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MEETING: JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

DATE: December 14, 2000

DAY: Thursday

TIME: 7:30 a.m.

PLACE: Metro Conference Room 370A & B

1. Call to Order and Declaration of a Quorum.

* 2. Minutes of November 9, 2000, JPACT meeting – APPROVAL REQUESTED

* 3. Resolution (Ref. No. 1479) – For the Purpose of Amending the MTIP to Approve Tri-Met’s FY 01 Appropriation – APPROVAL REQUESTED – Andy Cotugno

** 4. FY 02-05 MTIP Process, Schedule and Criteria – Public Release – APPROVAL REQUESTED – Andy Cotugno

5. South Corridor Transportation Alternatives Study – INFORMATIONAL – Richard Brandman/Ross Roberts

6. PDX Master Plan and Access – INFORMATIONAL – Chris Corich and Scott King, Port of Portland

7. Bi-State Transportation Meeting with State Legislators – INFORMATIONAL – Rod Monroe

8. Adjourn

* Material available electronically. Please call 503-797-1755 for a copy.

** Not all material on this agenda item is available electronically.

All material will be available at the meeting.
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December 7, 2000

SECOND NOTICE

To JPACT Agenda Mailing List of Interested Persons:

As I mentioned in my letter to you in last month’s JPACT agenda mailing, we are working to reduce costs pertaining to this and future agendas each month. If I have not heard from you by December 31, 2000, your name will be removed from my contact list.

Please note that you may continue to receive any material you have received in the past; you must, however, let me know that you wish to do so. Also, please keep in mind that we are attempting to reduce paper usage (including envelopes and labels), staff time and postage. For this month only:

1. You will receive an electronic copy of this month’s agenda and any agenda materials that are available electronically. If any agenda material is not available electronically and you wish to receive that as well, you can call and a copy will be mailed to you. Please keep in mind that all agenda material will be available at the meeting.

   If you have received this agenda by e-mail, you will automatically receive it by e-mail in the future unless you are no longer interested and tell me to remove your name.

2. If we do not have an e-mail address for you:
   a. Please provide me with your e-mail address. You will then receive a complete agenda packet by e-mail (as in 1., above).
   b. Please notify me that you are unable to receive electronic mail. You will receive a copy of the agenda page by mail, and can call if you would like other agenda items mailed to you.
   c. As stated above, if I don’t hear from you by December 31st, we will remove your name from our mailing list.

You may contact me via e-mail at barker@metro.dst.or.us or you may call me at 503-797-1755. Thank you for contribution to our cost- and labor-saving effort!

Sincerely,

Rooney Barker, JPACT Recording Secretary
Metro Transportation Department
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MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: November 9, 2000

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jon Kvistad, Chair
Serena Cruz, alternate
Rob Drake
Fred Hansen
Bill Kennemer
Jim Kight
Annette Liebe, alternate
Dave Lohman, alternate
Rod Monroe
Karl Rohde
Kay Van Sickel
Don Wagner
Ed Washington

GUESTS PRESENT: Jadual Waktu Ada
Martha Bennett
Clark Berry
David Bragdon
Victoria Brown
Judy Edwards
Ed Immel
Gary Katsion
Susie Lahsene
Stephan Lashbrook
Tony Mendoza
Ron Papsdorf
Lynn Peterson
Dave Williams
Ross Williams
Marc Zolton

AFFILIATION: Metro
Multnomah County
City of Beaverton, representing Cities of Washington County
Tri-Met
Clackamas County
City of Troutdale, representing Cities of Multnomah County
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Port of Portland
Metro
City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas County
Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
Bangladesh State Railway
City of Milwaukie
Washington County
Presiding Officer, Metro Council
Tualatin TMA/Tualatin Chamber of Commerce
Westside Transportation Alliance
ODOT - Rail
TPAC Citizen Member
Port of Portland
City of Wilsonville
Tri-Met
City of Gresham
Tri-Met
ODOT
Citizens for Sensible Transportation/CLF
Commissioner Charles Hales’ Office, City of Portland

STAFF:
Andy Cotugno
Mike Hoglund

AFFILIATION: Richard Brandman
John Houser
Bill Barber
Rooney Barker

SUMMARY:
The meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Chair Kvistad at 7:35 a.m.
MEETING REPORT:

Action taken: Councilor Rohde moved, with a second by Councilor Kight, to approve the meeting report of October 19, 2000. Councilor Rohde asked that his question to Councilor Monroe regarding the Bi-State Committee be included in the discussion on p. 14. The following sentence was added: Councilor Rohde asked if they were being allowed to take on so much work that it would allow them to compete with JPACT. The motion passed unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 00-3001 FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE FY 2000-03 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) IN INCLUDE $3,443,122 OF CMAQ FUNDS FOR HIGH-SPEED RAIL TRACK IMPROVEMENTS IN THE PORTLAND AREA

Mr. Cotugno gave a brief explanation of the resolution, as stated in the staff report. He then introduced Mr. Ed Immel of ODOT. Mr. Immel said this is a request to match a laundry list of other funds that are available to do track and signal work in southeast Portland. ODOT has looked at the rail corridor from the Oregon/Washington border down to Eugene, and divided it up into thirteen projects; these projects are needed in order to reduce running time to one hour and 55 minutes. One project has been completed – one of the biggest bottlenecks, north of Union Station. The second biggest bottleneck is in southeast Portland. Signaling systems and tracks that only work in one direction need to be fixed as they severely limit the number of trains that can be put in that corridor. The total project expense is $13.2 million. Of that, the Union Pacific Railroad is contributing $5.1 million, and other funds are available from ODOT for the High-Speed program. When the project is complete, there will be a double-track, reverse-signal railroad all the way from Albina Yard to Milwaukie Avenue. The major benefits of this project are that it will allow trains to move on time, and freight trains will be able to move much faster through southeast Portland, their time possibly cut in half. The running time between Albina and Brooklyn Yards will also be reduced from approximately 37 minutes to approximately 10 minutes. This will be a major fix for the rail system in Portland.

In response to a question from Councilor Rohde regarding the project’s timeline, Mr. Immel said they are in engineering now and hope to have construction started in spring 2001, taking about twelve months. The delay, he said, is the signaling parts, that the signaling industry can only move so fast. Saying he was strongly supportive of this, Mr. Hansen asked Mr. Cotugno if, when CMAQ funds are available for OTC to allocate within the region and obviously reflected in the MTIP, what would happen if there were a disagreement. Mr. Cotugno said we could reject these funds which would mean they wouldn’t be able to be spent on these projects in the region. It would be a deadlock. These funds are not controlled by a formula allocation, but OTC’s decision.

Commissioner Kennemer said Clackamas County was fairly excited about these upcoming improvements and the fact that they will soon have an Amtrak station in Oregon City. He said, however, that they were concerned about some serious grade crossing problems, the most
notorious being Lynnwood/Harmony with a probably $10 million overpass price tag. He reiterated the County’s support of the rail project.

Action taken: Councilor Rohde moved, with a second by Mr. Hansen, to approve Resolution No. 00-3001. The motion passed unanimously. (Mayor Drake was not present for this vote.) Chair Kvistad thanked Mr. Immel for sharing his knowledge and expertise with the committee.

RESOLUTION NO. 00-2999 FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING THE AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY DETERMINATION FOR THE 2000 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Mr. Cotugno reminded the committee that in August, when the 2000 RTP was adopted, it was subject to demonstrating that it conformed with air quality standards. This has not been submitted for approval to the federal government yet; with this resolution in place, that submission can take place. Demonstration of air quality conformity involves a number of pieces, he said, one being the estimate of vehicle emissions for different milestone years between now and 2020 to ensure that projects in the RTP will stay under the budgeted emission level assigned to the Transportation Sector of the State Implementation Plan. We also have to show we’re making progress on the transportation control measures. Both those things are demonstrated in this resolution. This is the first major overhaul of RTP air quality conformity that we’ve done in three or four years. We’ve done a series of amendments over that time – Interstate MAX, Airport MAX, Washington County Commuter Rail – each one was an amendment to the old air quality conformity which was based on the RTP adopted in 1995. The new RTP 2000 is substantially different and this is the first time we’ve done the air quality conformity that now gives us the confidence that all those things do stay within those limits. Given the fiscally constrained level of funding in the RTP, this is a demonstration that if we build those projects that we will stay within the air quality limits. Clearly, we have adopted a plan that says we want to go farther than that, so for local purposes we’ve also done an analysis to ensure the priority RTP (formerly strategic) system stays within the limits as well.

We’ve only done the one level at the fiscally constrained level with all of those projects, and then the second level with all the additional projects associated with the priority RTP. If individual projects get funded over the next few years and need to be added to the fiscally constrained, then we’ll need to determine the air quality impact of those individual projects. The system as a whole, if we do everything in the priority, would meet the air quality standards but an individual project might not.

The subarea emission estimates still need to be inserted into the plan, so Mr. Cotugno asked the committee to give staff the latitude to submit those later, for the winter carbon monoxide. He said there would be no submission to the federal government until those are included.

Councilor Monroe asked Mr. Cotugno to verify his understanding that if we did just the fiscally constrained programs, then we meet air quality standards twenty years out. If we did everything in the strategic, we meet air quality standards twenty years out. But if we did the fiscally constrained and some selective projects from the strategic, then we’d have to double check those
because what we have is a balance and some of the projects would possibly add some pollution, some would reduce pollution. If we pick and choose, we might not be in balance. Mr. Cotugno told Councilor Monroe that his understanding was correct.

Mr. Hansen said his understanding of the “extra room” in the fiscally constrained was not much, that we were just bumping against the lid. He asked if his perception was accurate. Mr. Cotugno replied that on three of the four pollutants we had a fairly good cushion, and on the fourth we didn’t, but were very close (NO$_x$ associated with summertime smog). Mr. Hanson then said that within the fiscally constrained there were some assumptions being made that there would be funds to do the projects, and some of those funds were not yet identified. Mr. Cotugno said the fiscally constrained, being very conservative, was based upon adopted state and local funding sources and an inflationary component on the federal resources, but not major increases. Of the federal resources, he said, it’s based upon only a portion of the federal resources being spent on expansion. Mr. Hansen said his question was perhaps moot in the sense that there were sufficient dollars under no change whatsoever at the state or local level. His concern was that if we aren’t able to make everything within the fiscally constrained system, how we would manage that relative to conformity. He asked if we would have to go back to reevaluate at period times or how it would work. Every three years it had to be redemonstrated, Mr. Cotugno said.

Councilor Washington asked what kind of public participation was received during the 30-day public comment period. He wondered who had been heard from, or if anyone had called. Mr. Hoglund said there had been a Port of Portland comment and a few questions. Councilor Washington, not meaning to be funny, asked if we had any citizens coming down and knocking on the doors. He said we always have public comment periods but does the public really comment. Mr. Hoglund said they do in other areas, but haven’t in the Portland area on conformity.

Ms. Liebe said when the next conformity was done she’d like to get the subarea analysis for carbon monoxide as part of the adoption package.

Councilor Washington said he understood the process for public comment, and that many times we make a big deal of public involvement, but in many cases there is none. He said he thought there should be some other way to solicit this. We assume most people will go along but a lot of them don’t. Mr. Hansen said he appreciates Councilor Washington’s comments. As he’s watched the public’s involvement over the years, he said, he’s seen the tendency for them to comment not on the conformity determination but on the issue(s) of the individual projects and their popularity or lack thereof on an ongoing basis. He said he felt this was more of a technical review, and this was a very serious issue across the nation, to ensure that if the projects aren’t able to achieve conformity the whole process must begin again. Essentially EPA is the keeper of that and can veto the conformity. It becomes a big issue, but primarily as a technical review that looks at the conglomeration of all of the projects that will all come out of the fiscally constrained system.

Mr. Cotugno said the biggest reason for the public comment requirement being added, which was instigated by the air quality advocacy groups at the national level, is that the process for
estimating emissions is a very detailed one, it’s difficult to penetrate, hard to break down. Only a few technicians can make the decisions and assumptions. The public can examine it, and it does get examined.

Ms. Liebe added that Metro is one of the leaders in the technical analysis process, and many advocacy groups recognize the expertise and leadership in the modeling field that Metro demonstrates.

Action taken: Ms. Liebe moved, with a second by Commissioner Kennemer, to approve Resolution No. 00-2999. The motion passed unanimously.

FY 2002-05 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP): RECOMMENDED PROCESS FOR PUBLIC REVIEW

Mr. Cotugno said he would like to continue the discussion the committee began at their meeting last month, where TPAC was looking for feedback and direction. The MTIP issues include whether to look at a few big projects or more small projects, and whether to consider freeway oriented projects, whether to stick with the old list or open it up to new possible projects. On a few of these issues, TPAC had some recommendations, starting on page 2 of the November 2 memo to JPACT, and there were some areas where TPAC didn’t have recommendations and these would need to be settled within the next few months. The memo outlined TPAC’s suggestions and provided feedback to this committee. The second paragraph included the revenue estimates for the 2002-05 MTIP.

Regarding the criteria, TPAC has suggested we stay with the criteria used last time. Other factors that may be relevant but that aren’t shown in the criteria need to be looked at as well, he said, such as leveraging, past commitments, etc. TPAC felt the 150% list was a reasonable starting place but not necessarily a reasonable ending place. They felt there should be some cautious consideration of additional projects rather than substituting, and allowance to some jurisdictions for submitting additional applications. The area where we still have no conclusion is big projects vs. small projects.

It was suggested at the TIP subcommittee, Mr. Hoglund added, that projects submitted for addition be limited to what’s in the financially constrained RTP, unless a project has funding. Mr. Hansen said at the last discussion, he, Councilor Rohde and Commissioner Hales were concerned that more dollars would be spent to achieve the conformity determination and not actually end up in the projects. Mr. Cotugno said the staff cost of running a conformity determination is not insignificant, and Mr. Hansen said that was what he wanted to underscore. Since there are limited dollars, he wanted to make sure actual benefit was received.

Councilor Rohde said he’d put a placeholder in his mind to relook at the criteria and look at the alternative modes. Understanding that there are few dollars available that can actually go toward alternative modes in this state, he had hoped the criteria could be looked at and discussed. Mr. Cotugno said it could be brought back for discussion at the next meeting.
From the audience, Councilor Bragdon had a question to the committee regarding asking the jurisdictions if the projects on the 150% list are still what they want. Mr. Cotugno responded that once the process is adopted, that will be laid out – whatever the timelines, application procedures, criteria, etc. – whatever process this body decides. In the past, the application is required to come from the sponsoring jurisdiction and they have been required to demonstrate that they’ve met Metro’s public involvement requirements.

Mayor Drake said the 150% list was the result of a great deal of work. It defined the region’s priorities, and barring some slight modifications due to a change of something that’s already on the list, he was very reluctant to open the process up again. The list wasn’t that old, and he would like to stay the course.

Commissioner Cruz thought if the jurisdictions were asked to stay within some level of constraint and to reprioritize, it would not open the floodgates but would require reexamination of projects and possible reprioritization. Mr. Cotugno said this was TPAC’s philosophy, but there may be changes in priorities.

Mr. Hansen said he wanted to take one step back from the projects that will have to be evaluated. He said the level of dollars needed to be pinned down, that the CMAQ dollars are clearly federally constrained and can be used only for those things that will improve air quality. For the STP dollars, which essentially are the flexible dollars, he said these have always been used for alternative transportation efforts, not necessarily road projects. Mr. Cotugno clarified that they’ve been used for arterial widening, freight access, bridge rehab, boulevard projects, and Mr. Hansen agreed, saying they were used for things that further the 2040 goals. He then said that even though this is a constrained setting, Mr. Cotugno had pointed out that the committee needed to look at both the federal priorities as well as whatever may be the agenda at the state level. Mr. Hansen urged the committee to not abandon the approach they’ve always used for STP dollars within the region, and to keep their focus on the long-term 2040 goals. He said if the broader framework is kept in mind, it will help the region get the type of projects it ought to have.

Mr. Cotugno, prompted by Councilor Rohde, addressed the Transportation Budget Review sheet (salmon colored) which the committee had requested at last month’s meeting. The Budget Review sheet provided a five-year history of the different parts of the Metro Planning program with the personnel and the resources available as well. Last month, the committee looked at the Unified Work Program portion that keyed into the dollars listed in the last column on this sheet, the current fiscal year. He pointed out that the FTE (full-time employee) number has been scaled down over the past five years working on the various planning programs, and the dollars have been scaled down as well. Another question that was raised, and he said he doesn’t have the answer ready yet, was how much was being spent on projects on the ground vs. how much was being spent on planning, preliminary engineering and environmental work that was intended to get projects ready. Mr. Hansen asked if the cutting back meant losing the capacity to do the quality of work that’s always been done. Mr. Cotugno said his staff hadn’t run into that problem yet as junior staff was where the cuts were, but he was worried that the Materials and Services were very thin. Long-term growth would be limited, however, by losing junior staff.
Chair Kvistad briefly mentioned the November 9th memo sent to committee members and their alternates, reminding those present to respond as to their preference in how they receive their agenda material each month.

TRI-MET TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT PROGRAM SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT

Mr. Tony Mendoza of Tri-Met opened his presentation by saying two years ago there were questions on what was going on in Transportation Demand Management, so now JPACT and TPAC are updated approximately every six months. A copy of Mr. Mendoza's presentation is included in this record.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 a.m. by Vice-Chair Rod Monroe.

Respectfully submitted,

Rooney Barker
Recording Secretary
CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 01-__ FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) TO APPROVE TRI-MET'S FY 01 APPROPRIATIONS

DATE: November 16, 2000
Presented by: Mike Hoglund

PROPOSED ACTION:
This resolution would amend the MTIP to approve obligation of new federal funds appropriated to five Tri-Met sponsored projects in FY 01. The projects include the Interstate MAX LRT extension, construction of the Milwaukie Transit Center, Wilsonville to Beaverton Commuter Rail design, improvement of the Pioneer Courthouse Visitor Center/Tri-Met Information Office, and ongoing support for the Tri-Met Jobs Access program.

EXISTING LEGISLATION
Federal regulations stipulate that federal transportation funds appropriated under the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) must be included in an approved, conformed, financially constrained MTIP before they can be obligated.

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS
The MTIP currently approves obligation of various Tri-Met projects that rely on federal funding. The FY 01 Congressional appropriation allocates a variety of funds for ongoing support for several of these projects. Under federal planning regulations, the additional funds must be included in the MTIP before FTA can approve grants submitted by Tri-Met to access the federal funds. All the projects addressed in this resolution have been previously endorsed and the resolution deals only with approval of newly appropriated dollars. The projects and new funds are shown in Exhibit A of the resolution.

The most significant appropriation is $7.5 million of Section 5309 New Start funds for the Interstate MAX LRT extension project. These funds are the first installment of appropriations established in the Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) between the region and FTA. The total FFGA amount is for $257.5 million of New Start funding.

The second appropriation addressed in this action is $1.5 million of Section 5309 funds for construction of the Milwaukie Transit Center. This appropriation was anticipated in Metro Resolution No. 00-2980A, which:

1) approved obligation of up to $4.0 million of federal funds for construction of the Milwaukie Transit Center;
2) approved reallocation of $1.5 million of funds left over from the PSU Transit Center to the Milwaukie project; and
3) programmed $650,000 of Section 5309 funds appropriated to the project in FY 00.
Total federal funds now appropriated to the Milwaukie Transit Center is therefore $3.65 million. Under Metro Resolution No. 00-2980A, another $350,000 of future federal appropriations to the project are authorized for obligation. This resolution addresses the FY 01 appropriation for information purposes only.

The third appropriation is another $1.0 million of Section 5309 New Start funds for design of the Wilsonville to Beaverton Commuter Rail project. These funds supplement $1.0 million of regional STP funds allocated in the FY 2000 MTIP for environmental analysis of the project and $500,000 of New Start funds appropriated to the project in FY 00. Conformity of the project recently received joint FHWA/FTA approval. With the current funds, total federal funds allocated to the project come to $2.5 million.

The fourth appropriation is $400,000 of Section 104, Transportation and Community and System Preservation program funds for enhancement of the Pioneer Courthouse Square Information Office shared by Tri-Met and the Portland Oregon Visitors Association (POVA). Regional funds to begin the improvement were approved in the FY 2000 MTIP. These funds enable completion of the Information Center reconstruction to fully accommodate both programs in the building.

The fifth appropriation approved for programming in this resolution is the combination of FY 00 ($850,000) and FY 01 ($1,840,000) Section 3037 funds for Tri-Met’s Jobs Access and Reverse Commute Program. These funds have a 50 percent local match. The program objectives were approved in June 1999 by Metro Resolution No. 99-2799A. In general, the program objectives are to provide new, traditional transit services, social services outreach and allied non-traditional, non-SOV travel demand management strategies to address low income, employment-related transportation needs.

The Resolution, which also provided authority to program all subsequent Jobs Access appropriations to the program administratively. The current appropriations are therefore referenced in this resolution for information purposes only. Resolution 99-2799A, moved by the City of Gresham, also stipulates that TPAC and JPACT should revisit the program after the first year of appropriations to determine whether its expansion would be appropriate to include additional “transit hub” improvements. Federal appropriations to the program are running about $600,000 above sums so far requested by Tri-Met. This Resolution therefore approves amendment of the Jobs Access program to include a Rockwood Transit Hub in Gresham, or elsewhere, in light of the funding windfall. The current appropriations are referenced in this resolution for information purposes only. In general, the program objectives are to provide new, traditional transit services, social services outreach and allied non-traditional, non-SOV travel demand management strategies to address low income, employment-related transportation needs.

ADMINISTRATIVE CONSIDERATIONS

MTIP Financial Constraint. All funds addressed in this resolution have been appropriated and their inclusion in the MTIP maintains financial constraint of the MTIP.

Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Financially Constrained System. The Interstate MAX and Milwaukie Transit Center projects are included in the 2000 RTP as specific line item projects in the
financially constrained RTP project list. The Commuter Rail project was amended into the 1995 Financially Constrained network and is included in the 2000 RTP Financially Constrained network. The Pioneer Courthouse Square Project appropriation was not anticipated in the RTP but is encompassed within the RTP’s general identification and approval of regional TDM initiatives. The Tri-Met Jobs Access program is specifically endorsed in RTP Chapter 1.3.3, Policy 5.2. As program funds were approved in the MTIP prior to adoption of the RTP, funding is not identified as a future needed resource in the Financially Constrained System project list.

Conformity Status. The Interstate MAX and Wilsonville to Beaverton Commuter Rail projects are included in the financially constrained system used to conform the 1995 RTP, as amended, the FY 2000 MTIP, and the 2000 RTP (conformity pending). The Milwaukie Transit Center is exempt by rule, but its effect on local circulation in Milwaukie was modeled as part of both the approved 1995 RTP/2000 MTIP Conformity determination quantitative analysis and the 2000 RTP analysis, whose federal approval is pending. The Pioneer Courthouse Square Information Office is exempt by rule. The Jobs Access Program is new transit service and TDM activity and is also exempt by rule.

BUDGET IMPACT

None.
BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE ) RESOLUTION NO. 01-
METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION ) INTRODUCED BY
IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) TO ) COUNCILOR JON KVISTAD,
APPROVE TRI-MET'S FY 01 ) JPACT CHAIR
APPROPRIATIONS )

WHEREAS, The region has previously approved various Tri-Met sponsored projects and programs, including the IMAX LRT extension, the Milwaukie Transit Center, the Wilsonville to Beaverton Commuter Rail project, Pioneer Courthouse Information Center Reconstruction and the Tri-Met Jobs Access and Reverse Commute program, for obligation of federal funds in the MTIP; and

WHEREAS, Congress has approved support for these five projects in the FY 01 appropriations bill, for the amounts shown in Exhibit A of this Resolution; and

WHEREAS, Tri-Met grant applications to obligate the newly appropriated federal funds cannot be approved by FTA until the MTIP is amended to program the appropriations for obligation; and

WHEREAS, The current action merely adds money to currently approved projects; and

WHEREAS, All the projects are currently identified in a conformed, financially constrained MTIP and STIP; and

WHEREAS, Resolution 99-2799A conditioned approval of the Tri-Met’s Jobs Access Program to direct that TPAC and JPACT consider addition of new projects and transit hubs after the first year of the program; and

WHEREAS, Tri-Met and Gresham have been negotiating over the past year with respect to establishing a Rockwood Transit Hub as part of the program; and

WHEREAS, total three year appropriation to the Jobs Access program are nearly $600,000 in excess of the $3.0 million anticipated by Tri-Met (federal share); now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. The MTIP is amended to approve obligation of the project sums shown in Exhibit A.

2. The Executive Officer is authorized to request amendment of the STIP to reflect this action and to coordinate administrative details with staff of ODOT, Tri-Met and others.
3. Amendment of the Jobs Access program, in light of higher than anticipated program revenues, to establish a Rockwood Transit Hub, or such other transit hubs as may be deemed by Tri-Met to be viable and consistent with the Jobs Access program, is approved, contingent on a report to TPAC and JPACT regarding any such adopted revisions.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this ___ day of _____________, 2001.

__________________________, Presiding Officer

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, General Counsel
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## Tri-Met FY 01 Appropriations
(Including FY 00 Jobs Access Program Funds)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>FUND TYPE</th>
<th>MATCH RATIO</th>
<th>WORK PHASE</th>
<th>FEDERAL DOLLARS</th>
<th>TOTAL DOLLARS</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMAX LRT Extension</td>
<td>5309</td>
<td>0.7966</td>
<td>capital</td>
<td>$7,500,000</td>
<td>$9,415,014</td>
<td>FY 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukie Transit Center</td>
<td>5309</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>capital</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,875,000</td>
<td>FY 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilsonville to Beaverton Commuter Rail</td>
<td>5309</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>capital</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>FY 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Square Information Center</td>
<td>TCSP</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>capital</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>FY 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs Access Program FY 00</td>
<td>3037</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>capital</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td>FY 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs Access Program FY 01</td>
<td>3037</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>capital</td>
<td>$1,840,000</td>
<td>$3,680,000</td>
<td>FY 01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the December 14 meeting, JPACT is scheduled to approve the release of the public review draft of the process and project selection criteria that apply to the development of the 2002-2005 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). Release of that information for a 30 day public review period is now tentatively scheduled for December 18, 2000. Action on approving the process and initiating a solicitation of projects is tentatively scheduled for mid-January, at the conclusion of public review. Tentative dates for these actions and a proposed schedule for the full MTIP process is attached.

This memorandum summarizes the key procedural and policy discussions that have been discussed to date and highlights remaining or new issues that warrant JPACT and Metro Council attention before materials can be released for public review. Those remaining or new issues are highlighted in **bold and italics** and are recommended for discussion at the December 14 meeting. JPACT members may, of course, raise any other issues related to the process.

Also attached for your review are the criteria used from the last MTIP update. JPACT and the Metro Council have generally concurred that the existing criteria should again be applied, but a few modifications have been suggested. Those modifications are discussed below.

**Background**

Funding in FY 02 and FY 03 has already been allocated in the current MTIP (FY 2000-2003). The current update is concerned with adjusting the first two years of programming, and allocating new funding expected in FY 04 and FY 05. About $25-$38 million is anticipated to be available.
Of this amount, approximately $10-$15 million will be CMAQ funds which are generally limited to alternative mode projects which improve air quality, and $15-$23 million will be STP funds, which are available to all projects.

Issues and Guidance

2002-2005 MTIP Goals. Program goals have been recommended in order to provide a clear direction for the process and the program. Recommended goals are:

- Establish a clear, simple, and understandable process that minimizes procedural hurdles while maintaining broad-based citizen participation.
- Fund the most critical projects that provide a clear public benefit.
- Emphasize projects and programs that most efficiently manage demand and enhance the operation of the existing transportation infrastructure. Look for low-cost projects that have large benefits.
- Continue to allocate funds to implement the 2040 Growth Concept.
- Consider funding logical project phases or projects that complete an obvious gap in the system. This includes projects where preliminary engineering (PE) has previously been allocated.
- Emphasize project implementation either through direct funding or leveraging other potential revenue sources.
- Support projects that can be delivered in the timeframe of the FY 2002-2005 STIP.

Criteria and Project Ranking. JPACT and the Metro Council Transportation Committee have previously recommended that the ranking criteria remain the same as they were for the last allocation. However, the 150% list projects may need to be re-ranked and any new projects must be ranked. The existing criteria are attached for review. JPACT specifically asked to review the criteria and the project selection process. Finally, an environmental justice (EJ) review of the proposed program will be required. Metro staff will provide a method and the information to address EJ concerns prior to project selection phase of the MTIP.

Specifically, two requests to modify the criteria have been made and warrant JPACT discussion:

- *Revise the technical ranking point system to increase the number of points for “2040 Support” from 40 to 60 out of a possible 100. Conversely, reduce the other categories (effectiveness, cost/benefit, safety) from 60 to 40.*
- *Add to the administrative criteria the results of Metro’s culvert inventory to determine if a project modifies a key culvert related to endangered salmon or steelhead.*
- *Consider a method to recognize the truck (freight?) benefits of projects.*

The first revision is intended to strengthen the policy choice that the flexible federal funds allocated through this process are primarily intended to leverage the implementation the 2040.
Growth Concept. The policy choice recognizes other funds (local, state, and other federal) are available for other aspects of the transportation system.

The second revision recognizes that better information is now available to discern projects that are “fish friendly.”

**Priorities 2000 150% List.** This issue remains unchanged from last month. The recommendation is to utilize the “150%” list from the last allocation process. Approximately $42 million worth of projects from around the region were highly ranked, yet un-funded. TPAC has suggested that those projects be considered a “base” package, including Preliminary Engineering (PE) phases of projects that were funded from the last process. JPACT and the Metro Council Transportation Committee have previously concurred with TPAC and recommended that 2002-2005 MTIP allocation should first consider the un-funded 150% list that resulted from the 2000-2003 MTIP process.

**New Projects.** This issue has been further defined from last month. JPACT and the Metro Council Transportation Committee have previously recommend that opportunities for new projects to the 150% list be “cautiously” allowed as “adds.” Also, any new projects should come from the Financially Constrained System of the 2000 RTP or been the result of a recently completed planning activity (e.g., the Gateway Regional Center Plan). Substitute projects should also meet or exceed Metro’s requirements for public involvement.

The general guidelines for adding new projects are:

- Limit the overall dollar amount and number of candidate projects in order to keep the program manageable.
- Maintain flexibility to add or drop projects based on local and regional priorities or to address changing conditions and current needs.

Generally, new or substitute projects may be submitted on behalf of eligible sponsors from the following agencies or jurisdictional groups:

- Metro
- Tri-Met
- DEQ
- ODOT
- Port of Portland
- City of Portland
- Washington County and its cities
- Clackamas County and its cities
- Multnomah County and its cities
Two new policy recommendations were discussed at TPAC to further clarify submission of new projects.

- **Projects must be submitted with an accompanying letter documenting the approval action of an eligible jurisdiction's elected council or from an agency's council or board.**
- **A “cautious” submittal of additional projects has been defined as a net of two new projects plus a few lower-cost projects if projects are removed from the existing 150% list.**

The first request, to require a letter of documentation, is to ensure adequate and open discussion of the project submittals by elected or appointed officials and the public. The second change defines “cautious” and allows for low-cost/big-bang projects to be added without penalty. While not defined by TPAC, “a few lower-cost projects” would imply perhaps not more than three projects that total no more than $500,000.

**Limited Access Highways.** At their November meeting, JPACT indicated a preference for not funding projects on limited access highways (freeways). TPAC asked for clarification as to whether this constituted a restriction on freeway-related preliminary engineering (PE), freeway interchange projects or freeway projects admitted by local governments as one of their few allowed “add” projects. TPAC recommended:

- **Freeway-related Preliminary Engineering, interchange construction or expansion projects submitted by local governments as one of their few allowed added projects be considered through this allocation process.**

**Big Projects v. Small Projects.** Past allocations have generally funded projects that are less than $6 million, even when resources have been greater. The alternative is to spread the money to smaller projects or do a combination program of various project sizes. TPAC again recommends remaining flexible on this issue, meaning to allow locals to decide their own priorities. JPACT has previously concurred with TPAC and has suggested remaining flexible on this issue. It seems there is interest in seeing the potential differences between a number of medium sized projects compared to an approach similar to what was done for the 2000-2003 MTIP where money was allocated primarily to smaller projects. Such an alternative can be developed during the program development phase of this effort.

As noted, following JPACT and Metro Transportation Committee discussion on these issues, a packet summarizing the process recommendations for comment will be prepared and distributed. An actual process proposal, including the final criteria and a solicitation packet, is tentatively scheduled for JPACT and the Metro Council action in January. Metro is scheduled to solicit for projects from mid-January to March 1.
The table identifies proposed milestones related to the 2002-2005 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program update. All dates are tentative and subject to change. Please call the Metro Hotline at 797-1900, option 3, or the Metro web site at www.metro-region.org for updated times and dates for hearings and meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tentative Schedule</th>
<th>Milestone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 25, 2000</td>
<td>Public Notification to Kick-Off Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 18, 2000</td>
<td>Initiate 30-day Public Review on Process and Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 5, 2000</td>
<td>Proposed TPAC Action on Process and Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 16, 2001</td>
<td>Proposed Public Hearing on Criteria; Close Public Review Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 18, 2001</td>
<td>Proposed JPACT and Metro Council Action on Criteria and Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 19-March 2, 2001</td>
<td>Project Solicitation Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2001</td>
<td>Rank Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2001</td>
<td>Release Technical Ranking and Draft Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April/May 2001</td>
<td>Public Outreach/Program Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1, 2001</td>
<td>TPAC Recommendation on Final Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2001</td>
<td>Proposed Public Hearings and JPACT/Metro Council Adoption on Funding Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2001</td>
<td>- Air Quality Conformity Public Review and Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- OTC Submittal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Final Action on 2002-2005 Full MTIP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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*This table does not reflect a joint schedule in cooperation with ODOT's development of the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). As that information becomes available, the table will be revised. However, as has occurred in the past, in order to simplify information review and outreach opportunities, the MTIP and STIP development processes will be combined to the degree possible.
BOULEVARD DESIGN
TECHNICAL CRITERIA

I. 2040 IMPLEMENTATION

Goal: Support implementation of 2040 priority land uses. (40 points)

See 2040 Criteria at end.

II. EFFECTIVENESS

1. Goal: Implement design elements that will help to reduce automobile speeds along boulevard segments, with a goal of reducing speeds to 25 miles per hour, or less. (10 points)

   1. Current lane widths are narrowed? Yes □ No □
   2. Curb extensions/"squeeze points" are constructed? Yes □ No □
   3. On-street parking is permitted? Yes □ No □
   4. Corner turn radii are engineered for slower turn movements? Yes □ No □
   5. Pedestrian crossings are increased Yes □ No □
   6. Pedestrian crossings are demarcated with distinct texture/color/platform treatment? Yes □ No □
   7. Signals re-timed to progress at slower than current speeds? Yes □ No □
   8. Travel or turn lanes are eliminated? Yes □ No □
   9. Other element? (relate to street design guidelines). Yes □ No □

Scoring:

   4+ design elements 10 points
   3 design elements 7 points
   2 design elements 3 points
   1 design element 0 points

2. Goal: Implement appropriate design elements to enhance alternative modes of travel along Boulevard segments.

   a. Sidewalks will be widened. (5 points) Yes □ No □

Ranking Objective: Achieve optimum sidewalk width of at least 10 feet on all boulevards. Points are reallocated to other criteria where existing sidewalk width is greater than or equal to ten feet.

Proposed Methodology: candidate projects that are constrained by narrow right of way may obtain full 5 points upon demonstration that all practical means are employed to maximize sidewalk widths including:
narrowing travel lanes and center median, elimination of on-street parking on one or both sides of the street and transfer of bike facilities to parallel facility.

b. Additional Enhancements. (10 points)

1. Are transit amenities provided? Yes □ No □
2. Is a landscape buffer provided? Yes □ No □
3. Are pedestrian refuges (curb extensions) installed at crossings? Yes □ No □
4. Is a raised pedestrian refuge in a median installed? Yes □ No □
5. Are bike lanes added (on or parallel to facility)? Yes □ No □
6. Are obstructions (e.g., utilities) removed from the primary pedestrian-way? Yes □ No □
7. Are street amenities provided? (e.g., benches, pedestrian scale decorative lights, railings, statuary, brick pavers, etc.) Yes □ No □
8. Other Factors? (relate to street design guidelines) Yes □ No □

Scoring:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4+ elements</th>
<th>10 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 elements</td>
<td>7 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 elements</td>
<td>3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 element</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. COST EFFECTIVENESS

Goal: Implement maximum feasible, highest priority boulevard design elements at lowest cost. (15 points)

Ranking Objective: Determine project cost per mile and divide result by sum of effectiveness points.

Example:

1. ¼ mile of improvement @ $100,000 = $400,000/mile of improvement.
2. Effectiveness points = $20,000 per “cost/effectiveness” point.
3. Allocate 15/7/0 points to low/medium/high-cost thirds.
IV. SAFETY

Goal: Enhance safety of alternative modes within Boulevard design classifications that are most hazardous, especially to pedestrian travel, through design elements that reduce speed of motor vehicles, increase driver awareness of non-motorized traffic, and promote higher density, mixed use development.

a) Ranking Objective: assess existing characteristics of motor vehicle right of way. Identify existence of features listed below which pose greatest hazard to alternative travel modes. Project proposal should specify corrections which should benefit alternative travel modes rather than restrict them. (10 points)

Project includes actions to correct the following safety problems:
1. 5 lanes
2. 12 ft lane width, or greater
3. speed > 40 mph (noon/off-peak)
4. no pedestrian refuge
5. more than 330 feet between marked pedestrian crossings
6. poor vertical delineation of pedestrian-way (e.g., no curb, intermittent curb, numerous driveways, substandard width, occluded by utility infrastructure, etc.).
7. Other considerations (e.g., SPIS data; high incidence of pedestrian/bicycle injuries, etc.)

Scoring:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5+</td>
<td>10 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Ranking Objective: Identify land use factors (other than expected increased of mixed use density) which promote/compel pedestrian/bike travel within the corridor. (10 points)

1. Transit corridor (4 points)
2. Regional bike system (3 points)
3. Within ¼ mile of a school, civic complex or cultural facilities (3 points)
## FY 2000 MTIP 2040 POINT ALLOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Access To:</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is a high proportion of travel on the</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hi</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Lo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project link seeking access to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Central City, Regional Centers,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Sanctuaries, Intermodal</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Station Areas, Town Centers, Main</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets, Corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employment Areas, Inner and Outer</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OR

| 2. Circulation Within:                 |        |          |          |          |
| Does a project improve mode           |        |          |          |          |
| appropriate circulation within:       |        |          |          |          |
| • Central City, Regional Centers,     |        |          |          |          |
| Industrial Sanctuaries, Intermodal    |        | 20       | 15       | 10       |
| Terminals                              |        |          |          |          |
| • Station Areas, Town Centers, Main    |        | 15       | 10       | 5        |
| Streets, Inner Neighborhoods           |        | 5        | 0        | 0        |
| • Employment Areas, Inner and Outer    |        |          |          |          |
| Neighborhoods                          |        |          |          |          |

AND

| 3. 2040 Target Density:                |        |          |          |          |
| Does the project serve an area        |        |          |          |          |
| projected in the 2040 Growth Concept  |        |          |          |          |
| to have a large increase of mixed     |        |          |          |          |
| use development between 1994 and 2020?|        |          |          |          |

| Change in Mixed Use Density 1994 to 2020: |        |          |          |          |
| High                                    |        | 20       |          |          |
| Med                                     |        | 10       |          |          |
| Low                                     |        | 0        |          |          |
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## FY 2000 MTIP 2040 POINT ALLOCATION FOR FREIGHT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Access To: Is the project located within Industrial Areas, Intermodal Facilities, Employment Areas:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intermodal rail yard, marine terminal, air cargo facility, truck terminal or distribution facility</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Industrial Area</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employment Areas with other industrial activity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• outside industrial area but providing access to</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Circulation Within: Does a project improve mode appropriate circulation within:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intermodal rail yard, marine terminal, air cargo facility, truck terminal or distribution facility</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Industrial Area</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employment Areas with other industrial activity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Employment Growth or Traded Sector Focus Does the project serve an area projected in the 2040 Growth Concept to have high growth of industrial employment between 1994 and 2020, or exhibit a high current focus on &quot;traded sector&quot; businesses?</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## FY 2000 MTIP Project Ranking Technical Criteria

### ATTACHMENT 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROAD MODERNIZATION</th>
<th>ROAD RECONSTRUCTION</th>
<th>BLVD. DESIGN</th>
<th>FREIGHT</th>
<th>PEDESTRIAN</th>
<th>BICYCLE</th>
<th>TOD</th>
<th>TRANSIT</th>
<th>TOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)</td>
<td>GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)</td>
<td>GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)</td>
<td>GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)</td>
<td>GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)</td>
<td>GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)</td>
<td>GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)</td>
<td>GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)</td>
<td>GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*8/28/98 Revised by JPACT 7/16/98*
**ATTACHMENT 1**

**FY 2000 MTIP/STIP PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS**

---

**STEP 1: PROJECT APPLICATION BY STATE, REGIONAL AND LOCAL JURISDICTIONS**

- Meet Street Design Guidelines
- Consistent With RTP Functional Classification Maps
- To Be Included in RTP "Strategic" Component
- Cost of Candidate Projects Constrained to Target of 3 Times Expected Revenue

**STEP 2: THRESHOLD CRITERIA**

- Support 2040
- GOAL: Safety (20 points)
  - Truck hours of delay reduced.
- GOAL: Reduce Delay of Freight (25 points)
  - Reasonable Cost (15 points)
- GOAL: Mobility at Reasonable Cost (25 points)
  - Cost/VMT reduced.
- GOAL: Reduce VMT at Reasonable Cost (25 points)
  - Cost per new patron.
- GOAL: Increase Modal Share (35 points)
  - Increase Non-SOV share.
  - Compare "Core" vs "Emerging" systems separately.
- GOAL: Increase Density (20 points)
  - Increase mixed use density.
- GOAL: Implement Blvd Design Elements (25 points)
  - Generate new walk trips.
  - Reduce bld hazard.
  - Increase density.
- GOAL: Upgrade To Urban Standard (15 points)
  - Eliminate flared street design elements.
- GOAL: Reduce Congestion (15 points)
  - Reduce VIC to improve LOS.
- GOAL: Improve high accident locations.
- GOAL: Implement Bird Design Elements for Least Cost (15 points)
  - Encourage Blvd street design elements.
- GOAL: Mobility at Reasonable Cost (15 points)
  - Reduce VIC to promote modal safety.

**STEP 3: TECHNICAL SCORE IS CALCULATED**

**RESULTS OF STEP 3: PROJECT LIST IS RANKED BY TECHNICAL SCORE**

**STEP 4: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ADDED THROUGH ADMINISTRATIVE CRITERIA**

- Is the candidate project the minimum logical phase?
- Is the project linked to another higher priority project?
- Is there local or private ownership?
- Is there a past regional commitment?
- Does the project include significant multi-modal benefits?
- Is there an affordable housing connection?
- What other factors are not reflected by the technical criteria?

**STEP 5: DRAFT FUNDING RECOMMENDATION FOR PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION BY J.PACT AND THE METRO COUNCIL**

---

**FUNDING AMOUNT AVAILABLE**

**BY STATE MOD, STP, CMAQ, TE, NHS, etc.**

**ALLOCATION CRITERIA**

- Multi-Modal Program
- Geographical Equity
- Support 2040 Objectives
- Meets Air Quality Test
Local Public
Involvement
Checklist

Local jurisdictions/project sponsors must complete this checklist for local transportation plans and programs from which projects are drawn that are submitted to Metro for regional funding or other action. Section 3.D of Metro's local public involvement policy for transportation describes the certification process, including completion of this checklist. See Section 3.D for information about the other certification steps.

If projects are from the same local transportation plan and/or program, only one checklist need be submitted for those projects. For projects not in the local plan and/or program, the local jurisdiction should complete a checklist for each project.

The procedures for local public involvement (Section 3) and this checklist are intended to ensure that the local planning and programming process has provided adequate opportunity for public involvement prior to action by Metro. To aid in its review of local plans, programs and projects, Metro is requesting information on applicable local public involvement activities. Project sponsors should keep information (such as that identified in italics) on their public involvement program on file in case of a dispute.

A. Checklist

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. At the beginning of the transportation plan or program, a public involvement program was developed and applied that met the breadth and scope of the plan/program. Public participation was broad-based, with early and continuing opportunities throughout the plan/program's lifetime.

*Keep copy of applicable public involvement plan and/or procedures.*

2. Appropriate interested and affected groups were identified and the list was updated as needed.

*Maintain list of interested and affected parties.*

3. Announced the initiation of the plan/program and solicited initial input. If the plan/program schedule allowed, neighborhood associations, citizen planning organizations and other interest groups were notified 45 calendar days prior to (1) the public meeting or other activity used to kick off public involvement for the plan/program; and (2) the initial decision on the scope and alternatives to be studied.

*Keep descriptions of initial opportunities to involve the public and to announce the project's initiation. Keep descriptions of the tools or strategies used to attract interest and obtain initial input.*

4. Provided reasonable notification of key decision points and opportunities for public involvement in the planning and programming process. Neighborhood associations, citizen planning organizations and other interest groups were notified as early as possible.

*Keep examples of how the public was notified of key decision points and public involvement opportunities, including notices and dated examples. For announcements sent by mail, document number of persons/groups on mailing list.*
5. Provided a forum for timely, accessible input throughout the lifetime of the plan/program.

Keep descriptions of opportunities for ongoing public involvement in the plan/program, including citizen advisory committees. For key public meetings, this includes the date, location and attendance.

6. Provided opportunity for input in reviewing screening and prioritizing criteria.

Keep descriptions of opportunities for public involvement in reviewing screening and prioritizing criteria. For key public meetings, this includes the date, location and attendance. For surveys, this includes the number received.

7. Provided opportunity for review/comment on staff recommendations.

Keep descriptions of opportunities for public review of staff recommendations. For key public meetings, this includes the date, location and attendance. For surveys, this includes the number received.

8. Considered and responded to public comments and questions. As appropriate, the draft documents and/or recommendations were revised based on public input.

Keep record of comments received and response provided.

9. Provided adequate notification of final adoption of the plan or program. If the plan or program's schedule allows, the local jurisdiction should notify neighborhood associations, citizen participation organizations and other interest groups 45 calendar days prior to the adoption date. A follow-up notice should be distributed prior to the event to provide more detailed information.

Keep descriptions of the notifications, including dated examples. For announcements sent by mail, keep descriptions and include number of persons/groups on mailing list.

B. Certification Statement

________________________________________
Project sponsor

Certifies adherence to the local public involvement procedures developed to enhance public participation.

________________________________________
Signed

________________________________________
Date

C. Summary of Local Public Involvement Process

Please attach a summary (maximum two pages) of the key elements of the public involvement process for this plan, program or group of projects.
Attachment 3: Detailed Technical Project Selection Criteria

Transportation Measures
- Pedestrian
- Transit Oriented Development
- Bicycle
- Road Modernization
- Road Reconstruction
- Transit
- Freight
- Transportation Demand Management (TDM)
- Boulevard Projects

Land Use Support Measures
- 2040 Funding Priority Matrix (Attachment B-1: Applicable to all modes except freight)
- 2040 Freight Funding Priority Matrix
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrian System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL: Increase Modal Share/Reduce Auto VMT (25 points)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VMT reduction potential for pedestrian projects will be inferred on the basis of zone walk-to-transit values generated by the Metro regional model. The following factors will be used to rank pedestrian project effectiveness.

*Note: For CMAQ eligibility purposes, total person trips within a 1/8th mile radius of the project will be calculated and zonal mode shift factors will be used to estimate walk reduction potential of projects and corresponding reduction of VMT and emissions.*

Project is located in a zone with a high increase in the number of walk-to-transit mode share between 1994 and 2020. (15 Points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project is located in a zone with a high increase in the percent of walk-to-transit trips between 1994 and 2020. (10 Points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Large increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Moderate increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| GOAL: Safety (20 points) |

Project corrects an existing safety problem. Very wide roads with fast moving traffic make crossing difficult and dangerous. Factors such as traffic volume, speed, road width, proximity to schools, and citizen complaints will be considered in determining critical safety problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Project will correct an extremely hazardous situation which needs immediate attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Project will correct an unsafe situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Project will provide little or no safety improvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| GOAL: Addresses 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points) |

See Funding Priority Matrix. (Attachment B-1)

| GOAL: Provide Mobility at Reasonable Cost (15 points) |

Add effectiveness and 2040 mixed use density points (maximum of 45 points). Divide sum of points by total project cost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Low Cost/point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Moderate Cost/point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>High Cost/point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GOAL: Increase Mode Share (25 points)

Is the TOD project proposed in a zone with a high increase in the percent of walk-to-transit, bike, and walk trips between 1994 and 2020.

*Note: For CMAQ eligibility purposes, total person trips generated by the TOD project will be calculated using standard ITE trip factors. Zonal mode shift percent change 1994/2020 will be used to estimate walk reduction potential of projects and corresponding reduction of VMT and emissions.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## GOAL: Density Criteria (20 points)

Does the TOD project increase the density of land uses within a one-fourth mile radius of transit above the level that would result without these public funds into the TOD project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>High - 50 percent or greater increase in persons per acre within a one-fourth mile radius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Medium - 25 percent or greater increase in persons per acre within a one-fourth mile radius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low - less than 25 percent increase in persons per acre with a one-fourth mile radius.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## GOAL: 2040 Criteria (40 points)

See Funding Priority Matrix. *(Attachment B-1)*

## GOAL: Cost-Effectiveness Criteria (15 points)

Cost per effectiveness points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Low cost/point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Medium cost/points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>High cost/point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**GOAL: Ridership (Usage) (25 points)**

Ridership (Usage) (25 points)
Calculate the project's potential ridership based on a travel shed of 1/8 mile radius from the proposed project. The 2020 model generated distribution of bike trips occurring within the travel shed will be concentrated onto newly proposed bike facilities. Resultant "ridership" values will be compared for all bike projects.

Note: For CMAQ eligibility purposes, total person trips within a 1/8th mile radius of the project will be calculated and zonal mode shift factors will be used to estimate walk reduction potential of projects and corresponding reduction of VMT and emissions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>High ridership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Medium ridership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low ridership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOAL: Safety (20 points)**

Does the project address an existing deterrent to bicycling?

Target roadway a deterrent to bicycling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>High auto ADT and narrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>High auto ADT and wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low auto ADT; narrow &amp; curves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other safety factors (blind curves, high truck volume, soft shoulders, high reported accident rate).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)**

See regional and local bikeway rows on 2040 Transportation Prioritization Criteria Matrix. (Attachment B-1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOAL: Cost Effectiveness (15 points)**

Determine cost per rider. (use concentrated 2020 ridership value)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Low cost/rider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Medium cost/rider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>High cost/rider</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Roadway Expansion

## GOAL: Reduce Congestion (25 points)
(Project derives from CMS, consistent with 2020 per capita VMT targets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>1994 two-hour “blended” V/C Ratio (pm, peak direction)</th>
<th>2020 V/C Ratio (pm peak hr &amp; direction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Central City, Regional Centers, Town Centers, Main Streets, Station Areas)</td>
<td>(Corridors, Industrial Areas, and Inner and Outer Neighborhoods)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>1994 two-hour “blended” V/C Ratio (pm, peak direction)</th>
<th>2020 V/C Ratio (pm peak hr &amp; direction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Central City, Regional Centers, Town Centers, Main Streets, Station Areas)</td>
<td>(Corridors, Industrial Areas, and Inner and Outer Neighborhoods)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Regional Highways to be determined on case by case basis.

## GOAL: Enhance Safety (20 points)
Accident Rate per Vehicle Mile (Use 1990 ODOT Accident Rate Book); per vehicle for intersections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>1994 two-hour “blended” V/C Ratio (pm, peak direction)</th>
<th>2020 V/C Ratio (pm peak hr &amp; direction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Central City, Regional Centers, Town Centers, Main Streets, Station Areas)</td>
<td>(Corridors, Industrial Areas, and Inner and Outer Neighborhoods)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Regional Highways to be determined on case by case basis.

## GOAL: Addresses 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)
See Funding Priority Matrix. (Attachment B-1)

## GOAL: Provide Mobility at a Reasonable Cost (15 points)
Cost per Vehicle hours of delay (VHD) eliminated in 2020: \[ VHD = 2020 \text{ No-Build VHD} - \text{Build VHD} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Cost per Vehicle hours of delay (VHD) eliminated in 2020: [ VHD = 2020 \text{ No-Build VHD} - \text{Build VHD} ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

MTIP/STIP 2000 Technical Project Selection Criteria (adopted by JPACT 8/98)
## Roadway Reconstruction

**GOAL:** Project brings facility to current urban design standard or provides long-term maintenance (25 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1994 Condition: pavement base, etc.</th>
<th>2004 Condition: pavement, base, etc. (without earlier improvement)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Fair</td>
<td>0 Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Poor</td>
<td>5 Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Very Poor</td>
<td>10 Very Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOAL:** Enhance Safety (20 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accident Rate Per Vehicle Mile (Use 1990 ODOT Accident Rate Book)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 &gt;124% Statewide Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 100% Statewide Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 &lt;100% Statewide Median</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOAL:** Addresses 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)

See Funding Priority Matrix. (Attachment B-1)

**GOAL:** Provide Mobility at Reasonable Cost (15 points)

Cost per year 2020 VMT (or Vehicles Traveled at interchanges & intersections)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersections/Interchanges Points</th>
<th>Interstate Projects Points</th>
<th>Link Improvement Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 &lt;$.51 per vehicle</td>
<td>15 &lt;$.51 per vehicle</td>
<td>15 &lt;$.33/VMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 $.51-.99 per vehicle</td>
<td>8 $.51-.99 per vehicle</td>
<td>8 $.24-.5.99 VMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 &gt;$1.00 per vehicle</td>
<td>0 &gt;$1.00 per vehicle</td>
<td>0 &gt;$.99/VMT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: To be updated to current costs or will assign points for low, medium and high cost.*

MTIP/STIP 2000 Technical Project Selection Criteria (adopted by JPACT 8/98)
**Transit**

**GOAL:** Increase Modal Share (35 points)

**Formula:**

\[
\text{Subtract} \\
2020 \text{ transit target} \hspace{1cm} - \\
1994 \text{ ridership} \\
\text{Multiply} \hspace{1cm} \text{Remainder} \\
\times \text{Percent attributed to project} \\
\times \text{Average regional trip length} \\
= \text{VMT Reduction}
\]

**Points**

- 35 High VMT Reduction
- 17 Medium VMT Reduction
- 0 Low VMT Reduction

*Note: Service increase proposals will be split as urban core or suburban new start and ranked separately.*

**GOAL:** Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)

See Funding Priority Matrix. (Attachment B-1)

**GOAL:** Provide Cost Effective Improvements (25 points)

**Cost/New Ridership**

(Factored 2020 ridership increase)

**Points**

- 25 Low Cost
- 12 Medium cost
- 0 High cost
# Freight Intermodal

## GOAL: Reduce Truck Hours of Delay (25 points)
Determine Truck hours of Delay on target facility in 2020 with and without the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours of Delay Eliminated</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## GOAL: Enhance Safety (20 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Reduces conflicts for freight modes (especially with bicycles and pedestrians)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Addresses hazardous road/rail geometric problem for truck/train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Addresses location with high accident rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## GOAL: Addresses 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)
See 2040 Freight Table. (Attachment B-1)

## GOAL: Provide Freight Mobility at Reasonable Cost (15 points)

Cost per VHD eliminated in 2015: Cost/Year 2020 (No-Build VHD - Build VHD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Cost/VHD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Low cost/VHD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mid cost/VHD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>High cost/VHD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MTIP/STIP 2000 Technical Project Selection Criteria *(adopted by JPACT 8/98)*
## TDM

### GOAL: Increase Modal Share (35 points)

Mode share increase for (transit, bike, walk, shared-ride) or elimination of trip. Use Regional TDM program survey data to estimate SOV mode shift potential of proposed projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GOAL: Addresses 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)

(See Funding Priority Matrix for specific land uses.) (Attachment B-1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Project is a regional strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GOAL: Cost Effectiveness (25 points)

Cost/VMT reduced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Low cost</th>
<th>Medium cost</th>
<th>High cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>