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Meeting: JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

Date: April 8, 1999

Day: THURSDAY

Time: 7:30 a.m.

Place: METRO, CONFERENCE ROOM 370A-B

1. MEETING REPORT OF MARCH 11, 1999 – APPROVAL REQUESTED.*

2. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE – INFORMATIONAL - Ray Phelps, Pac/West Communications.#


5. APPROVAL OF 150 PERCENT MTIP CUT LIST – Andy Cotugno.*
   • Listening Post and Hearing Summary – Gina Whitehill-Baziuk
   • Next Steps
   • Proposed 150% List
   • Impact on Narrowing to the 100% List


7. ROSS ISLAND BRIDGE PRESENTATION – INFORMATIONAL – Kay Van Sickel, Bill Ciz and Christie Holingren, ODOT.#

Please mark your calendar for a Joint JPACT/MPAC Meeting at 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday, April 28, 1999.

* Material enclosed.
# Available at meeting.
DATE OF MEETING: March 11, 1999

GROUP/SUBJECT: Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)

PERSONS ATTENDING:
Chair Jon Kvistad, Ed Washington and David Bragdon, Metro Council; Roy Rogers, Washington County; Royce Pollard, City of Vancouver; Kay Van Sickel, Region 1 ODOT; Don Wagner, WSDOT; Karl Rohde, Cities of Clackamas County; Sharron Kelley, Multnomah County; Larry Sowa (alt.), Clackamas County; Charlie Hales, City of Portland; Fred Hansen, Tri-Met; Dave Lohman (alt.), Port of Portland; Jim Kight, Cities of Multnomah County; and Rob Drake, Cities of Washington County

Guests: Mike Burton, Metro Executive Officer; Rod Monroe, Metro Presiding Officer; Susan McLain (JPACT alt.), Metro Council; Lisa Naito (JPACT alt.) and Karen Schilling, Multnomah County; Lou Ogden (JPACT alt.), Cities of Washington County; Dave Williams, Steve Harry, Bill Ciz, Leo Huff, Frank Nelson and Kathy Conrad, ODOT; Ted Spence, Citizen; Tom VanderZanden and Rod Sandoz, Clackamas County; Elsa Coleman and Mark Lear, City of Portland; Lee Leighton, Sellwood-Moreland Citizen; Kevin Downing, SMILE; Thayer Rorabaugh, City of Vancouver; Jason Daughn, Senator Ron Wyden’s Office; Martha Bennett, City of Milwaukie; Tom Markgraf, Office of Congressman Blumenerau; Craig Maynard, Sellwood resident; Ron Papsdorf, Cities of Multnomah County; Gerald Gregg and William Paden, Oregon State Police; Bob Hart, Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council; Scott Rice, Cornelius City Council; Mary Legry (JPACT alt.), WSDOT; Dick Feeney, Bernie Bottomly and Bob Stacey (JPACT alt.), Tri-Met; Rex Burkholder, Coalition for a Livable Future; Mark Schoening, City of Lake Oswego; and Lynn Peterson, 1000 Friends of Oregon

Staff: Andy Cotugno, Richard Brandman, Mike Hognlund, Chris Deffebach, and Lois Kaplan, Recording Secretary

Media: John Dillin, The Sellwood Bee

SUMMARY:
The meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Chair Jon Kvistad.
MEETING REPORT

Councilor Rohde moved, seconded by Councilor Kight, to approve the February 11, 1999 JPACT meeting report as submitted. The motion PASSED unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 99-2756 – APPROVING THE FY 2000 UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM

Andy Cotugno explained that the FY 2000 Unified Work Program (UWP) represents the Transportation Department’s overall work program effective July 1 and is the prerequisite for grants to be authorized to that program. He highlighted some of the work elements and noted that the high capacity transit element is generic because no conclusion has been reached on its future direction. There’s uncertainty about what will happen and, until it’s sorted out, its inclusion in the UWP stresses the importance of pursuit of that South/North program. Andy noted that it may require a future UWP amendment.

Commissioner Sowa of Clackamas County raised questions relating to the FEIS reference under “Objectives” on Page 32 of the UWP and asked that it be corrected as follows:

“The work plan may need to be amended to include developing an FEIS for the North segment of the corridor. In addition, it may need to be amended to define the scope of work for a South Corridor Improvement Program. The HCT Program’s…”

Andy Cotugno pointed out that the budget does not include an FEIS. In order to undertake that, it only recognizes that it is a direction under discussion and could constitute action by JPACT in the future. This work plan may include some plan to look at Clackamas County’s needs. Andy felt that Commissioner Sowa’s comments reflected the intent of the paragraph and would be appropriate. Fred Hansen also expressed his support of the proposed text change.

Action Taken: Commissioner Sowa moved, seconded by Fred Hansen, to amend the text on Page 32 of the Unified Work Program as noted above. The motion PASSED unanimously.

Action Taken: Mayor Drake moved, seconded by Dave Lohman, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 99-2756, approving the FY 2000 Unified Work Program with the text change noted. The motion PASSED unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 99-2761 – CERTIFYING THAT THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING REQUIREMENTS

Action Taken: Commissioner Kelley moved, seconded by Mayor Drake, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 99-2761, certifying that the Portland metropolitan area is in compliance with federal transportation planning requirements. The motion PASSED unanimously.
SOUTH WILLAMETTE RIVER CROSSING STUDY

Andy Cotugno explained that the material relating to the South Willamette River Crossing Study in the agenda packet reflects the conclusions reached by a JPACT subcommittee of affected jurisdictional representatives, including elected officials and community leaders. He reviewed the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Study Group which clearly supported options for rehabilitation or replacement of the Sellwood Bridge as a two-lane structure that would also meet the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists; to support land use goals, drop further study of a new bridge in Milwaukie; identifying actions that would mitigate traffic growth; better alternative modes, citing increased and improved transit service, bus treatments, and better bike/pedestrian treatments; consideration of more east-west bus routes between Milwaukie and Lake Oswego; increasing capacity on appropriate regional facilities that would attract traffic away from this corridor toward other regional districts; and encouragement of more jobs in Clackamas County to balance the oversupply of households.

Andy spoke of the preliminary conclusions reached by JPACT a few meetings ago. The recommendations of the subgroup reflect improvements to be pursued but are separate from the considerations in the Milwaukie/Sellwood area.

Councilor Washington reported that the subgroup he chaired included representation from all the affected jurisdictions. He felt that the Ad Hoc Committee was clear in its recommendations, urged acceptance of those recommendations, and felt that JPACT should move the recommendations forward for public comment.

Commissioner Hales complimented the work of the subcommittee and staff in getting to this point. He felt it was a test of whether the stated philosophy of coordinating land use and transportation meant something and indicated that this report passed that test. Commissioner Hales commented on the great neighborhood plan which was adopted by the City of Portland. He felt the plan mattered as did Milwaukie’s recommendation in support of reinforcing neighborhoods rather than fixing traffic congestion. He noted that there was a strong consensus at the subcommittee level and felt it represented a model for future decisions. Commissioner Hales also thanked Mayor Tomei and her staff for the extra effort they put forward.

Commissioner Kelley indicated that Multnomah County would be supportive of the recommendation and respect the Ad Hoc Study Group process. She noted that the Sellwood replacement represents a $60 million project with no new traffic amenities or plans for moving people. She asked for JPACT’s support in funding this project as she acknowledged that Multnomah County can’t do the job alone. Up to $60 million is needed for the project.

Councilor Rohde and Fred Hansen cited the importance of the funding issue and felt that staff should be addressing that issue. Commissioner Rogers wanted to be assured that the vote would not be tied to a recommendation for prioritized funding and he was assured it would not.

Action Taken: Councilor Washington moved, seconded by Commissioner Hales, to recommend approval for release of the South Willamette River Crossing Study recommendations for public comment. The motion PASSED unanimously.
Metro Executive Officer, Mike Burton, recognized Chris Deffebach for her fine effort on this project. He noted that, critical to the process, was the terrific group of staff from the different jurisdictions backed by a great technical staff. Councilor Rohde also applauded Chris Deffebach for her effort as well.

Councilor Washington thanked everyone for their participation, indicated it was an easy committee to chair, noted that staff was helpful, and commented that the committee members worked well together with a sense of purpose.

Fred Hansen felt there was an opportunity over the next 18-24 months, in view of the planned closure of the Ross Island Bridge, to analyze where traffic flows are moving, what the choices are, and what future growth would mean. In addition, he was hopeful that there would be opportunity to see if there are ways of influencing the bridge area’s mode split. He suggested targeting advertising for other alternatives to achieve long-term management goals. He cited the need for an aggressive way to address what those traffic impacts will be and corresponding management.

Kay Van Sickel indicated that the Ross Island Bridge won’t be fully closed. One lane will be open at all times but the bridge will be under construction for a year. She spoke of difficulty with respect to Tri-Met’s nearby facility and getting buses through the work area. She cited the need to take a critical stand so that congestion doesn’t get ahead of them.

Bill Ciz of ODOT reported that the Ross Island Bridge project will be contracted to bid for August or September with construction work to commence as early as October. The railing on the bridge will have to be replaced; there is rehabilitation of the pavement involved; the bridge must be brought up to standard; and sidewalk work must be done. It will require about a year’s work in duration. Bill noted that ODOT has been working with the City of Portland on traffic management and how to handle the construction. Construction will be done primarily at night. A discussion followed on the percentage of trips the Ross Island Bridge carries. In addition, the discussion centered on recognition of the work on regional facilities such as Highway 217 and the I-5/217 intersection impacts, the need to move people and cars, and the fact that they are critical projects that are not funded in the package.

Metro Presiding Officer Monroe noted that he was assuming that work on the Hawthorne Bridge would be completed before Ross Island traffic would need to be diverted. It was noted that ODOT has no plans to widen the Ross Island Bridge. Frank Nelson of ODOT indicated that pedestrian access is perilous on the bridge but that ODOT does not have the funds to do anything beyond what is planned. If the Ross Island Bridge was widened, there would be need to completely rebuild all of the cross-members and then put sidewalks inside. He noted that the four lanes are less than standard width and carried on the steel superstructure of the bridge. To widen the bridge would require $30-40 million presuming the steel would withhold the additional capacity. ODOT generally defers to the region for Modernization projects.

In further discussion on the Ross Island Bridge, Presiding Officer Monroe reported that the listed speed on the bridge is 40 miles per hour and that it remains a high-accident structure. He felt it should be widened if there is the opportunity to do so and suggested there be more study of the bridge and its problems with on and off access. He added that it is poorly designed and that it is the major service way from the Southeast to Southwest area.
Fred Hansen re-emphasized the two issues raised: 1) to try to analyze what people choose to do rather than what our models project; and 2) to concern ourselves not only with the movement of buses but to be creative in finding alternatives that can influence traffic patterns and manage congestion. Chair Kvistad suggested that this issue be discussed further at a future JPACT meeting. Andy Cotugno indicated he would like to ask the traffic mitigation effort to deal with those traffic problems.

OREGON STATE POLICE 1999-2001 BIENNIAL BUDGET

Lt. Gerald Gregg of the Oregon State Police (OSP) reported that the OSP has been preparing for its 1999-2000 biennial budget request. He spoke of meetings held with other law enforcement agencies in an effort to determine what the expectations would be of the OSP. Transportation safety is one of their goals and they well realize that they are understaffed in terms of providing patrols on the state and interstate systems.

Lt. Gregg noted a resource gap and the need to fill the void. They are requesting 220 new personnel statewide. He reported that there are no troopers patrolling the City of Portland’s freeway system. Fifty-eight officers are needed for 24-hour coverage in the Portland area.

Chair Kvistad clarified that endorsement of this request would not commit funding from the Transportation Trust Fund or gas tax allocation. Equipment, vehicles, and personnel were all included in the estimate.

A discussion followed on whether or not the Oregon State Police had looked into contracting with the local jurisdictions. It would cost $11 million a year to utilize jurisdictional officers and equipment. The sheriffs, counties and the police chiefs don’t have to provide the services the Oregon State Policy is presently providing.

Metro Presiding Officer Monroe commented that vehicle miles traveled have increased dramatically and felt there is a critical need for the patrols. He felt the Legislature should be encouraged to consider this a critical need and that anything JPACT can do to foster safer highways should be pursued.

Dave Lohman felt it was a worthy cause but felt uneasy about supporting the endorsement in light of not knowing its context out of the Governor’s budget.

Councilor Rohde felt the patrols were a good idea but, in terms of statewide concerns and as a citizen, was not convinced that $11 million a year was better utilized for the OSP than for the school system. He didn’t object to the matter of safety but rather to the specificity of a biennial budget request.

Mayor Drake commented on the growth in Beaverton, citizen support of transportation measures, the lack of state police enforcement for patrolling the state highways, and Pact’s responsibility to send a message to the Governor on the need to make our regional safer, that we are not getting adequate patrols, and that we are a donor state.
Chair Kvistad noted that the letter did not specify a specific amount.

Councilor Bragdon shared his concern over the decline and cuts of the state police that evolved from the state gas tax. He felt the service should be provided through a user fee and had difficulty in supporting this endorsement. Chair Kvistad noted that the Regional Transportation Plan calls for safe transportation systems.

Mayor Ogden commented on the importance of safety and enhancement but questioned JPACT’s signature as an endorsement. Commissioner Hales emphasized the grassroots effort underway in establishing the relationship between transportation engineering work and the enforcement necessary to make the system work. He didn’t feel JPACT should be content with a status quo position. Councilor Washington also felt that JPACT needs to send a supportive message.

Fred Hansen acknowledged that there are a lot of needs and priorities to be set but was supportive of the state police request.

Dave Lohman suggested a statement in the letter that wouldn’t refer to the specific biennium budget and to note that state patrols are among the many transportation needs that are unfunded. Metro Presiding Officer Monroe commented that he’s a member of the David Douglas School Board and didn’t feel this was an education versus state police issue. He cited it as a critical safety need for the state of Oregon that needs to be addressed by the Legislature. Discussion followed over the possibility of there being other extraneous requests for endorsements.

**Action Taken:** Mayor Drake moved, seconded by Councilor Kight, to endorse the Oregon State Policy request with the recommended text changes. Mike Hoglund of Metro staff was directed to incorporate the text changes to reflect discussion at the meeting. The motion PASSED by a vote of 13 for; one against (Councilor Bragdon); and one abstention (Commissioner Rogers, citing the importance of first having a corrected draft).

**FY 2000-2003 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

Andy Cotugno noted that two of the “listening post” sessions on the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) had been held and the one remaining would take place on Wednesday, March 17, at 6:00 p.m. at Clackamas Community College. Staff is currently going through the ranking process and TPAC will meet to define the administrative criteria. Andy encouraged TPAC members to be timely in articulating what the other issues are that might affect which projects will get funded.

$75 million of flexible STP funds are available but there are $300+ million of projects to be ranked. Freeway projects are handled separately and have not been the focus of discussion. Andy indicated a short list of $110 million would be drawn from the $300 million of potential projects and that JPACT would adopt that short list at its April 8 meeting. Two public hearings will be held jointly by JPACT and the Transportation Planning Committee. The first is April 6 to discuss the 150 percent “short list” and a final hearing on May 4. Both hearings will start at 5:30 p.m. JPACT will then consider approval of the MTIP at its May 13 meeting. Andy asked JPACT members to review the preliminary rankings with their respective technical staff.
Fred Hansen distributed a draft of Tri-Met’s three-year service plan that is reflected among the projects.

Commissioner Kelley asked about allocating specific amounts to modal categories and how or whether it should be done. Andy indicated that staff’s recommendation is that there not be a prescribed or predetermined percentage assigned to each category. He felt that what’s relevant is not the percentage in each category but rather which projects should be supported. He emphasized that it’s more relevant when you’re focused on specific projects on a prioritized list. Commissioner Kelley felt that policy-makers should be able to target specific allocations for each mode and that it’s an issue that hasn’t been discussed. She asked for JPACT discussion on that issue. Councilor Kvistad pointed out that we are dealing with a constrained fiscal environment and have tried to focus on the most critical projects. Andy suggested that JPACT use the 150 percent list to have each JPACT member provide their input on how much to allocate to each mode.

Dave Lohman felt that JPACT will get to the policy decisions and was supportive of how the list was formed. Discussion will take place at the April 8 JPACT meeting on the 150 percent project list. There was further discussion on whether to craft a survey that would help form a list by modes, assign a number of projects for each mode, and help develop the proper mix. If that feedback were provided in writing, it would be helpful in preparing the matrix for the April 8 JPACT meeting.

Mike Hoglund explained that there is a separate statewide process that will handle the enhancement projects but it won’t be complete until May or June. It does, however, have a bearing on other projects. Committee members cited the need to get the statewide process better integrated with what is happening at the local level.

Councilor McLain spoke of the Cornelius boulevard program and the fact that it has moved down to about 13th on the list.

Councilor Bragdon asked how the “listening post” testimony gets disseminated to JPACT. Mike Hoglund indicated that, in addition to comments received on cards at the listening posts, comments were also directed to a website and are being summarized in a document for JPACT review, which will become available about the 1st of April.

In view of the Legislature meeting at this time, Chair Kvistad asked that each jurisdiction provide him with their No. 1 priority freeway or highway project that would benefit from a gas-tax increase. Committee members, however, decided to pass on the suggestion and not to participate in an exercise that would ask the Legislature for earmarks. Chair Kvistad reported that the Republican House and Senate Caucus have indicated that it would be in the region’s best interests to reinforce the importance of their regional priorities. Commissioner Hales reminded the committee of the roles of JPACT and the Legislature and was not supportive of providing an “earmarked” list. Mayor Ogden commented that the STIP actually reflects those projects. Councilor Bragdon commented on process and the need for JPACT members to reach out to the House and Senate members in a timely and tactful manner as they approach the gas tax issue.
Councilor McLain agreed with Mayor Ogden and Commissioner Hales with respect to submitting a legislative request for earmarks. She felt it was more important to refine the process for land use/transportation-related decisions. If the list is too long or too integrated, she suggested stressing the land use/transportation approach as part of the full transportation system. In terms of selecting a short list, Councilor McLain asked them to consider how project No. 1 would infill the rest of the system and what projects they would get the most out of.

WASHINGTON COUNTY/CLACKAMAS COUNTY LETTERS RELATING TO REGIONAL PRIORITIES

Letters submitted by Washington County and Clackamas County raising issues relating to project priorities in the South/North Corridor were distributed. Commissioner Rogers stated that it was his request that this matter be scheduled for the April 8 JPACT meeting. He cited the confusion that exists over what regional projects are still being supported in the South/North Corridor, which are being recommended to move forward, and the need for that clarification. Commissioner Rogers reported that, in Washington, D.C., there is discussion about the north part of the corridor but not about the south end. Washington County would like to have a reassessment of that understanding. Commissioner Rogers noted that a prior commitment was made to Clackamas County and, if not viable, there’s need to move quickly onto a north route.

At issue was the $55 million of funds committed to a South/North light rail project. If the route takes a north alignment only, discussion should take place on whether the full $55 million should be committed for that north alignment only. Commissioner Rogers cited the need for an open process rather than other alternatives being looked at. Congressmen in D.C. thought the project had been scoped at the JPACT table and they are not predisposed to any decision.

Commissioner Sowa noted that Commissioner Kennemer had raised similar concerns at the February 11 JPACT meeting. He felt he wasn’t basically heard. During the rail planning effort, many alternatives surfaced in Clackamas County. The study process has not been completed as to whether support would be for high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes or whether other options might surface. The purpose of the transportation hearings was to gain public input such as improvements to existing roads. Comments were universally in support of north light rail. A decision will need to be made on the Columbia Extension and whether to move it forward as a project. Commissioner Rogers asked that the South/North Corridor priorities be placed at the top of the agenda for the April 8 JPACT meeting.

Councilor McLain expressed support of the Clackamas County/Washington County letters. She felt that issues to be addressed include: what the project looks like to the north, the short and long-term needs of Clackamas County, and the need for a plan that includes those elements.

I-5 CORRIDOR PROJECT WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON THE INTERSTATE BRIDGE NORTH SPAN – PAINTING AND REHABILITATION PROJECT

A packet of information relating to painting of the I-5 Bridge was distributed. Kay Van Sickel reported that ODOT, WDOT, Metro, Southwest Washington RTC, Tri-Met, C-TRAN and the cities of Vancouver and Portland are participating in a collaborative effort to minimize impacts of that task.
The northbound traffic span will be affected beginning April 1, 1999 through October 31, 2000. The bridge will be encapsulated during the 22 stages of painting. The project will cost $17 million and will take place over an 18-month timeframe. The work will start at both ends of the bridge and progress toward the middle. Only those firms that had demonstrated the capability of doing a project of this magnitude were considered.

Bill Ciz of ODOT commented on the traffic management plan. He indicated that three meetings were held with the same group that planned for mitigation on the trunnion project. Strategies planned for during the painting period include keeping the high-occupancy vehicle lane in place for the length of the project and keeping three travel lanes open. During low-water periods, the contractor can only keep two lanes in place (summer months). C-TRAN is committed to additional service and park-and-rides. ODOT also will continue to work with the Portland Police for enforcement of the HOV lanes. Tow trucks will also be utilized to remove cars. There will be changes in signal times on the arterials and a campaign to divert traffic onto I-205. Kathy Conrad of ODOT can provide literature if wanted.

Mayor Pollard expressed his appreciation for the work done and the amount of cooperation extended. He noted that it is a critical time for the City of Vancouver as they are rebuilding the entire downtown at a $360 million investment.

Discussion followed on the issue of sponsors during the trunnion project. Information will be available throughout the region by means of billboards and bus advertisements but they are not experiencing the sponsorship they had with the trunnion project.

UPDATE ON 99W THROUGH SHERWOOD

Dave Williams reported on the growth of Sherwood and the increase of traffic volumes from the casinos that have affected the performance of 99W. He noted that managing access among the roads is difficult for ODOT as there’s a lot of roadway. Dave indicated that Sherwood’s development objectives identify places where their growth and development conflict with traffic efficiency of the road, citing the need to identify mitigation measures, prioritize, and list the cost of those actions to determine the likelihood of implementing the plan. They are striving to reach consensus on what can be implemented. At issue is how much deterioration of the roadway is possible based on development of Sherwood.

Mayor Ogden of Tualatin spoke on behalf of Mayor Hitchcock of Sherwood. He noted that Sherwood is faced with being a town center, has a jobs/housing imbalance, and needs to assess the problem to see what can be done in a cooperative effort. Mayor Ogden thanked ODOT for its approach.

Chair Kvistad thanked Henry Hewitt for making overtures in resolving the Sherwood problems and moving this forward. He also thanked Mayor Hitchcock as well.
ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned to videos on the I-5 Corridor and OR 99W through Sherwood projects.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Mike Burton
           JPACT Members
HB 2082 – House Revenue Committee

4-cent increase -- 1-1-2000
$10 increase – 1/1/2000

Weight/Mile – currently 37.7 percent of 24-cent gas tax

No amount specified at this time. The tables in the bill will be completed when gas tax amount determined.

Consultant now reviewing the recent Cost Allocation Study. The purpose of this study is to maintain the “fair share” policy for transportation funding. Consultants should report next week to the House Revenue Committee.

HB 3344 – House Transportation – House Revenue

Eliminates current weight/mile tax policy.

Diesel fuel tax will be 1-cent above vehicle fuel tax

Everyone will pay new diesel tax

Now: Under 26,000 lbs. pay 24-cent tax
Over 26,000 pay weight/mile tax

Registration fee will increase approximately twelve-fold -- EX: $300 to $3,000!

Consultants are evaluating this proposal. Report should be available two and one-half to three weeks. Objective is to be sure this changeover, if made, will be revenue neutral.

Proposal before the committee is to increase the fuel taxes another 2-cents to provide for bonding. This change would provide for immediate funding of modernization work. 15-year sunset for debt service.

HB 2478 – ODOT Reorganization

Passed House

On Senate Floor for vote
Progress Report

- Draft report
- First working version of the model with Oregon data
- Assembly of data completed 2 months behind original schedule
- Refinement of model and findings by 3/31
- Assistance in analyzing OTA and other proposals
- Final report by 4/15
- Documentation report by 5/15
List of SRT Issues

1. Use of NAPCOM for pavements
2. Bridge procedures
3. Width-related costs
4A. Capacity improvement projects
4B. Right of way
4C. Climbing lanes
4D. Rest area costs
5. Common, residual, and administrative costs
6A. External costs
6B. Expenditure vs. cost-based approach
6C. Historical vs. forecast period for analysis
6D. Federal and local revenues and expenditures

Non-user funded expenditures
Trends in truck weights
DRAFT REPORT

OREGON HIGHWAY COST ALLOCATION STUDY

Prepared for
Department of Administrative Services

Prepared by

Dr. Joseph R. Stowers, Sydec, Inc., Project Manager
Arlee Reno and Patrick Balducci, Cambridge Systematics, Inc.
Roger Mingo, R.D. Mingo and Associates
Holly Wolff, Consultant
Harry Cohen, Consultant
Dr. Daniel Haling, Transdata

March 4, 1999
Exhibit 1
Cost Responsibility for Construction and Other Expenditures by Expenditure Category
(Thousands of Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registered Gross Weight Class</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other Expenditures</th>
<th>Total Construction &amp; Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>New Pavement</td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Pavement</td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>9,886</td>
<td>11,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,001</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,001</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>1,374</td>
<td>961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,001</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>2,148</td>
<td>1,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,001</td>
<td>54,999</td>
<td>2,028</td>
<td>1,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,001</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>8,967</td>
<td>26,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80,001</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>2,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90,001</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>3,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,001</td>
<td>105,500</td>
<td>2,276</td>
<td>8,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105,501</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Heavy Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,547</td>
<td>45,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>29,433</td>
<td>57,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Heavy Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exhibit 2

**Cost Responsibility for Construction and Other Expenditures by Expenditure Category**

*(Thousands of Dollars)*

State Aid to Local Governments Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registered Gross Weight Class</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other Expenditures</th>
<th>Total Construction &amp; Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>New Pavement</td>
<td>New Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>5,116</td>
<td>20,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,001</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,001</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>1,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,001</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>2,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,001</td>
<td>54,999</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>2,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,001</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>13,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80,001</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90,001</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,001</td>
<td>105,500</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105,501</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Heavy Vehicles</strong></td>
<td>2,682</td>
<td>23,671</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7,798</td>
<td>43,929</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent Heavy Vehicles</strong></td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Exhibit 4
OREGON HIGHWAY USER REVENUE BY TYPE OF TAX
(Thousands of Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registered Gross Weight Class</th>
<th>Gasoline Tax</th>
<th>Diesel &amp; Other Fuel Tax</th>
<th>Registration Fees</th>
<th>Weight-Mile Tax</th>
<th>Flat Fees</th>
<th>Road Use Assessment Fees</th>
<th>Permits</th>
<th>Total State Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From To</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 8,000</td>
<td>354,863</td>
<td>14,672</td>
<td>45,778</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>415,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,001 16,000</td>
<td>3,462</td>
<td>3,505</td>
<td>3,442</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,001 26,000</td>
<td>2,034</td>
<td>3,401</td>
<td>3,341</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,001 40,000</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>2,628</td>
<td>1,845</td>
<td>4,102</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>9,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,001 54,999</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>4,043</td>
<td>11,571</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>17,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55,000 75,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>6,232</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>7,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,001 80,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>12,428</td>
<td>145,117</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,078</td>
<td>160,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80,001 90,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>11,811</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>12,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90,001 100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>13,521</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>14,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,001 105,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1,328</td>
<td>29,786</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>31,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105,501 150,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Heavy Vehicles</td>
<td>6,209</td>
<td>11,258</td>
<td>28,671</td>
<td>222,141</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>3,725</td>
<td>273,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Vehicles</td>
<td>361,072</td>
<td>25,929</td>
<td>74,448</td>
<td>222,141</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>3,725</td>
<td>689,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Heavy Vehicles</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 4A
OREGON HIGHWAY USER REVENUE PER MILE BY TYPE OF TAX
(Cents per Mile)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registered Gross Weight Class</th>
<th>Gasoline Tax</th>
<th>Diesel &amp; Other Fuel Tax</th>
<th>Registration Fees</th>
<th>Weight-Mile Tax</th>
<th>Flat Fees</th>
<th>Road Use Assessment Fees</th>
<th>Permits</th>
<th>Total State Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From 0 To 8,000</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,001 To 16,000</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,001 To 26,000</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,001 To 40,000</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,001 To 54,999</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55,000 To 75,000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,001 To 80,000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80,001 To 90,000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90,001 To 100,000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,001 To 105,500</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105,501 To 150,000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Heavy Vehicles</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Vehicles</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 5

VEHICLE MILES, REVENUE, AND COST RESPONSIBILITY
For Full Fee Paying Vehicles Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registered Gross Weight Class</th>
<th>Vehicle Miles</th>
<th>User Revenue (Thousands)</th>
<th>Cost Responsibility (Thousands)</th>
<th>Revenue-To-Cost Responsibility Ratios</th>
<th>Cost Per Mile (Cents)</th>
<th>Revenue Per Mile (Cents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>(Millions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>30,802</td>
<td>408,184</td>
<td>407,265</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,001</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>8,825</td>
<td>8,475</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,001</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>6,626</td>
<td>7,153</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,001</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>7,775</td>
<td>8,447</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,001</td>
<td>54,999</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>17,532</td>
<td>19,611</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7,491</td>
<td>6,163</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,001</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>160,531</td>
<td>147,899</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80,001</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12,758</td>
<td>12,220</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90,001</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>14,427</td>
<td>13,360</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,001</td>
<td>105,500</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>31,806</td>
<td>34,411</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105,501</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Heavy Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,263</td>
<td>268,289</td>
<td>258,262</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>33,065</td>
<td>676,473</td>
<td>665,528</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Heavy Vehicle</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 6 A
Development of Recommended Weight Mile Tax Rates
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Exhibit 6B
Development of Recommended Weight Mile Tax Rates
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Exhibit 6C
Weight Mile Tax Rates Rounded to Half Cent/Mile

Registered Gross Weight
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- Linear Fit WMT Rates
○ Rounded to 1/2 Cent WMT Rates
### THREE CENTS (effective 1/1/00) PLUS THREE CENTS (effective 9/1/01) INCREASE

#### FUEL TAX REVENUE PROJECTION 1999-2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Total Gallons</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total Fuel Tax Collection</th>
<th>OR Marine Bd</th>
<th>Snowmobile/ATV</th>
<th>Aviation</th>
<th>Collection Costs</th>
<th>REVENUE</th>
<th>State (60%)</th>
<th>City (16%)</th>
<th>County (24%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>827,341,750</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>$198,562,020</td>
<td>($2,715,169)</td>
<td>($1,044,036)</td>
<td>($116,198)</td>
<td>($523,080)</td>
<td>$194,163,537</td>
<td>$110,595,204</td>
<td>$30,231,263</td>
<td>$47,337,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,654,683,500</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>$397,124,040</td>
<td>($5,430,337)</td>
<td>($2,088,071)</td>
<td>($232,395)</td>
<td>($1,043,159)</td>
<td>$388,330,078</td>
<td>$233,192,212</td>
<td>$60,462,993</td>
<td>$94,674,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>827,341,750</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>$198,562,020</td>
<td>($2,715,169)</td>
<td>($1,044,036)</td>
<td>($116,198)</td>
<td>($523,080)</td>
<td>$194,163,537</td>
<td>$110,595,204</td>
<td>$30,231,263</td>
<td>$47,337,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,309,367,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$794,248,080</td>
<td>($8,145,506)</td>
<td>($3,132,107)</td>
<td>($348,593)</td>
<td>($1,566,239)</td>
<td>$776,657,152</td>
<td>$466,382,620</td>
<td>$120,925,519</td>
<td>$189,349,014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Increase with 65% 50-30-20 Split;35% 0-70-30 Split

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Total Gallons</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total Fuel Tax Collection</th>
<th>OR Marine Bd</th>
<th>Snowmobile/ATV</th>
<th>Aviation</th>
<th>Collection Costs</th>
<th>REVENUE</th>
<th>State (60%)</th>
<th>City (16%)</th>
<th>County (24%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1,211,165,209</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>$40,729,799</td>
<td>($66,943)</td>
<td>($25,699)</td>
<td>($2,860)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$40,634,297</td>
<td>$20,317,149</td>
<td>$10,158,574</td>
<td>$10,158,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,357,659,982</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>$22,216,254</td>
<td>($36,515)</td>
<td>($1,560)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$22,164,162</td>
<td>$11,082,081</td>
<td>$5,541,041</td>
<td>$5,541,041</td>
<td>$10,158,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>740,541,809</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>$62,946,054</td>
<td>($103,457.68)</td>
<td>($39,716.31)</td>
<td>($4,420)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$62,798,459</td>
<td>$15,699,615</td>
<td>$15,699,615</td>
<td>$15,699,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,309,367,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$857,194,134</td>
<td>($8,248,964)</td>
<td>($3,171,823)</td>
<td>($353,013)</td>
<td>($1,566,239)</td>
<td>$839,455,611</td>
<td>$497,781,849</td>
<td>$136,625,133</td>
<td>$205,048,628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOUR CENT INCREASE (effective 1/1/00)

#### FUEL TAX REVENUE PROJECTION 1999-2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Total Gallons</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total Fuel Tax Collection</th>
<th>OR Marine Bd</th>
<th>Snowmobile/ATV</th>
<th>Aviation</th>
<th>Collection Costs</th>
<th>REVENUE</th>
<th>State (60%)</th>
<th>City (16%)</th>
<th>County (24%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>827,341,750</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>$198,562,020</td>
<td>($2,715,169)</td>
<td>($1,044,036)</td>
<td>($116,198)</td>
<td>($523,080)</td>
<td>$194,163,537</td>
<td>$110,595,204</td>
<td>$30,231,263</td>
<td>$47,337,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,654,683,500</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>$397,124,040</td>
<td>($5,430,337)</td>
<td>($2,088,071)</td>
<td>($232,395)</td>
<td>($1,043,159)</td>
<td>$388,330,078</td>
<td>$233,192,212</td>
<td>$60,462,993</td>
<td>$94,674,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>827,341,750</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>$198,562,020</td>
<td>($2,715,169)</td>
<td>($1,044,036)</td>
<td>($116,198)</td>
<td>($523,080)</td>
<td>$194,163,537</td>
<td>$110,595,204</td>
<td>$30,231,263</td>
<td>$47,337,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,309,367,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$794,248,080</td>
<td>($10,860,675)</td>
<td>($5,176,143)</td>
<td>($2,069,319)</td>
<td>($4,654,791)</td>
<td>$776,657,152</td>
<td>$349,787,416</td>
<td>$90,694,256</td>
<td>$142,011,943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Increase with 65% 50-30-20 Split;35% 0-70-30 Split

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Total Gallons</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total Fuel Tax Collection</th>
<th>OR Marine Bd</th>
<th>Snowmobile/ATV</th>
<th>Aviation</th>
<th>Collection Costs</th>
<th>REVENUE</th>
<th>State (60%)</th>
<th>City (16%)</th>
<th>County (24%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1,211,165,209</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>$54,306,399</td>
<td>($69,257.78)</td>
<td>($34,265)</td>
<td>($3,814)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$54,179,063</td>
<td>$17,608,195</td>
<td>$12,732,080</td>
<td>$23,838,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,357,659,982</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>$29,621,672</td>
<td>($48,866.06)</td>
<td>($18,690)</td>
<td>($2,080)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$29,552,216</td>
<td>$9,604,470</td>
<td>$6,944,771</td>
<td>$13,002,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>740,541,809</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>$83,928,072</td>
<td>($137,943.84)</td>
<td>($52,955.07)</td>
<td>($5,894)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$83,731,279</td>
<td>$27,212,666</td>
<td>$19,676,851</td>
<td>$36,841,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,309,367,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$178,176,152</td>
<td>($10,998,619)</td>
<td>($4,229,098)</td>
<td>($470,685)</td>
<td>($2,069,319)</td>
<td>$180,048,431</td>
<td>$377,000,081</td>
<td>$110,371,106</td>
<td>$178,853,706</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Distribution of Revenue

**Current Distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Law 1999-01 Biennium</th>
<th>Increase in Fuel Tax 1999-01</th>
<th>Total Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gas Tax</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Law</td>
<td>$186.40</td>
<td>$106.39</td>
<td>$292.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Law</td>
<td>$106.39</td>
<td>$336.76</td>
<td>$443.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle Registration</strong></td>
<td>$43.97</td>
<td>$20.43</td>
<td>$64.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Law</td>
<td>$20.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weight-Mile</strong></td>
<td>$109.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Law</td>
<td>$109.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$376.66</td>
<td>$443.29</td>
<td>$820.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Increase Passenger Vehicle Registration $10; No Sunset

- **Increase in Fuel Tax:** $0.24
- **Total Increase:** $443.29
- **Grand Total Revenue w/ Increase:** $510.95

### Distribution of Revenues:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gas Tax</strong></td>
<td>$28.31</td>
<td>$13.61</td>
<td>$13.74</td>
<td>$13.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle Registration</strong></td>
<td>$18.67</td>
<td>$9.07</td>
<td>$9.16</td>
<td>$9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weight-Mile</strong></td>
<td>$70.77</td>
<td>$34.02</td>
<td>$34.35</td>
<td>$34.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$117.96</td>
<td>$56.70</td>
<td>$56.98</td>
<td>$57.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 50% State 50% Local Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gas Tax</strong></td>
<td>$35.39</td>
<td>$17.01</td>
<td>$17.18</td>
<td>$17.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle Registration</strong></td>
<td>$23.59</td>
<td>$11.34</td>
<td>$11.45</td>
<td>$11.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weight-Mile</strong></td>
<td>$58.98</td>
<td>$28.35</td>
<td>$28.63</td>
<td>$28.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$117.96</td>
<td>$56.70</td>
<td>$56.98</td>
<td>$57.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Split Distribution

**Distribution of First 65% of Revenue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7/1/01-1/1/02</th>
<th>1/1/02-6/30/03</th>
<th>2003-2005</th>
<th>2005-2007</th>
<th>2007-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gas Tax</strong></td>
<td>$6.20</td>
<td>$18.77</td>
<td>$13.61</td>
<td>$13.67</td>
<td>$13.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weight-Mile</strong></td>
<td>$15.51</td>
<td>$46.91</td>
<td>$34.02</td>
<td>$34.19</td>
<td>$34.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$25.85</td>
<td>$78.19</td>
<td>$56.70</td>
<td>$56.98</td>
<td>$57.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Distribution of Balance of Revenue 35%**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7/1/01-1/1/02</th>
<th>1/1/02-6/30/03</th>
<th>2003-2005</th>
<th>2005-2007</th>
<th>2007-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gas Tax</strong></td>
<td>$9.74</td>
<td>$34.35</td>
<td>$13.61</td>
<td>$13.67</td>
<td>$13.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle Registration</strong></td>
<td>$4.16</td>
<td>$12.51</td>
<td>$9.07</td>
<td>$9.12</td>
<td>$9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weight-Mile</strong></td>
<td>$13.92</td>
<td>$56.98</td>
<td>$57.25</td>
<td>$57.25</td>
<td>$57.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$35.62</td>
<td>$93.71</td>
<td>$57.25</td>
<td>$57.25</td>
<td>$57.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three Plus Three Cent Fuel Tax Increase W 10 Increase in Vehicle Registration Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Distribution</th>
<th>Gas Tax</th>
<th>Vehicle Registration</th>
<th>Weight-Mile</th>
<th>Current Law Distr. Total</th>
<th>Gas Tax</th>
<th>Vehicle Registration</th>
<th>Weight-Mile</th>
<th>Increase Distr. Total</th>
<th>Total Distribution w/lncrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counties @ 24%</td>
<td>$186.40</td>
<td>$43.97</td>
<td>$106.39</td>
<td>$336.76</td>
<td>$15.11</td>
<td>$5.62</td>
<td>$8.22</td>
<td>$28.95</td>
<td>$702.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities @ 16%</td>
<td>$124.27</td>
<td>$29.32</td>
<td>$70.93</td>
<td>$224.51</td>
<td>$10.07</td>
<td>$3.75</td>
<td>$5.48</td>
<td>$19.30</td>
<td>$468.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State @ 60%</td>
<td>$465.99</td>
<td>$109.93</td>
<td>$265.97</td>
<td>$841.90</td>
<td>$37.77</td>
<td>$14.06</td>
<td>$20.55</td>
<td>$72.38</td>
<td>$1,756.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$776.66</td>
<td>$183.22</td>
<td>$443.29</td>
<td>$1,403.17</td>
<td>$62.95</td>
<td>$23.44</td>
<td>$34.24</td>
<td>$120.63</td>
<td>$2,926.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>50% State:50% Local Distribution</th>
<th>Gas Tax</th>
<th>Vehicle Registration</th>
<th>Weight-Mile</th>
<th>Current Law Distr. Total</th>
<th>Gas Tax</th>
<th>Vehicle Registration</th>
<th>Weight-Mile</th>
<th>Increase Distr. Total</th>
<th>Total Distribution w/lncrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counties @ 30%</td>
<td>$186.40</td>
<td>$43.97</td>
<td>$106.39</td>
<td>$336.76</td>
<td>$18.88</td>
<td>$7.03</td>
<td>$10.27</td>
<td>$36.19</td>
<td>$709.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities @ 20%</td>
<td>$124.27</td>
<td>$29.32</td>
<td>$70.93</td>
<td>$224.51</td>
<td>$12.59</td>
<td>$4.69</td>
<td>$6.85</td>
<td>$24.13</td>
<td>$473.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State @ 50%</td>
<td>$465.99</td>
<td>$109.93</td>
<td>$265.97</td>
<td>$841.90</td>
<td>$31.47</td>
<td>$11.72</td>
<td>$17.12</td>
<td>$60.31</td>
<td>$1,744.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$776.66</td>
<td>$183.22</td>
<td>$443.29</td>
<td>$1,403.17</td>
<td>$62.95</td>
<td>$23.44</td>
<td>$34.24</td>
<td>$120.63</td>
<td>$2,926.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Split Distribution</th>
<th>Gas Tax</th>
<th>Vehicle Registration</th>
<th>Weight-Mile</th>
<th>Current Law Distr. Total</th>
<th>Gas Tax</th>
<th>Vehicle Registration</th>
<th>Weight-Mile</th>
<th>Increase Distr. Total</th>
<th>Total Distribution w/lncrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counties @ 30%</td>
<td>$186.40</td>
<td>$43.97</td>
<td>$106.39</td>
<td>$336.76</td>
<td>$12.27</td>
<td>$4.57</td>
<td>$6.68</td>
<td>$23.52</td>
<td>$697.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities @ 20%</td>
<td>$124.27</td>
<td>$29.32</td>
<td>$70.93</td>
<td>$224.51</td>
<td>$8.18</td>
<td>$3.05</td>
<td>$4.45</td>
<td>$15.68</td>
<td>$464.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State @ 50%</td>
<td>$465.99</td>
<td>$109.93</td>
<td>$265.97</td>
<td>$841.90</td>
<td>$20.46</td>
<td>$7.62</td>
<td>$11.13</td>
<td>$39.20</td>
<td>$1,723.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$776.66</td>
<td>$183.22</td>
<td>$443.29</td>
<td>$1,403.17</td>
<td>$40.91</td>
<td>$15.23</td>
<td>$22.26</td>
<td>$78.41</td>
<td>$2,884.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of First 65% of Revenue</th>
<th>Gas Tax</th>
<th>Vehicle Registration</th>
<th>Weight-Mile</th>
<th>Current Law Distr. Total</th>
<th>Gas Tax</th>
<th>Vehicle Registration</th>
<th>Weight-Mile</th>
<th>Increase Distr. Total</th>
<th>Total Distribution w/lncrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counties @ 30%</td>
<td>$186.40</td>
<td>$43.97</td>
<td>$106.39</td>
<td>$336.76</td>
<td>$15.42</td>
<td>$5.74</td>
<td>$8.39</td>
<td>$29.55</td>
<td>$29.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities @ 20%</td>
<td>$124.27</td>
<td>$29.32</td>
<td>$70.93</td>
<td>$224.51</td>
<td>$5.61</td>
<td>$2.46</td>
<td>$3.60</td>
<td>$12.87</td>
<td>$12.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State @ 50%</td>
<td>$465.99</td>
<td>$109.93</td>
<td>$265.97</td>
<td>$841.90</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$776.66</td>
<td>$183.22</td>
<td>$443.29</td>
<td>$1,403.17</td>
<td>$22.03</td>
<td>$8.20</td>
<td>$11.99</td>
<td>$42.22</td>
<td>$42.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of balance of revenue 35%</th>
<th>Gas Tax</th>
<th>Vehicle Registration</th>
<th>Weight-Mile</th>
<th>Current Law Distr. Total</th>
<th>Gas Tax</th>
<th>Vehicle Registration</th>
<th>Weight-Mile</th>
<th>Increase Distr. Total</th>
<th>Total Distribution w/lncrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counties @ 70%</td>
<td>$186.40</td>
<td>$43.97</td>
<td>$106.39</td>
<td>$336.76</td>
<td>$15.42</td>
<td>$5.74</td>
<td>$8.39</td>
<td>$29.55</td>
<td>$29.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities @ 30%</td>
<td>$124.27</td>
<td>$29.32</td>
<td>$70.93</td>
<td>$224.51</td>
<td>$5.61</td>
<td>$2.46</td>
<td>$3.60</td>
<td>$12.87</td>
<td>$12.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State @ 50%</td>
<td>$465.99</td>
<td>$109.93</td>
<td>$265.97</td>
<td>$841.90</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$776.66</td>
<td>$183.22</td>
<td>$443.29</td>
<td>$1,403.17</td>
<td>$22.03</td>
<td>$8.20</td>
<td>$11.99</td>
<td>$42.22</td>
<td>$42.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$182.62</td>
<td>$201.56</td>
<td>$203.13</td>
<td>$204.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$93.11</td>
<td>$104.86</td>
<td>$105.81</td>
<td>$106.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$34.27</td>
<td>$35.51</td>
<td>$35.70</td>
<td>$35.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$309.99</td>
<td>$341.93</td>
<td>$344.63</td>
<td>$346.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$74.40</td>
<td>$82.06</td>
<td>$82.71</td>
<td>$83.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$49.60</td>
<td>$54.71</td>
<td>$55.14</td>
<td>$55.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$186.00</td>
<td>$205.16</td>
<td>$206.78</td>
<td>$208.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$309.99</td>
<td>$341.93</td>
<td>$344.63</td>
<td>$346.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
March 5, 1999

Mr. Jon Kvistad  
JPACT Chairman  
11595 SW North Dakota, No. 100  
Portland OR 97223

Dear Mr. Kvistad:

Last week Tom Brian and I had the opportunity to meet with a number of our congressional delegation in Washington D.C. As a result of those meetings, it is clear to me that there are a couple of outstanding issues that JPACT needs to address over the next few weeks in order to give our delegation a clear signal as to what the regional priorities are, particularly as they relate to South/North Light Rail.

The purpose of my letter is to raise these issues with JPACT and to bring them up under "other business" on Thursday. Based on that discussion, it would be my hope this could be scheduled for some type of formal JPACT action in April.

First is the issue of South/North and exactly what project the region is recommending to the delegation. Washington County has been steadfast in its support of a project going south to Clackamas County, as Clackamas County has supported the region and Washington County for a number of years on the Westside project. Our commitment still rests with Clackamas County. If a rail project to Clackamas County is not the preferred project at this time, there is still a need to address the transportation issues in the south corridor, particularly in light of 2040 and the expectation of the region for Clackamas County to accept a substantial amount of growth over the next 50 years. Much of the discussion in Washington dealt with a north only project, and I am very unclear as to exactly what the project is or is purported to be. We were told by at least one representative that the project under consideration is in the $300 million range, while projects as high as $700 or $800 have been discussed in the past. I think it is important for JPACT to have a clear understanding and debate as to what project we are or are not moving forward on. If a North-Only project is the region’s choice, and Clackamas County agrees, we should make that choice clear to everyone.
February 25, 1999

The Honorable Jon Kvistad
Metro
Chair, Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
600 NE Grand Ave
Portland, OR 97232-2736

By FAX: 797-1794

Dear Jon:

I am sending this letter as a follow up to our phone conversation and visit the other day regarding the future use of the $55 million of STP funds that JPACT and METRO set aside for the South/North high capacity transit corridor in January 1997 (Resolution No. 962442).

As you know, JPACT and the METRO Council have had a long-standing commitment that the next high capacity transit improvement project following the completion of the Westside LRT project would serve Clackamas County.

Following the defeat of the November 98 South/North LRT bond measure, the possibility of constructing a less expensive “north only” LRT segment has been discussed. Let me assure you that we could support such a plan provided that the transportation capacity problems in the south portion of the South/North corridor on McLoughlin Blvd. and Hwy 224 are also addressed.

Clackamas County is one of the fastest growing areas of the Region. 65% of the Regions “2040” urban reserve lands are located in Clackamas County. McLoughlin Blvd. is currently one of the region’s most congested corridors. We need to identify and develop a “balanced” transportation connection to the existing East / West light rail line which will serve Clackamas County now and in the future.
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As I told you on the phone, it has recently come to my attention that the entire $55 million of STP funds is being proposed to help fund a LRT project north of the Rose Quarter. I hope that you can appreciate that Clackamas County cannot agree to such an arrangement without the region first identifying what improvements will be provided in the McLoughlin Blvd. / Hwy 224 corridor. These improvements must be accompanied with a specific and realistic financial plan.

Jon, I know that you are sensitive to our immense need for transportation improvements here in Clackamas County, and I personally would appreciate any assistance you, Metro and all at JPACT can give us.

With warm regards,

Bill
Bill Kennemer
Chair
Clackamas County Board of Commissioners

cc: Fred Hansen
South/North Corridor
New Directions

Discussion Draft for Southeast Bus Improvements

Discussion Draft for Light Rail on Interstate Avenue

Tri-Met
JPACT Meeting
April 8, 1999
Discussion Draft for Southeast Bus Improvements

The package of transit service and facilities improvements in the southeast would be developed around three Bus Rapid Transit routes. Bus Rapid Transit emulates light rail transit operating speeds, stations and park & ride lots. Faster operating speeds are achieved through a combination of exclusive lane and signal priority treatment and limited stops. Improvements in service and ridership would occur in the corridor as operating and capital investments are made over a multi-year period. Corresponding investments by others would be needed to improve pedestrian access and traffic circulation.

Phase I: Service quality improvements (fall 1999 – 2001)
- Increase service on the corridor trunk routes – initially Line 33 – McLoughlin and then Line 31 – Estacada (via Clackamas Town Center).
- Increase off-peak service on local southeast routes – midday, evenings and weekends.
- Improve bus stop amenities – pavement, shelters, lighting.
- Create new shared use park & ride lots.
- Expand the Clackamas Town Center Transit Center.

Phase II: Bus Rapid Transit Development (fall 2002 – fall 2003)
- Upgrade Line 33 and 31 trunk routes to Bus Rapid Transit. Develop prominent bus stations, work with the cities, Clackamas County and ODOT to develop preferential treatments that speed up operations.
- Develop an off-street Milwaukie Transit Center.
- Construct three new park and ride lots:
  - McLoughlin at Tacoma Street (as identified in the South/North DEIS). Would replace the existing Southgate Park & Ride lot. (structured: 1000 spaces)
  - Oregon City / Gladstone: site to be determined. (surface: 400 spaces)
  - Highway 224 / Clackamas Town Center: at Harmony / Linwood or Harmony / 82nd Avenue. (surface: 400 spaces)
- Add new east-west local service in Milwaukie and Gladstone.

Phase III: Upgraded Bus Rapid Transit with introduction of HOV lanes (fall 2004)
- Construct HOV or exclusive bus lanes on McLoughlin Boulevard from eastside Portland to Tacoma St.
- Construct an east Portland transit center.
- Adjust bus schedules to capture operating efficiencies.

Phase IV: Bus Rapid Transit development Oregon City to Gateway (fall 2005)
- Bus Rapid Transit development: Oregon City to Gateway (fall 2005).
- Construct Bus Rapid Transit stations at Foster Road, Division Street, other locations TBD.
- Construct a new park & ride lot at the Foster Road / I-205 interchange. (surface: 400 spaces).
- Operate Bus Rapid Transit on existing freeway lanes with stops at the Oregon City, Clackamas Town Center and Gateway Transit Centers as well as the new freeway stops.

Cost (millions 1999 $)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>(millions 1999 $)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and ride lot development (4 lots)</td>
<td>$ 30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit centers</td>
<td>$ 10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus stops / bus rapid transit stations</td>
<td>$ 20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses and bus maintenance facility (portion)</td>
<td>$ 19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated highway improvements</td>
<td>$ 48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 125.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: these improvements (to existing service, three bus rapid transit routes and two new local lines) would require 4,237 additional weekly service hours or a 10.5% increase in Tri-Met’s existing (2/99) total service hours. The annual cost of this additional service (1999 dollars, total operations cost) by the year 2005 would be $11.5 million.  

Tri-Met 4/7/99
South Bus

- Potential Park & Ride Sites
- Transit Centers
- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
- More frequent service
- New & extended routes
- Feeder routes
- Existing bus routes
Discussion Draft for light rail on Interstate Avenue

Following the defeat of the South/North light rail bond measure in November 1998, Metro Council held four public forums on the future of transportation in the region. Recognizing a continuing interest in possibilities for light rail expressed at these meetings, the business community and north/northeast Portland community representatives called on Tri-Met and Metro to look again at light rail north.

The firm of Shiels Obletz Johnson assembled a project review team to undertake an independent, “fresh” look at the proposed north extension of MAX. Composed of planners and engineers from various disciplines, agencies and firms, the review team undertook an expedited, one-month preliminary analysis of the options, benefits, impacts and costs associated with a proposed North extension.

The team focused on a light rail alignment (called “Full Interstate,” or Interstate MAX) traveling north from the Rose Quarter in the median of Interstate Avenue to Kenton and the Expo Center. A similar alignment from earlier studies (“locally preferred strategy,” or LPS) had been proposed to run along I-5 north to the vicinity of Portland Blvd. before crossing over to continue north on Interstate.

Key findings of the Shiels Obletz Johnson study are:

1. Interstate MAX would cost substantially less than the LPS alignment -- $350 million as compared to $464 million.
2. The proposal for Interstate MAX extends the line north to the Expo Center -- setting the stage for a ready expansion to Vancouver.
3. Interstate MAX would not displace any residences or businesses.
4. Ridership on Interstate would be slightly lower than on the LPS alignment -- although providing interim park-and-ride service for Clark County commuters could add riders.
5. Interstate MAX could be built using local and Federal transportation resources without property tax-backed bonds.
6. Interstate MAX provides opportunities to link light rail to neighborhood stabilization in Kenton and elsewhere along Interstate Avenue.

### Comparison of Interstate MAX with LPS alignment (I-5/Interstate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interstate MAX</th>
<th>LPS alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length</strong></td>
<td>5.8 miles</td>
<td>6.0 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of stations</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Route</strong></td>
<td>Interstate Ave. to Kenton, Denver Ave and Expo Rd to Expo Center</td>
<td>East of I-5 Rose Quarter to Kaiser, west of I-5 north to vicinity of Portland Blvd, west to Interstate, north to Kenton and Expo Center on Interstate, Denver, Expo Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost</strong></td>
<td>$350 million</td>
<td>$464 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ridership (average weekday)</strong></td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>14,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel time 11th Ave.-Expo</strong></td>
<td>27 minutes</td>
<td>27 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homes/businesses displaced</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structures required</strong></td>
<td>3 bridges</td>
<td>8 bridges, 2 tunnels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewer, water relocation</strong></td>
<td>$8.5 million</td>
<td>$11.6 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Meeting the Regional Transportation Challenge

The Role of Transit and Tri-Met's Financial Position

April 8, 1999
In the period from 1990 to 1997 transit ridership in the Portland Metropolitan area grew 20% faster than the growth in vehicle miles traveled (VMT), 43% faster than the growth in service and 40% faster than the growth in population. In that period transit ridership grew by 30%, VMT grew by 24%, Tri-Met service by 17% and population by 18%.

Source: Metro, Tri-Met Annual Ridership
Data is for the urbanized Area of Washington, Clackamas and Multnomah Counties
Looking Back:
Tri-Met Revenue and Expenditure Increases
FY1989-FY1999

After adjusting for inflation, Tri-Met total General Fund revenues grew by 57% between FY1989 and FY1999. During the same period, Tri-Met expanded service to the public by 57% and ridership increased 55%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avg. Annual Change</th>
<th>Revenue (inflation adjusted growth in revenue FY1989-FY1999): +57% 4.6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service hours – bus rail, ATP (without rail = bus equivalent) +35% 3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service hours – bus, rail, ATP +57% 4.6% (rail is counted at its bus equivalent carrying capacity, rail hours x 4.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boarding rides (annual) +55% 4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing FY89 and FY99, revenues increased $117.0 million (YOE$). Each dollar of new revenue (YOE$) was used as follows:

**Service**
- Fixed Route Service 59% < 52%
- Accessible Transportation Service 7%
- General Fund Capital 23%
- Debt 27% < 4%

**Service Subtotal** 86%

**General and Administration** 14%

**Total** 100%

On average, between FY1989 and FY1999, Tri-Met operating revenues grew by 4.6% per year inflation adjusted. Eighty six percent of that went into the capital and operating costs of service for fixed route and special needs customers; the rest was used for administrative support.
Looking Forward:
Tri-Met Revenues and Expenditures
FY1999-FY2006

Key Revenue and Expenditure Assumptions From FY99 to FY2006:

Revenues (YOEs): Employer payroll tax revenues increase 7.5% on average, or $12.2 million a year. By comparison, payroll taxes grew $7.9 million a year between FY95 and FY99, with an average annual growth rate of 9.6%.

Passenger revenue increases 6% per year due to semi annual fare increases, nominal growth and service increases (including TCL three year service expansion plan) and the extension of the light rail line to the Airport.

Total operating revenues are projected to increase $16.4 million a year on average or $115.0 million (FY99 and FY2006); all revenue figures exclude OMAP. By comparison, after removing three significant one time only revenues (domestic leasehold, cross border lease and Rail Ready grant revenues), revenues increased $11 million a year between FY95 and FY99, high growth years. The difference between the $11 million annual growth of the recent past and the $16 million per year projection is evidence that the forecast is for fairly strong revenue growth in times which should be characterized with some economic uncertainty. Additional revenues supporting the three year service expansion plan ($4 million a year of STP) are assumed in the forecast. Tri-Met’s forecast assumes no economic downturn.

Expenditures (YOEs)

FY99 and FY2006 Additional Revenues: + $115 million

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Committed – FY2006</th>
<th>$ (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wage, Materials and Services Inflation</td>
<td>$ 49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL – Three-Year Service Plan</td>
<td>$ 7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport $31.5m (Tri-Met Share)</td>
<td>$ 2.8 (debt service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Operations</td>
<td>$ 5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5% Bus/Rail Service Increases Annually</td>
<td>$ 14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP Service Increases</td>
<td>$ 7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Capital</td>
<td>$ 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$ 10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$101.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Under Discussion. Solution: Partnerships/Grants/Cash/Debt</th>
<th>Tri-Met Total</th>
<th>Annual Oper. Cost or Debt Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 LRVs</td>
<td>$ 33.0</td>
<td>$ 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Garage</td>
<td>$ 37.0</td>
<td>$ 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North LR Ext. ($350.0m)</td>
<td>$ 25.0</td>
<td>$ 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North LR Ext. Operations</td>
<td>$ 7.5</td>
<td>$ 7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bus Capital ($125.0m)</td>
<td>$ 75.0</td>
<td>$ 7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040 Plan: Transit Role (TCL Phase II)</td>
<td>$ 7.5</td>
<td>$ 7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$185.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: March 30, 1999
To: JPACT/Metro Council
From: Andrew C. Cotugno, Transportation Director
Re: STIP/MTIP Update – 150% List

The FY 2000-2003 STIP/MTIP allocation process is approaching the step to select the projects for funding. The technical committees and Metro staff have developed technical and administrative ranking information to provide the basis for narrowing the list. The process that has been outlined calls for an initial narrowing to approximately 150 percent of the available revenues by April 8, followed by adoption of the final program balanced to 100 percent of available revenues by May 27. A joint JPACT/Transportation Planning Committee hearing on the draft 150 percent list is scheduled for April 6 (5:30 p.m. time certain) and on the final program on May 4 (5:30 p.m. time certain).

Enclosed is the proposed 150 percent list that has been recommended by the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC). The total amount reflected on the list is $125.5 million in 12 categories of proposed projects for the $75.8 million available to allocate for the period 2000-2003. Also identified on the attached list is $103.6 million in projects for which funding is already committed. A few points of clarification are appropriate:

1. The projects have been technically scored using the criteria established before applications were solicited. The “rank” for each project represents the results of that technical score within that mode.

2. There are numerous instances where projects that deviate from the technical ranking are recommended for funding based upon the administrative criteria such as overmatch, link to another priority or in an attempt to achieve geographic balance.

3. The “Transportation Enhancement” projects are going through a separate statewide evaluation process by ODOT. The full list of applicants is reflected here. By the May 8 conclusion, we will be provided a list of finalists and will need to determine whether to include any in our final program. If so, they will need to be funded within the $75.8 million total funding available.

At the April 8 JPACT and Metro Council meetings, we are also seeking input on the best mix between the different transportation modes. Projects have been categorized and ranked in 12 separate groups. The enclosed 150 percent list proposes the following amounts in these groups:
Priorities 2000 Project Selection Schedule

22-May-98  Public notification to kick-off process
23-Jun-98  Public hearing on draft criteria
16-Oct-98  Deadline for local governments to submit projects
Oct – Feb  Technical ranking of projects
8-Feb-99   Public comment period begins
23-Feb-99  Public workshop with ODOT (in Portland): Comment on technical and administrative factors
27-Feb-99  Open house (in Hillsboro) – distribute information to public
17-Mar-99  Public workshop with ODOT (in Oregon City) – Comment on technical and administrative factors
22-Mar-99  Public comment period ends
26-Mar-99  TPAC: review/approve 150% cut list
6-Apr-99   JPACT/Transportation Planning Committee public hearing on 150% cut list 5:30 p.m., Council Chamber, Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand, Portland
8-Apr-99   JPACT/Metro Council Review/Approve 150% cut list
20-Apr-99  Transportation Planning Committee review
30-Apr-99  TPAC Approval of Program Recommendation
4-May-99   JPACT/Transportation Planning Committee public hearing on program recommendation – 5:30 p.m., Council Chamber, Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand, Portland
13-May-99  JPACT consideration of program approval
27-May-99  Metro Council consideration of program approval
Priorities 2000
Narrowing the 150 Percent Cut List
To A Balanced 100 Percent Program

The categories listed below reflect the modes and funding amounts recommended by TPAC for retention on the 150 percent cut list. The total for all the modes is $124,973 million. However, only $75.8 million is available to allocate to projects. In general, modes in the first group (modes A-F) are only eligible for funding with the Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds, with a few projects or project elements eligible for Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) funding. Modes in the second grouping (modes F-L) are eligible for all of the available $75.8 million of funds. To help reach the next step – reducing to a 100 percent program – a response to the following exercise is requested by staff.

Group 1 – STP Eligible

Define the dollar amount or the percent of funds you would assign to each mode in Group 1. Due to eligibility restrictions, the total of funds assigned to modes in Group 1 should add up to no more than $40 million or 53 percent of the available $75.8 million.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Amount (millions)</th>
<th>% Of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Road Modernization</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Road Reconstruction</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Freight</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Boulevard</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$58.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Amount (millions)</th>
<th>% Of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>TDM</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>TOD</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>ODOT Enhancement</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$66.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group 2 – STP, CMAQ, Transportation Enhancement Eligible

Define the dollar amount or the percent of funds you would assign to each mode in Group 2. Due to funding eligibility, the total for Group 2 modes could add up to $75.8 million or 100 percent of available funds if nothing is assigned to Group 1 modes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Amount (millions)</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>TDM</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>TOD</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>ODOT Enhancement</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$66.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group 1 and 2 Total

Amounts assigned to each mode in Groups 1 and 2 should add up to no more than $75.8 million or 100 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
<th>$125.1</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$75.8</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table below breaks down the amount of Regional Flexible Funds allocated to each transportation mode from the beginning of ISTEA in 1992. Also shown are state highway funds allocated to freeway modernization in the urban portion of Region 1 during the same period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT MODE</th>
<th>Built</th>
<th>Funded but Not Built</th>
<th>SUBTOTAL OF COMMITTED FUNDS</th>
<th>MODAL % OF COMMITTED FUNDS: NON-FRWY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$0.659</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Modernization</td>
<td>30.12</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28,250</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Reconstruction</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2,680</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>3.130</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight</td>
<td>18,350</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulevard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>5,950</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7,750</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5,838</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM</td>
<td>3,260</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0,813</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0,150</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>36,870</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33,500</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Freeway Subtotal</td>
<td>$116,780</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$103,580</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway</td>
<td>160,896</td>
<td></td>
<td>72,112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$277,676</strong></td>
<td><strong>$175,692</strong></td>
<td><strong>$453,368</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# PRIORITIES 2000 DRAFT 150 PERCENT CUT LIST

## A. Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>$2,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>$0,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>$0,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>$1,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>$0,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>$7,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>$0,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>$28,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## B. Road Modernization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>$5,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>$0,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>$2,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>$0,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>$0,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>$0,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>$2,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>$34,069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## C. Road Reconstruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>$6,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>$0,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>$1,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>$0,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>$0,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>$1,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>$8,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>$10,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## D. Bridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>$6,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>$0,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>$1,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>$0,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>$0,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>$1,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>$8,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>$10,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## E. Freight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>$6,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>$0,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>$1,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>$0,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>$0,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>$1,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>$8,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>$10,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## F. Boulevard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>$6,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>$0,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>$1,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>$0,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>$0,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>$1,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>$8,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>$10,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## G. Pedestrian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>$5,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>$0,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>$2,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>$0,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>$0,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>$0,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>$2,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>$34,069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## H. Bike/Trail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>$6,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>$0,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>$1,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>$0,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>$0,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>$1,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>$8,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>$10,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## I. TDM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>$6,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>$0,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>$1,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>$0,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>$0,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>$1,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>$8,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>$10,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## J. TOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>$6,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>$0,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>$1,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>$0,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>$0,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>$1,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>$8,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>$10,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## K. Transit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>$6,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>$0,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>$1,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>$0,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>$0,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>$1,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>$8,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>$10,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## L. 100% of ODOT Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>$6,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>$0,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>$1,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>$0,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>$0,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>$1,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>$8,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>$10,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PRIORITIES 2000 DRAFT 150 PERCENT CUT LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>$6,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>$0,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>$1,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>$0,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>$0,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>$1,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>$8,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>$10,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# TOTAL COMMITMENTS FOR ALL MODES

$103,569
### PRIORITIES 2000 DRAFT 150 PERCENT CUT LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freeway</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5/217/Kruse Way</td>
<td>14.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5/217/Kruse Way</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL I-5/217/Kruse Way</strong></td>
<td>21.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-205/Sunnybrook Intrchng</td>
<td>22.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-205/Sunnybrook Intrchng</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL I-205/Sunnybrook Intrchng</strong></td>
<td>28.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tualatin/Sherwood Bypass</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 26: Camelot/Sylvan Interchng</td>
<td>21.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 00-03 Committed Total</td>
<td>$72,112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US 26: Sylvan Interchange Ph. 3</td>
<td>$26,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Total:</td>
<td>$26,513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3/30/99
PRIORITIES 2000

SUMMARY DESCRIPTION
OF
NOMINATED PROJECTS

Metro
March 30, 1999
KEY to project Coding:

Jurisdictions:

C = Clackamas County
M = Multnomah County
P = City of Portland
W = Washington County
R = Regional (Metro and Tri-Met. Note: Port of Portland proposals are listed under City of Portland)

Modes:

M = Road Modernization (e.g., “CM1” is Clackamas Co. Road Modernization Project No. 1)  See page 1.
R = Road Reconstruction (e.g., “PR5” is City of Portland Road Reconstruction project No. 5)  See page 9.
F = Freight  See page 11.
B = Bridge  See page 13.
Bi = Bicycle  See page 15.
P = Pedestrian  See page 19.
BL = Boulevards  See page 21.
Tr = Transit  See page 25.
TOD = Transit Oriented Development  See page 27.
TDM = Transportation Demand Management (TDM proposals have no jurisdictional code, all are regional)  See page 29.
Plng = Planning  See page 31.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM1</td>
<td>Highway 43: “A” Street/Pimlico Drive</td>
<td>Widen to three lanes with landscaped median with turn pockets, two 5 foot bike lanes and two 8 foot sidewalks</td>
<td>$990,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM2</td>
<td>Harmony/Linwood Railroad Avenue Intersection</td>
<td>Request for PE to construct grade separation of the intersection from the UP/SP RR tracks and improve access to future Linwood LRT station</td>
<td>$448,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM3</td>
<td>Sunnyside Road: 132\textsuperscript{nd}/172\textsuperscript{nd}</td>
<td>Request for final design funds for widening of Sunnyside Road to five lanes</td>
<td>$2,691,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM4</td>
<td>Sunnyside Road: 122\textsuperscript{nd}/132\textsuperscript{nd}</td>
<td>Final Design and widening of Sunnyside from two to five lanes</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM5</td>
<td>Sunnyside Road/Mt. Scott Creek Bridge</td>
<td>Request to supplement $6.4 million of previously committed regional funds to construct bridge and environmental remediation associated with programmed widening of Sunnyside Rd. from I-205 to 122\textsuperscript{nd}.</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM6</td>
<td>Johnson Creek/I-205 Ramps</td>
<td>PE funds for upgrade of SB ramps</td>
<td>$448,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM7</td>
<td>Clackamas County ITS/ATMS Plan &amp; Program</td>
<td>Funding to develop a transportation technology system plan for County and city facilities ($100,000) and $1.325 million to begin implementing plan recommendations for signal interconnection and timing optimization, communication and computer processing needs, and traffic control and incident management strategies.</td>
<td>$1,425,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM13</td>
<td>Beaver Creek Road: Highway 213/Mollalla</td>
<td>Widen 3,600 feet of Beaver Creek Road from two to five lanes with enhanced median, bike and pedestrian facilities</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project ID</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM14</td>
<td>Beavercreek Road/Highway 213 Intersection</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right of way purchase and Phase 1 modernization of the intersection to provide new signal equipment, dual left turn lanes, better sight distance/geometries, bike and pedestrian facilities, some ramp construction and phase 2 right of way purchase.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM1</td>
<td>207th Avenue Connector: Halsey/Glisan/223rd</td>
<td>$1,345,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request for additional funds to cover cost overrun on this recently built project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM2</td>
<td>Halsey Street: 223rd/238th</td>
<td>$1,090,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widen approximately 4,000 feet of Halsey to three lane minor arterial, including sidewalks and bike lanes</td>
<td>Also being ranked as a bike project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM3</td>
<td>223rd Avenue RR Overcrossing</td>
<td>3,402,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruct substandard overcrossing to widen from 20 feet to Collector of Regional Significance standards, including bike connections to 40 mile loop and regional recreations and freight facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4</td>
<td>Stark Street: 257th/Troudtale Road</td>
<td>$2,690,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mult Co/Gresham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widen 3,000 feet of Stark to three lanes with bike lanes and sidewalks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM5</td>
<td>242nd Avenue: I-84/Stark</td>
<td>$3,268,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct PE for construction of Mt. Hood Parkway first phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM6</td>
<td>257th Avenue: Division/Powell Valley Road</td>
<td>$4,596,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gresham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widen 5,600 feet of 257th to five lane major arterial with bike lanes, sidewalks, traffic signals, landscaping, lighting and drainage to match current dimensions at Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM7</td>
<td>Gresham/Multnomah County ATMS Program, Phase 3</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gresham/Mult Co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Install 12 CCTV cameras, 12 variable message signs and five highway advisory radio emitters throughout City/County facilities for detection and management of arterial incidents, especially in proximity to freeway facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM1</td>
<td>Portland Arterial/Freeway System Integration</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhancement of city-wide ATMS system to integrate management of significant corridors, establish transit priority and adaptive signal control capabilities and enable sharing of operations information between jurisdictions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM2</th>
<th>Broadway/Weidler: Larrabee/Sandy</th>
<th>$590,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implement comprehensive traffic management equipment on corridor including traffic count stations, enhanced signalization, message signs, CCTV, fiber optic interconnection and communication to City’s central management computer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM3</th>
<th>Barbur Boulevard: I-405/South City Limits</th>
<th>$550,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implement comprehensive traffic management equipment on corridor including traffic count stations, enhanced signalization, message signs, CCTV, fiber optic interconnection and communication to City’s central management computer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM4</th>
<th>Sandy Boulevard: E. Burnside/82nd Avenue</th>
<th>$340,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implement comprehensive traffic management equipment on corridor including traffic count stations, enhanced signalization, message signs, CCTV, fiber optic interconnection and communication to City’s central management computer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM5</th>
<th>82nd Avenue: PDX/Flavel</th>
<th>$350,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implement comprehensive traffic management equipment on corridor including traffic count stations, enhanced signalization, message signs, CCTV, fiber optic interconnection and communication to City’s central management computer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM6</th>
<th>MLK/Interstate Avenue: N. Denver/SE Clay</th>
<th>$550,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implement comprehensive traffic management equipment on corridor including traffic count stations, enhanced signalization, message signs, CCTV, fiber optic interconnection and communication to City’s central management computer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PM7**  
**Portland**  
**SW BH Highway: Terwilliger/Shattuck**  
Implement comprehensive traffic management equipment on corridor including traffic count stations, enhanced signalization, message signs, CCTV, fiber optic interconnection and communication to City’s central management computer  
$100,000

**PM8**  
**Portland**  
**SE Foster Road: 136th/Barbara Welch Road**  
Extend urban improvement of Foster to Barbara Welch Road; signalize intersection, reconstruct bridge crossings, illuminate and enhance bike/ped facilities  
$3,836,813

**PM10**  
**Metro Parks&Greenspaces & Portland**  
**SE Foster Road/Kelly Creek Bridge**  
One-quarter of funds needed to convert culvert to bridge, enabling fish passage and riparian corridor enhancement.  
$600,000

**PM11**  
**Port of Portland**  
**PDX ITS**  
Deploy a Traffic Management and Traveler Information system at PDX with regional connectivity to provide traffic management, incident detection and response, remote traveler information and parking management capabilities.  
$2,420,000

**WM1**  
**Beaverton**  
**Farmington Rd: Hocken/Murray**  
Widen Farmington Rd to five lanes w/ bike lanes and sidewalks. Provide double left as Farmington/Murray “Boulevard” intersection.  
$8,350,000

**WM2**  
**Beaverton**  
**Murray Blvd: Scholls Ferry/Barrows**  
Construct new six-lane “Boulevard” intersection at Murran/Scholls Ferry; extend Murray as four lane major arterial to Barrows  
$6,442,254

**WM3**  
**Hillsboro**  
** Cornelius Pass Road: US 26/Pickering Drive**  
1,000 feet extension of the SB auxiliary lane on the Cornelius Pass overcrossing of US 26 to Pickering Drive intersection  
$290,000

**WM4**  
**Wash Co**  
**Washington County ATMS Program**  
Funding to develop a system plan for County and city needs and to begin implementation of traffic monitoring and regulation system on the County’s major road network, including signal timing plans, CCTV cameras, message boards, and computer equipment purchase.  
$370,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WM5</td>
<td>Murray Blvd Overcrossing: Millikan/Terman</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This project would widen the existing crossing of Murray Blvd over Terman Rd and the Westside LRT tracks by building a new two lane bridge structure parallel to the existing two lane bridge. New sections would provide minimum lane widths of 12' with 6' bike lanes; 6' sidewalks and 5' landscape strips on the surface street approach sections; and 8' sidewalks only on the bridge structures. The bridge would be 321' long and includes a 302' retaining wall. Requested funds supplement a $3.75M TEA-21 “high priority” allocation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM6</td>
<td>Hall Boulevard: Cedar Hills/Hocken</td>
<td>$4,171,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Build 750 feet, three lane extension of Hall with two 12 foot travel lanes; a continuous left-turn lane, sidewalks and bike lanes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM7</td>
<td>231st Avenue: Borwick Road/Baseline</td>
<td>$10,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct 650 foot, three-lane viaduct over Rock Creek as part of extension of 231st to TV Highway. Includes eight foot sidewalks, six foot bike lanes and new signal at Baseline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM8</td>
<td>Cornell Road Signal Intercon’ct: Brookwood/Stucki</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interconnect 11 signals from Amberglen Parkway/Stucki Avenue to Brookwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM9</td>
<td>BH Hwy/Oleson Rd/Scholls Ferry Rd Intersection</td>
<td>$1,080,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preliminary engineering for estimated $12 million project to reconstruc/modernize this Regional “Boulevard” intersection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM10</td>
<td>Cedar Hills Boulevard/Barnes Road Intersection</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruct intersection and approaches (new NB/EB travel lanes, added NB/SB/EB left turn refuge, new EB/WB right turn lanes), upgrade Cedar Hills/ Barnes signal, install new signal at US 26 off-ramp to Cedar Hills, interconnect four signals between Barnes and Butner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM11</td>
<td>Bethany Boulevard: West Union/Bronson</td>
<td>$4,640,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widen to three lanes (14-foot median) with 5.5-foot sidewalks, six-foot bike lanes, sound walls, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM12</td>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td>Cherry Lane/Cornelius Pass Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruct Cherry Lane as public component of new, mostly privately financed east/west collector from 185th to 231st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM13</td>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td>SE 10th Avenue: E. Main/SE Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct new 12 foot wide, 900 foot long turn lane and new 13 foot sidewalk in station area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM14</td>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td>Aloclek Dr: NW Amberwood/ Cornelius Pass Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase 70 foot of right of way for new three lane road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM16</td>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td>NE 28th Avenue: NE Grant/E. Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost for bike and pedestrian components of planned widening of 28th to three lane minor arterial. New facility would intersect Fair Complex LRT Station and provide new north/south access to Hillsboro and improve circulation within the regional center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM17</td>
<td>Tualatin</td>
<td>I-5/Nyberg Interchange Widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperate with ODOT to widen Nyberg overcrossing with two new travel lanes and sidewalks and widen SB off-ramp from I-5 to Nyberg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM18</td>
<td>Tigard</td>
<td>SW 72nd: 99W/Hunziker Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Widen approximately ¾ mile of 72nd Avenue from three to five travel lanes of 11 foot width with 12 foot median, 13 foot sidewalks with planter strips and bike lanes (total right of way of 92 feet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM19</td>
<td>Tigard</td>
<td>SW Greenburg Road: Washington Square/Tiedeman Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Widen 3,100 feet of Greenburg from three to five lanes. Improve pavement from Washington Square Drive to Highway 217; provide transitions on Tiedeman to Greenburg intersection and on Greenburg past intersection with Tiedeman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM20</td>
<td>Forest Grove</td>
<td>Bonnie Lane Extension: Brooke/Gales Creek Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct extension of Bonnie Lane from just west of Brooke to Gales Creek Road between Thatcher Rd and Willamina Ave. Provide curbs, gutters, traffic control, pedestrian crossings and other streetscape amenities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WM21  Bonnie Lane Extension:  “B” St./Main St.  
Forest Grove  
Extend Bonnie Lane across gap from its dead end at “B” St. east, to its continuation from Main St. Provide curbs, gutters, traffic control, pedestrian crossings and other streetscape amenities.

WM22  Main Street Extension:  Beal/Bonnie Lane  
Forest Grove  
Construct a link of Main Street that closes the existing gap from south of Beal to Bonnie Lane. Provide curbs, gutters, traffic control, pedestrian crossings and other streetscape amenities.

SUBTOTAL:  $100,998,000
## Priorities 2000

### Projects Nominations Summary

#### Roadway Reconstruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CR1</th>
<th>Willamette Falls Dr: 10th/Sunset</th>
<th>$3,313,890</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruct badly deteriorated roadway to enable transit vehicle use and improve bike/pedestrian accessibility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CR2</th>
<th>Johnson Creek Blvd: 36\textsuperscript{th}/45\textsuperscript{th}</th>
<th>$1,076,400</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruct pavement and provide two 11' travel lanes w/ 6' bike lanes, 5' sidewalks and landscaping on the south side only.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CR3</th>
<th>Lake Road: Oatfield/Hwy 224</th>
<th>$1,524,900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruct 4,350'; narrow lanes to 11' w/ new 10' left and right turn lanes at Oatfield and 5' sidewalks on both sides of street. Provide raised medians, bus pullouts and widened sidewalks at bus stops.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PR1</th>
<th>Bybee Boulevard Overcrossings</th>
<th>$5,234,892</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Replace the existing structure over SE McLoughlin Boulevard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PR2</th>
<th>SE Stark Street Overlay: 122\textsuperscript{nd}/146\textsuperscript{th}</th>
<th>$1,351,523</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruct 1.2 miles with overlay and new stormwater drainage facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PR3</th>
<th>NW 23rd Ave: Burnside/Lovejoy Street</th>
<th>$825,262</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruct NW 23\textsuperscript{rd} Ave pavement and restripe facility to accommodate one lane of traffic in each direction, on-street parking and accommodate bicyclists on street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PR4</th>
<th>SE 39\textsuperscript{th} Ave: Powell/Holgate</th>
<th>$1,340,067</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruct SE 39\textsuperscript{th} Avenue pavement and restripe facility to accommodate two lanes of traffic in each direction, left turn bays at major intersections, provide corner curb ramps compliant with ADA standards. Upgrade and retine signals within corridor and centralize signal management to aid efficient movement of goods and services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PR5
Portland
SE Holgate Blvd: SE 42nd Ave/SE 52nd Ave
Reconstruct SE Holgate Blvd pavement structure and stormwater drainage facilities. Reconstruct corner curb ramps to ADA standards

$797,341

PR6
Portland
SW Market/Clay Couplet: Naito Prkwy/SW 12th
Reconstruct both streets, which are state facilities in Downtown, curb to curb with full-depth base pavement. Rebuild corner curb ramps to ADA requirements. Renovate traffic signal loops to moderate traffic flow through Central City.

$3,663,128

PR7
Portland
SE Washington St: 82nd/109th
Reconstruct SE Washington Street pavement and structure and restripe the facility to accommodate EB traffic in the Stark/Washington couplet. Reconstruct corner curb ramps to ADA standards. Reconstruct signal at the SE 102nd/103rd Ave. intersection

$1,087,353

PR8
Portland
NE Cully Blvd: Prescott/Killingsworth
Reconstruct parts of the roadway and overlay the entire length of the project. The road will remain in its two-lane configuration. Future phase will widen the roadway, add bike lanes and curb/sidewalks and signalize the Cully/Prescott intersection

$402,978

PR9
Portland
Hayden Island Dr: N. Center Ave/N. Farr St.
Reconstructs North Hayden Island Drive in vicinity of the retail center and restripes it to accommodate four travel lanes and a continuous left turn lane

$1,440,391

PR10
Portland
SW/NW Naito Parkway: NW Davis/SW Market
Supplement previous allocation to reconstruct Naito Parkway and restripe to accommodate two lanes of traffic in each direction, left turn bays, median islands, and on-street bicycle facilities (rather than a multi-use path in the park as previously approved). Replace many badly deteriorated brick crosswalks with architectural concepts. Rebuild corner curb ramps to ADA standards

$1,500,000

SUBTOTAL: $25,558,000
## Freight Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| PF1     | **Lower Albina Overcrossing**  
Portland  
Construct overcrossing of rail facilities to eliminate freight vehicle delay experienced when trains block multiple local street intersections. | $4,000,000 |
| PF2     | **North Marine Drive Reconstruction 4R**  
Portland  
Current two-lane road is 25 years old, has poor drainage and is badly deteriorated. Widen 2.5 miles to five lanes w/ bike lanes and sidewalks and vegetation buffer of adjacent trail and natural resource area beginning at the Columbia Slough to North Marine Drive Overpass. | $1,795,000 |
| PF3     | **SE 7th/SE 8th Avenue Connector**  
Portland  
Improve freight and vehicular access to SE Industrial District from Ross Island Bridge by realignment of SE 7th to provide a continuous street connection with SE 8th Avenue. | $2,511,600 |
| PF4     | **Duplicate of PF5**                                                                 |        |
| PF5     | **E. Columbia to Lombard Connection**  
NE 82nd/I-205 Interchange (Webster/Holman)  
ODOT (Port and City of Portland)  
Improve access to and from I-205 along the Columbia Blvd corridor for businesses and freight through movements. Expand railroad overcrossings, and provide interchange and intersection modifications at 82nd Avenue, I-205 and Columbia and Lombard. | $29,500,000 |
| PF6     | **Powell/SE 8th Signalization**  
Portland  
New traffic signal and left turn pocket at SE Powell/SE 8th to limit freight infiltration to SE residential neighborhoods. | $224,250 |
| PF7     | **Marine Dr: BNSF O’Xing/Kelly Point Park**  
Port of Portland  
PE for second phase of widening. Design 1,400 rail O’xing; construct 64’ wide curb-to-curb pavement w/ four 12’ travel lanes, two 6’ bike lanes, 4’ median; add sidewalks. | $1,794,000 |

**SUBTOTAL:** $40,325,000
PF8  Rivergate ITS Project  $448,500
Deploy highway/rail intersection management system within the Rivergate Industrial District and surrounding street system (mostly N. Marine Dr. and Columbia Blvd. including I-5 and I-205 ramps) to reduce intermodal conflicts, streamline freight movement and optimize existing capacity of key freight routes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PBr1 Mult Co/Portland</td>
<td><strong>Broadway Bridge Painting</strong>&lt;br&gt;Partial funding of a $17 million project to strip and repaint the main truss of spans above the deck.</td>
<td>$7,960,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBr2a Mult Co/Portland</td>
<td><strong>Morrison Bridge Electrical Upgrade</strong>&lt;br&gt;Replace and upgrade electrical control systems for traffic control gates, signals and lighting on the Morrison and Burnside Bridges</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBr2b Mult Co/Portland</td>
<td><strong>Burnside Bridge Electrical Upgrade</strong>&lt;br&gt;Replace and upgrade electrical control systems for traffic control gates, signals and lighting on the Morrison and Burnside Bridges</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBr3 Mult Co/Portland</td>
<td><strong>Broadway Bridge/Approaches Rehabilitation Phase 5</strong>&lt;br&gt;Partial funding of a $20 million project to replace deck grating on the main span of the bridge and paint the lower structural members.</td>
<td>$3,650,790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

March 25, 1999
# Priorities 2000
## Projects Nominations Summary

### Bicycle Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CBi1       | Rothe Road: River Road/McLoughlin  
Widen 0.38 miles to accommodate joint, striped, shared bike/pedestrian path in both directions. Install curbs and drainage. This project falls within the McLoughlin Corridor Study area just northwest of Gladstone. Full sidewalks in follow-up project. | $430,704     |
| CBi2       | SE Fuller Road: Harmony/King  
Widen west side of road. Stripe 6' bikelanes, construct new sidewalk, curbs/drainage on west side, infill east side sidewalks. | $592,218     |
| CBi3       | Phillip Creek Greenway Trail:  
Causey Ave/Mt. Scott Greenway Trail  
Construction of 1.1 mile trail mostly within Clackamas Regional Center boundaries. | $468,391     |
| CBi4       | Portland Traction Company Trail: Park/Glen Echo  
Construct 3.6 miles of mixed 10’- 12’ multi-use trail and 6’- 10’ on-street segments along historic street car ROW. | $1,076,760   |
| CBi5       | Hill/Thiessen Roads Bike Infill  
Widen sections of Hill/Thiessen Roads between Oatfield and Webster to construct cumulative 5,700’ of missing bike lanes. Completes bike connections between McLoughlin and Linwood corridors. | $601,191     |
| CBi6       | Linwood Ave: King Rd/Johnson Creek Blvd.  
Provide 6-foot bike lanes on both sides of Linwood Ave. Project completes the final gap in the Linwood-Webster transit corridor, providing multi-modal travel movements to the Springwater Corridor. | $448,650     |
| CBi7       | Clackamas Regional Center District Park Multipurpose Trail:  
Harmony Road/82\textsuperscript{nd} Avenue  
Park Trail would run from 82\textsuperscript{nd} Avenue to Lake Road primarily within the Clackamas Town Center Regional Park, south of Harmony Road, west of 82\textsuperscript{nd} and north of the Union Pacific Railroad main line. | $278,163     |
| CBi8       | Jennifer Street: 106\textsuperscript{th}/120\textsuperscript{th}  
Construct an 8’ shared bike/pedestrian path along 3,500’ of Jennifer (south side only) in a largely industrial area. Topography precludes a more complete solution. | $444,164     |
CBi9  Wilsonville  
**Town Center Park Bike/Ped Connections**  
Strip and sign 5’–6’ bike lanes from Parkway Avenue in Wilsonville, east to the proposed Town Center Park access off Town Center Loop east. Acquire 700 feet of 12’ ROW and construct eastern access to the park  
$200,000

CBi10  Wilsonville  
**Parkway Avenue/Town Center Loop Bikeway**  
Sign and re-stripe Parkway Avenue in Wilsonville from Boeckman Road to Town Center Loop, creating two 15 foot shared bike/vehicle lanes and one 12 foot center turn lane; sign and re-stripe Boeckman Road and Town Center Loop creating bike lanes that will connect with an existing 12 foot pedestrian bike pathway that leads into Town Center Park  
$40,000

CBi11  Wilsonville  
**Parkway Center Dr: Ellingsen Rd/Burns Way**  
Stripe and sign 1,200’ of on-street bike lanes 5 to 6 feet in width. Erect appropriate bike lane and safety signage for a larger adjacent area  
$20,000

CBi12  Portland  
**Willamette Shoreline Rail: Lake Oswego/Sellwood Bridge**  
Feasibility Study for Multi-Use trail  
$150,000

CP2  Clack Co  
**Washington St: Abernethy Rd/7th St**  
Reduce from 4-lanes to 2-lanes w/ median and “boulevard-like” improvements.  
$400,000  
Moved from Pedestrian

MBi1  Gresham  
**Gresham Fairview Trail: Springwater Trail/Marine Drive**  
5.2 mile multi-use path designed for bike and pedestrian use  
$1,076,760

MM2  Mult Co  
**Halsey Street: 223rd/238th**  
Widen approximately 4,000 feet of Halsey to three lane minor arterial, including sidewalks and bike lanes  
$1,090,000  
Also being ranked as a Road Mod Project.

PBi1  Portland  
**Morrison Bridge Pedestrian Bike Accessibility**  
Permanent bike, pedestrian and disabled access across main span of the Morrison Bridge. Reduce number of lanes from 6 to 5 lanes (3 westbound and 2 lanes eastbound)  
$1,569,750

PBi2  Metro  
**Peninsula Crossing Trail, North Portland Road Improvements**  
Complete second phase of Peninsula Crossing trail project from present terminus on N. Portland Rd. at the Treatment Plant, north to Marine Dr.  
$358,800

PBi3  Portland  
**Marine Drive Multi-Use Trail Segments: Bridgeton Road/13th Avenue; 28th/33rd Ave; and 112th/122nd Ave.**  
Construct two-way bike path along the south side of Marine Drive  
$738,200
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PBi4</td>
<td>SE 111&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;/112&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Avenue: Market/Holgate</td>
<td>$1,553,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widen some road segments on 112&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (Holgate/Mt. Scott Blvd) build some retaining wall and drainage improvements to provide continuous 6’ bike lanes on both sides of roadway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBi5</td>
<td>Springwater Corridor: Rugg Rd. to Boring</td>
<td>$538,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBi6</td>
<td>Eastbank Trail: OMSI/Springwater Trail Completion</td>
<td>$3,139,507</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|              | *PBi6a:* North end of Water Avenue from Caruthers Street south to the Oregon Pacific right of way will be paved with bicycle and pedestrian improvements.  
              | *PBi6b:* Convert Umatilla and Spokane Streets to bicycle boulevards; or Develop off street trail (Umatilla St. to Springwater) and construct three bridges. |
| PBi8         | Willamette Greenway Trail: Willamette Cove Segment                                | $448,500      |
|              | This project is on the banks of the Willamette River. It will involve development of a multi-use trail along the North Edgewater Street up to Willamette Boulevard |
| PBi9         | Greeley/Interstate: Killingsworth/Russell                                          | $143,600      |
|              | Provide bike lanes along N. Greeley St from Killingsworth to Interstate Ave, and then along Interstate Ave to existing lanes at N. Russell St.  
              | Raised medians along Greeley and Interstate will have to be replaced at narrower width to provide sufficient ROW for bike lanes. |
| PP5          | Red Electric Line: Willamette Park/Oleson Road                                    | $134,500      |
|              | Conversion of an abandoned rail corridor into a bicycle/pedestrian corridor. Feasibility study. |
| WBi1         | Fanno Creek Bike Path: Allen/Denny                                                | $74,451       |
|              | Supplemental funds for programmed multi-use path.                                 |
| WBi2         | Hall Boulevard Bikeway: 12<sup>th</sup>/Allen                                     | $944,541      |
|              | Complete regional bike system from Farmington to Hwy 217 by constructing 1,500’ of bike lanes on Hall Boulevard from 12<sup>th</sup> to 700’ south of Allen |
| WBi3         | *Project was removed from the process by Washington County.*                      |               |
| WBi4         | Cedar Mill Multi-Use Path (Cornell Road: 119<sup>th</sup>/113<sup>th</sup>)          | $900,000      |
|              | Provide a combination bike/ped path that would help fill the gap between existing bike and ped facilities at Cedar Hills Blvd/113<sup>th</sup> and 119<sup>th</sup> Avenue |

February 19, 1999
Cornell Road Bikeway: Elam Young Parkway to Ray Circle

Retrofit Cornell Road to add a 6-foot wide bike lanes. This entails about ½ mile segment of Cornell Road that will connect two existing bike lanes segments to form a continuous 3 mile bikeway.

Rock Creek Trail: Evergreen Prkwy/Amberwood Dr.

Third phase of 4 phase project. Improve 1,800’ of existing 8’ trail to 10’; construct 2,000’ of new trail pathway, and an 800’ connection to Amberwood Dr.; build bridge over Rock Creek and safety improvements at trail crossing of Cornell Rd.

Beaverton Powerline Multi-Use Path

Provide a continuous multi-use access way from Scholls Ferry Rd. to Farmington Rd. along the powerline corridor west of 155th Ave.

Rock Creek Powerline Multi-Use Path

Locate and construct trail in the powerline easement from NW 185th to NW Kaiser Rd.

Fanno Creek Multi-Use Path: East to Allen/Scholls Ferry.

Construct a 10-foot wide path with boardwalks and bridge structures.

SUBTOTAL: $22,707,000
## Priorities 2000
### Projects Nominations Summary

### Pedestrian Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CP1</td>
<td>Scott Creek Lane Pedestrian Path 129&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Avenue to West/Mt. Gate Road to East</td>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>$80,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM16</td>
<td>Linwood Ave: Monroe/Cedarcrest</td>
<td>Milwaukie</td>
<td>$783,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP1</td>
<td>257&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave: Cherry Park Rd/Stark</td>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>$1,345,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP1</td>
<td>Capitol Hwy: SW Taylors Ferry/36&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>$923,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP2</td>
<td>Capitol Hwy: Bertha/BH Hwy</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP3</td>
<td>West Burnside: Wildwood Trail O’Xing</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>$448,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP4</td>
<td>River District Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>$1,614,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP6</td>
<td>Springwater Trailheads at 82&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;, 136&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; and 174&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>$1,253,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

February 19, 1999
PBi7  Eastbank Riverfront Access and Neighborhood Connections  Portland  
Implement streetscape improvements to enhance the pedestrian experience along the designated routes through the Central Eastside Industrial area  $1,345,500

WP1  Hillsboro Regional Center Ped Program  Hillsboro  
On 18th Avenue, 21st Avenue, Maple Street, Oak Street and Walnut Street improve sidewalks, lighting, pedestrian crossings, bus shelters and benches. Add curbs and storm drainage where needed  $1,350,000

WP2  Milikan Way: Murray/Hocken  Wash Co.  
Construct 5’ sidewalk with street lights for 3,000’ along south side of Milikan Way  $224,500

WP3  Saltzman Road: Marshall Rd/Dogwood Rd  Wash Co  
Construct sidewalks on the west side of Saltzman Road  $436,500

WP4  Sentinel Plaza: Cornell Rd/Cedar Hills Blvd/113th Ave  Wash Co  
Multi-use path for pedestrians and bicyclists that connects to an existing path on Cedar Hills Boulevard  $180,000

WP5  SW 170th Ave: Merlo Rd/Elmonica LRT Station  Wash Co  
Replace deteriorating asphalt path with 9’-foot sidewalk along 1,100’ of the east side of SW 170th Avenue  $270,000

WP6  131st/Fischer Rd: Beef Bend/99W  Wash Co  
Purchase ROW and in-fill curbs/sidewalks on one side of 131st between Beef Bend and Fischer Rd and on Fisher Road between 131st and 99W.  $315,000

WBi6  Tualatin River Pedestrian Bridge  City of Tualatin Park/ Rec Dept.  
Project would connect to existing pathways in Tigard Cook’s Park and Durham City Park. Would run across the Tualatin River and include safety fencing and connecting ramps within Tualatin Community Park  $897,000

WP7  Cedar Hills Blvd: Walker/Butner Rd.  Wash Co.  
Construct 5-foot wide bike lanes and 6-foot wide sidewalks on both sides of Cedar Hills Blvd. Construct 6-foot wide sidewalks on the west side of Cedar Hills Blvd. from Berkshire Street to just north of Walker Rd.  $85,000

SUBTOTAL:  $11,953,000
## Boulevard Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBL1</td>
<td>Clack Co Harmony Road: 82nd/Fuller Road</td>
<td>Provide a center median/turn lane, narrowed travel lanes, standard width bicycle lanes, boulevard sidewalks, pedestrian crossings and median refuges, bus pullouts and corner curbing</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBL2</td>
<td>West Linn Willamette Drive: “A” St/McKillican</td>
<td>Provide median/turn lane, narrowed travel lanes, standard bicycle lanes, boulevard sidewalks, pedestrian crossings and median refuges, bus pullouts</td>
<td>$1,081,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBL3</td>
<td>ODOT McLoughlin Blvd: Harrison /SPRR X’ing</td>
<td>Widen existing sidewalks, install landscaping and higher quality lighting</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBL4</td>
<td>Lake Oswego “A” Avenue Improvement</td>
<td>Extend Phase 1 “A” Ave improvements to Hwy 43</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBL5</td>
<td>Lake Oswego Boones Ferry Rd: Mercantile//Kruse Way Pl</td>
<td>Widen Boones Ferry 12’ between Mercantile and Kruse Way Pl. and add NB lane through segment</td>
<td>$265,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBL6</td>
<td>Lake Oswego Boones Ferry Rd: Washington Crt/Madrona St</td>
<td>Construct new boulevard intersection at Boones Ferry Rd/Sunset Dr. and provide Regional Blvd enhancement of 1400’ (total) of Boones Ferry north/south of intersection</td>
<td>$1,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBL1</td>
<td>Gresham Division St: Cleveland/Birdsdale</td>
<td>Implement Boulevard design along 1.5 mile street section through the Gresham Regional Center</td>
<td>$3,589,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBL2</td>
<td>Gresham Stark St: 181st/197th</td>
<td>Expand on pedestrian friendly treatments currently under construction in the Rockwood Transit Center renovation at 188th and Stark Street</td>
<td>$1,538,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBL1</td>
<td>Hawthorne Blvd: SE 20th/SE 55th</td>
<td>Enhance bike, pedestrian and transit amenities w/in corridor, signalize new intersections and progress vehicle platoons similar to downtown pedestrian environment on appropriate stretches.</td>
<td>$2,692,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBL2</td>
<td>Gateway Regional Center</td>
<td>Begin implementation of concepts identified in the Gateway Regional Center Transportation Study</td>
<td>$2,261,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBL3</td>
<td>W. Burnside Blvd: Bridge/NW 23rd Avenue</td>
<td>Develop a concept plan for preliminary engineering to balance vehicular with alternative mode function of the corridor.</td>
<td>$2,691,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBL4</td>
<td>Barbur Blvd: Naito Parkway/65th</td>
<td>Complete and enhance the existing pedestrian system by providing sidewalk connections to the surrounding neighborhoods. This project will enhance the existing transit system by improving access to bus stops</td>
<td>$882,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBL5</td>
<td>So. Portland Circulation: I-405/Wil. River/Hamilton/Barbur</td>
<td>Reconstruct SW Front between Arthur and Barbur as neighborhood collector street with a three lane cross section, boulevard-type treatment: street trees, wider sidewalks, left turn pockets with planted medians, signalized intersections with ped crossings and high amenity transit stops</td>
<td>$5,382,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBL1</td>
<td>Cornell Rd: Trail Ave/Saltzman Rd</td>
<td>Wider sidewalks, curb extensions, bus stop enhancements, raised medians, pedestrian scale lighting, street furniture, enhanced landscaping and “gateway features” at entry points to town center</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBL2</td>
<td>Main St: 10th/20th Blvd</td>
<td>Funding for reconstruction of TV Hwy/20th intersection and enhancement of the Cornelius Main Street Couplet.</td>
<td>$4,541,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBL3</td>
<td>Murray Blvd: Scholls Ferry/Barrows</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,442,254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**WBL4 Forest Grove Downtown Area Improvements**
Forest Grove

Widen sidewalks and provide other street amenities along five key downtown streets including: Pacific Ave; Cedar/College Way; College Way: 19th/21st and adjacent local streets.

**WBL5 BH Hwy/Oleson Rd/Scholls Ferry Rd Intersection**
Wash Co

Reconstruct/modernize this Regional “Boulevard” intersection

**WBL6 Hall Boulevard: Cedar Hills/Hocken**
Wash Co

Build 750 feet, three lane extension of Hall with two 12 foot travel lanes; a continuous left-turn lane, sidewalks and bike lanes.

**SUBTOTAL:** $45,931,000
### Priorities 2000

#### Project Nominations Summary

#### Public Transit Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WTr1</th>
<th>Wash Co Commuter Rail: Wilsonville/BV</th>
<th>$4,460,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>Environmental work and design for trackwork improvements, stations, park and ride facilities, signals, switches and crossing protection for a Commuter Rail Project from Wilsonville to Beaverton.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WTr2</th>
<th>Washington County Bus Stop Enhancement Project</th>
<th>$670,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>Package of bus stop improvements including provision of bus shelters at high use stops, bus benches at stops with a medium level of boarding activities, lighting enhancements, landing pad improvements, pedestrian links and bicycle racks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTr1</th>
<th>S.M.A.R.T. Transit Center and Park &amp; Ride Lot</th>
<th>$1,172,200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilsonville (SMART)</td>
<td>Purchase of 2.5 acres of land on the corner of Elligsen and Parkway Center Drive in Wilsonville in order for SMART to build a transit center and 250 space Park &amp; Ride lot.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTr2</th>
<th>Willamette Shore Line Trestle and Related Track Repairs</th>
<th>$897,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake Oswego</td>
<td>Trestle repair work on the Willamette Shore Line Trolley.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RTr1</th>
<th>Regional Contribution for Airport LRT</th>
<th>$18,000,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tri Met</td>
<td>Funds to supplement Tri-Met’s capital program, thereby allowing them the financial capacity to contribute Tri-Met General Funds to construction of light rail to the Portland International Airport and to the Portland International Center Mixed used development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RTr2</th>
<th>Service Increase for Regional/Town Center TCL</th>
<th>$16,000,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tri Met</td>
<td>Purchase 56 new/replacement buses for Tri-Met in order to establish new Transit Choices for Livability (TCL) services focused on Regional and Town Centers throughout the region. At the conclusion of its service plan update in late spring, Tri-Met would present its base service plan (which is funded through their existing resources) for review by JPACT and the Metro Council and seek concurrence for planned service expansion proposed to be funded through these regional funds. This four-year, $4 million per year regional allocation would provide funds to Tri-Met’s capital program, thereby allowing them to increase service by $4 million.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL:** $41,199,200

March 30, 1999
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## Transit-Oriented Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RTOD1</th>
<th>TOD Program</th>
<th>Metro</th>
<th><strong>$10,000,000</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOD Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Region-wide program to stimulate market for transit-oriented development along eastside MAX and the Westside extension. Funding will be used either to provide infrastructure needed to support transit-oriented development or to buy land for subsequent sale for development. Specific projects and/or developers will be selected through a competitive solicitation process. The funding request of $2.5 million per year will allow for approximately six projects per year based on project to date requiring $50,000 to $1,000,000 each.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PTOD2</th>
<th>District Streets and Connections</th>
<th>Portland</th>
<th><strong>$2,692,500</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N Macadam District Streets and Connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvements in this request will be spread through the district, which is bounded by the Marquam Bridge to the north, the Willamette River to the east, SW Hamilton Court to the south and I-5 to the west. Connections into and out of the district to the regional system will also be included.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL:** **$12,692,500**
### Transportation Demand Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Funding Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDM1</td>
<td>Regional TDM Program</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri Met/Region</td>
<td>Funding needed by Tri Met to continue provision of its core services to the Regional Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM2</td>
<td>Portland Area Telecommuting Project</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OOE/Region</td>
<td>Four-year funding needed by the Oregon Office of Energy to continue provision of its core Telecommute marketing element to the Regional TDM program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM3</td>
<td>Employee Commute Options</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEQ/Region</td>
<td>Four-year funding needed by DEQ to continue provision of ECO information clearing house services which compliments the Regional TDM Program housed at Tri-Met.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM4</td>
<td>Region 2040 Initiatives</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri Met/Region</td>
<td>Request to reserve up to $500,000 per year for a 4-year program to implement innovative transit solutions in and around the Central City, Regional Centers and other locations. Focus would be to serve locations of high regional significance, or to address such criteria as may be recommended by the TDM Subcommittee for TPAC approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM5</td>
<td>TMA Assistance Program</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri Met/Region</td>
<td>Request for up to $500,000 per year for a 4-year program to competitively award funding of preliminary feasibility analyses and to provide 3-years of phased-down assistance per adopted regional procedures for Transportation Management Associations (TMAs). Requests will be evaluated by the TPAC TDM Subcommittee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM6</td>
<td>SMART TDM Program</td>
<td>$303,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilsonville</td>
<td>Four year funding to expand So. Metro Area Rapid Transit TDM outreach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL:** $7,923,360
Priorities 2000
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Planning Project Nominations

RPlng1
Core Regional Transportation Planning Program
Metro
FY 01-03 (3 years) funding to support staff, staff support and public involvement activities for Metro efforts in the areas of Transportation Planning, Travel Forecasting and Technical Assistance. These funds would support routine elements of Metro’s planning functions, as opposed to major new initiatives. This includes conducting corridor studies, development of the regional transportation plan and MTIP, maintenance and incremental enhancement of the regional travel forecasting model, monitoring of regional transportation trends and statistics, communication of travel forecasting efforts and provision of technical services to Metro’s regional partners.

RPlng2
Green Steets Handbook
Metro
Funding for Metro staff/consultant project to prepare handbook providing guidance for addressing environmental design features in regional transportation facilities, especially concerning fish passage, road runoff, wildlife corridors and adjacency to sensitive habitats, with a focus on urban reserve facility planning.

PPIng3
Regional Freight Program Analysis/Communication Tools
Metro
Funding for Metro staff to develop methodology for routine update of Commodity Flow Study data (e.g., truck counts, model refinement, etc.) and procedures for dissemination of data to users. Need is comparable to update and distribution of population/employment statistics maintained by Metro.

RPlng4
Bicycle Travel Demand Forecasting Enhancement
Metro
Funding for Metro staff/consultants to conduct focus group/stated preference surveys of bicycle use factors and integrate data into calibrated model outputs that predict anticipated bicycle travel demand and distribution in the Metro’s regional model and GIS system.
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RPlng5  OPB Pilot: Building Community Through Media  $100,000
Funding for Metro staff/consultants to prepare hour-long pilot episode of an educational documentary regarding relationships between transportation, land use and environmental planning. Multi-jurisdiction, public/private funding.

RPlng6  I-5 Trade Corridor Study:  $500,000
Metro
Matches $1.1 million of local funds to study and recommend improvement of I-5 corridor to enhance freight access to air, marine and rail terminals on both sides of the Columbia River. Study recommendation will leverage TEA 21 Trade Corridor implementation funds.

SUBTOTAL:  $2,986,000
To: JPACT/Metro Council
From: Washington County Coordinating Committee
Subject: MTIP/STIP Recommendations

At their April 5, 1999 meeting, the Washington County Coordinating Committee endorsed the following four recommendations concerning the proposed FY2000-2003 MTIP/STIP 150% Cut-List:

1. **Transportation needs rather than concerns about salmon restoration should be the primary determinant for including projects on the 150% Cut-List.**

   Committee members noted that a major purpose of several projects in the Road Modernization category was salmon restoration. Given the multitude of urgent transportation needs in the region and the lack of clarity about salmon restoration requirements, projects dealing with demonstrable transportation problems should be included on the 150% Cut-List before projects related to salmon restoration.

2. **Add several important projects in the Hillsboro and Beaverton areas to the 150% Cut-List while downscoping other projects within Washington County to stay within the current total program cost ceiling.**

   None of the Road Modernization projects submitted by the City of Hillsboro and Beaverton were included in the 150% Cut-List, despite growing populations and transportation problems within those communities. The committee recommends that the following projects be added to the list for preliminary engineering and right-of-way acquisition only:

   - **SE 10th Ave. from E. Main to Baseline (City of Hillsboro).** Construct a new turn lane and widened sidewalk. This project should replace a current project on the list to extend the southbound auxiliary lane on Cornelius Pass from Hwy. 26 to Pickering Drive.
   - **Farmington Rd. from Hocken to Murray.** Widen to 5 lanes with bike lanes and sidewalks (City of Beaverton).
- Murray Blvd. Extension from Scholls Ferry to Barrows (City of Beaverton). Extend Murray as a four-lane major arterial to Barrows.

To accommodate these additions to the list without increasing the total cost of the list, the following projects currently on the 150% Cut-List should be reduced in scope (and cost) to reflect preliminary engineering and right-of-way only:

- SW Greenburg from Washington Sq. Rd. to Tiedeman (City of Tigard). Widen from 3 to 5 lanes.
- I-5/Nyberg interchange widening (City of Tualatin). Widen overcrossing with two new travel lanes and sidewalks and widen southbound off-ramp.

3. **Move the existing $25.5 million South/North project from the Committed Transit project category to the Proposed Transit project category and defer any decision about retaining this project on the final list until more information is known.**

   To facilitate an honest and meaningful discussion about South/North this project should be moved from the Committed funding status to compete for funding with other proposed transit projects until more is known about the nature and support for this project.

4. **Increase emphasis in the 150% Cut-List on highway projects relative to transit projects.**

   The region has made significant progress toward achieving an appropriate balance between highway and transit funding in recent funding allocations, but an increased emphasis is now needed on highway projects to address increasing highway travel needs.

Coordinating Committee members believe that making these recommended revisions will result in an improved 150% Cut-List that better reflects westside transportation needs and will facilitate progress toward an acceptable final program recommendation for the region.

**Attachment**

cc:  Board of County Commissioners  
    Cities of Washington County  
    Andy Cotugno, Metro
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City of Beaverton

City of Gaston

City of Hillsboro

City of Cornelius

City of Tigard

City of Durham

City of North Plains

City of Banks

City of Tualatin

City of Sherwood

City of Forest Grove

City of Wilsonville

City of King City
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**WCCC Signature Page**  
MetroTransportation Improvement Program (MTIP)  
April 5, 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Beaverton</th>
<th>City of Gaston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Hillsboro</td>
<td>City of Cornelius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tigard</td>
<td>City of Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of North Plains</td>
<td>City of Banks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tualatin</td>
<td>City of Sherwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Forest Grove</td>
<td>City of Wilsonville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of King City</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In response to limited funding for Modernization projects, the OTC eliminated the “Development” section of the STIP in 1998 and ceased development work on most Modernization projects. The Columbia-Killingsworth Connection project (Eastend Connector) was included in the “Development” program endorsed by JPACT.

In response, the Port of Portland and the City of Portland assumed responsibility for $2 million toward PE and environmental analysis for the Columbia-Killingsworth Connection project (Eastend Connector). This project is an existing problem, was identified as a priority in the Columbia Blvd. Corridor Study and ranked fourth in the MTIP Transportation Priorities 2000 freight category.

Tight financial constraints for MTIP funding preclude a regional contribution to this project for the 2000-2003 period. Nevertheless, JPACT supports ODOT’s intention to implement the Columbia-Killingsworth Connector project upon fulfillment of its commitment to complete the Sunset Highway and I-5/Hwy. 217 improvements.
March 2, 1999

Mike Hogland

METRO

600 Northeast Grand Avenue

Portland, Oregon 97232

Dear Mr. Hogland:

The Central Eastside Industrial Council is committed to the revitalization and growth of the diverse Central Eastside Industrial District. METRO can not meet its goals if it continues to finance suburban traffic needs at the expense of inner city areas. Private investment follows the public's investment in roads and access resulting in the suburbanization of our region.

Many of our most critical projects appear to be missing from your list. These projects have been adopted by the City of Portland and supported every year by METRO. Yet these projects continue to languish.

We would like to invite you to meet with our transportation committee to discuss each project; particularly the East Marquam Interchange Phase IV, the connection of McLoughlin Boulevard to the Marquam Bridge. The reconstruction of the Grand/King Viaduct makes this project extremely timely.

In addition, the project list that you have included in the packet contain anomalies that are unexplainable. The SE 7th/SE 8th Avenue Connector and the 8th & Powell light were specifically developed to address the railroad and state concern regarding railroad crossing safety, yet these projects received a '0' on crossing safety. The Hawthorne Boulevard project begins at SE 20th leaving a huge gap between the newly reconstructed Hawthorne Bridge and 20th (Grand to 20th).

We find it reasonable that METRO must invest a significantly greater amount of funds to support and cultivate inner city neighborhoods to enable them to effectively compete with suburban developers and jurisdictions to curb aggressive attempts of pulling business and investment out of Portland.

Sincerely,

Connie Hunt, President

Central Eastside Industrial Council

cc METRO Council

Portland City Council
The following public hearings are being held by the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council Transportation Planning Committee to solicit public input on the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) and the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). All state and federally funded projects must be included in these documents to be constructed from 2000 – 2003.

**Tues., April 6, 5:30 p.m.**
**Public hearing on the "150 percent cut list"**
Metro Regional Center
Council Chamber
600 NE Grand Ave., Portland
Oral testimony will be taken.
Please limit your testimony to three (3) minutes.
Tri-Met bus route 6 or take light rail to the Oregon Convention Center MAX station

**Tues., May 4, 5:30 p.m.**
**Public hearing on the final funding recommendation**
Metro Regional Center
Council Chamber
600 NE Grand Ave., Portland
Oral testimony will be taken.
Please limit your testimony to three (3) minutes.
Tri-Met bus route 6 or take light rail to the Oregon Convention Center MAX station

All Metro meetings are A.D.A. accessible. Devices for the hearing impaired and language translation, including signing, are available with 48 hours advance notice. Please call Metro at (503) 797-1866 or T.D.D. (503) 797-1804 to request any of these services.

**Who are the decision-makers?**
Transportation funding decisions require the approval of the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council and require the concurrence of the Oregon Transportation Commission. JPACT is a 17-member committee of local elected officials and representatives of local, regional and state agencies.

**What is Priorities 2000?**
Approximately $75.8 million of federal flexible funding is available for transportation projects in our region from 2000 through 2003. Local governments, Tri-Met and the Port of Portland have submitted 150 transportation projects, that have a total cost of more than $300 million, to Metro for funding consideration.

The Metro Council and JPACT are seeking public input through the Priorities 2000 process to determine how these funds should be used. A public comment period was held from Feb. 8 – March 22, 1999. The public hearings listed on this notice will complete the public outreach process.

**What is the 150 percent cut list?**
The projects submitted to Metro for consideration have been evaluated and ranked based on how well they meet regional goals for each mode of travel. Based on this technical scoring, as well as other factors such as whether there is a past regional commitment to a project or whether significant matching funds are being offered, the list of projects has been pared down to a set of project priorities that would cost approximately 150 percent of the funds available. Based on public input on this list, a final funding recommendation will be developed.

**How can I get more information?**
If you have questions or would like to request information in advance of the hearings call Metro's transportation hotline, (503) 797-1900 option #3, or contact Metro via e-mail at: trans@metro.dst.or.us.
Priorities 2000 Project Selection Schedule

22-May-98  Public notification to kick-off process
23-Jun-98  Public hearing on draft criteria
16-Oct-98  Deadline for local governments to submit projects
Oct – Feb  Technical ranking of projects
8-Feb-99   Public comment period begins
23-Feb-99  Public workshop with ODOT (in Portland): Comment on technical and administrative factors
27-Feb-99  Open house (in Hillsboro) – distribute information to public
17-Mar-99  Public workshop with ODOT (in Oregon City) – Comment on technical and administrative factors
22-Mar-99  Public comment period ends
26-Mar-99  TPAC: review/approve 150% cut list
6-Apr-99   JPACT/Transportation Planning Committee public hearing on 150% cut list
            5:30 p.m., Council Chamber, Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand, Portland
8-Apr-99   JPACT/Metro Council Review/Approve 150% cut list
20-Apr-99  Transportation Planning Committee review
30-Apr-99  TPAC Approval of Program Recommendation
4-May-99   JPACT/Transportation Planning Committee public hearing on program recommendation – 5:30 p.m., Council Chamber, Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand, Portland
13-May-99  JPACT consideration of program approval
27-May-99  Metro Council consideration of program approval