAS, Governor Kulongoski and legislative leaders have declared that passage of a transportation funding package will be a top legislative priority in 2009; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) endorse a set of principles to guide the region's participation in the development of a state legislative funding proposal to be considered by the 2009 Oregon Legislature, as described in Exhibit A of this resolution, entitled "Metropolitan Region Principles for Legislative Transportation Funding Package in 2009".

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this _____ day of March 2008.

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

Metropolitan Region Principles For a Legislative Transportation Funding Package in 2009

We, the local governments of the Portland Metropolitan Region, believe:

The mounting inadequacy of funding for modernization and maintenance of Oregon's transportation system:

- Threatens the state's economy.
- Harms the long term livability of our communities.
- Undermines public safety.
- Places the long term value of previous investments at risk.
- Contributes to global climate change and energy insecurity.

To solve this transportation funding crisis, and to guide critical decisions on transportation, we, the undersigned, support the following principles:

MAKE STRATEGIC INVESTMENTS

- Adopt a significant, coordinated, comprehensive, long-term transportation funding package that addresses the needs of the entire state through investments at the state, regional, and local levels.
- Ensure that any transportation funding package is responsive to the specific needs of Oregon's metropolitan areas.
- Recognize the mutually dependent relationship between our land use and transportation systems, and between these systems and the state's economic competitiveness.
- Invest transportation revenues in a multi-modal program that provides statewide economic benefits and produces a high return on investment.
- Allocate sufficient funds to address critical safety needs in communities statewide, and to support the maintenance and preservation of new and existing transportation facilities.

REINFORCE OREGON'S LIVABILITY AND SUSTAINABILITY

- Design transportation investment programs to reward practices that best enhance the State's goals with respect to public health and safety, livability, global climate change, economic prosperity and environmental stewardship.

INVEST IN ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS

- Invest in key projects that strengthen freight movement, improve system reliability and safety, and expand access and transit to traditional downtowns and other centers of commerce.

MAINTAIN FLEXIBILITY AND EQUITY FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

- Allow and encourage innovative approaches and funding mechanisms to meet the differing needs of Oregon's state, regional, and local transportation systems.
- Facilitate or expand funding authorities available to local and regional governments and eschew unfunded mandates.
- Address state and local transportation needs through the distribution formula providing 50% to the state, 30% to counties, and 20% to cities, and maximize local flexibility as to how these funds may be used.