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Written e-mail comments received:

May 15, 2001
Matthew Galaher
1023 SE Miller Street
Portland, OR 97202
As an active cyclist and parent, I urge you to give all your support to full funding of the Springwater Trail. This will complete a fun, safe and useful bike path that could lessen commuter traffic as well as provide beautiful recreational riding for the whole family.

May 29, 2001
Lisa Rowan
8031 N. Hurst
Portland, OR 97203
Strongly supports alternative transportation over car usage. She thinks priority should be placed on creating safer and more extensive biking-walking networks and efficient mass transit system. She is a voice for promoting cycling, walking and mass transit.

June 9, 2001
Mr. Pat Doty
1010 NE Horizon Loop, #1902
Hillsboro, OR 97124
I believe transit improvements should be number 1 on the priority list. Sidewalks in the suburbs should be the number 2 priority. Sidewalks encourage and allow people to move around their neighborhoods without driving the car everywhere. No new roads should be built and no roads should be widened. If you build it they will come, with their cars.

June 15, 2001
Stuart Gwin
Stuart.Gwin@pdxtrans.org
Comments and supporting information for city of Portland’s MTIP application for Preliminary Engineering for a regional boulevard on SE/NE 102nd Avenue in the Gateway Regional Center. No e-mail message attached.

June 14, 2001
Robert Bailey
310 South High Street
Oregon City, OR 97045
Strongly supports three projects proposed by Oregon City, including the McLoughlin Boulevard improvements, the Molalla Avenue Boulevard and Bikeway Improvements, and the Washington Street Improvements. Each of these projects is worthy and will meet regional as well as local transportation needs. Together, completion of these three projects will have a profound effect on improving transportation, development and livability in Oregon City.
June 17, 2001
Paige Norris Goganian and Achod Goganian
2720 NW Forest Avenue
Beaverton, OR 97006
Family with a small child in Washington County supports the Morrison Bridge Bicycle/Pedestrian facility. This project would provide safe, attractive access across the river for us. It could also be a wonderful landmark for the city and region. The livability of Portland and downtown is critical to our quality of life. Being able to enjoy the city without getting into our car is a big reason we choose to live here. The Morrison Bridge project could significantly enhance the civic heart of our region.

June 19, 2001
Eugene Grant
Happy Valley Mayor
1211 SW Fifth, Suite 1700
Portland, OR 97204
In order for a successful urbanization of the Pleasant Valley area inside the UGB, it is essential to support the Sunnyside Road Phase 2 and the Sunrise Corridor Unit 1 projects in the MITP. It would be political disaster to try to urbanize to the east of Happy Valley without these transportation projects going forward.

June 20, 2001
Raj Gala
rajgala@pacifier.com
Supports the Fanno Creek Trail Phase 2 project that would improve the bike system in the Washington County area. In general, favors minibus and jitney systems, shuttle systems serving specific areas and tax breaks for environmentally friendly transportation.

June 21, 2001
April Olbrich
Please consider the Fanno Creek Trail Phase 2 a priority in funding. It will provide off-road walking and biking opportunities, including commuting for the citizens of Tigard, Beaverton and east Washington County.

June 21, 2001
Robert Mixon
Chair, Washington County BTA
mixonr@ohsu.edu
Supports funding for the Fanno Creek Regional Trail from Greenwood Inn to Scholls Ferry Road. This would support Metro’s goals for livable communities by providing not only park and trail spaces but also connectivity to existing trails for walking and bicycling options in the region.
June 21, 2001
Hal Ballard
bikeadvocate@earthlink.net
Strongly supports the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District grant request to construct a segment of the Fanno Creek Regional Trail from the Greenwood Inn to Scholls Ferry Road. As an active member of trail and bicycle committees, he believes it is important to have regional connectivity and trails as part of the solution for regional transportation. Funding is critical to continue developing this alternative mode of transportation and recreational asset.

June 21, 2001
Lenny Anderson, project manager
Swan Island TMA
sitma@teleport.com
Believes that the MTIP must have a balance of transportation investments, with bike and pedestrian facilities, boulevard projects, TDM strategies and transit and freight investments, as resources allow. The freeway system should be funded by ODOT, not by flexible funding dollars. Everything should be keyed on the reduction of vehicle miles traveled for the sake of air quality and congestion. Freight movement, as opposed to person trips, is also critical.

June 21, 2001
Heather Michet
heatherm@spiritone.com
Wants public transit ranked in top position, including light rail, bicycle paths, bus lines, trolley and incentive programs to encourage people to use them. Prefers the funds go to repair existing roadways and bridges as opposed to new construction.

June 21, 2001
Michael Eury
euryman@email.msn.com
Has lived car-free by choice in the Portland area, including his current home of Lake Oswego. Lake Oswego lacks effective multi-modal transportation. Please invest resources into expanding bicycle and pedestrian connectivity along Highway 43: This integral pathway is underserved.

June 21, 2001
Dan Reilly
Cully Association of Neighbors
5005 NE Ainsworth Ct.
Portland, OR 97218
On behalf of CAN and all of our neighbors, I want to urge you to place a high priority on the installation of sidewalks in our area. The Cully neighborhood was annexed by the city of Portland. However, any sidewalk upgrades in Cully have been done by homeowners or property developers as new housing has been constructed. No government agencies have assisted. As a result we have a growing population still using
unimproved streets, many with no sidewalks at all. It is time that sidewalk improvements in Cully be given top priority for the safety of children, especially those routes used as they walk to school on Killingsworth, Prescott, NE 52nd, NE 60th and Cully.

June 21, 2001
Steve Gutmann
ShoreBank Pacific
sgutmann@sbpac.com
Writing a second time to re-urge you to support completion of the Springwater Trail Connector, the Morrison Bridge improvements and Metro’s multi-use trail system as a whole. Every dollar spent on the trail system means clean air, clean water, less traffic congestion, healthier citizens, better places to live, a potential tourist draw and stronger local economies. I urge you to work hard to fund as many of the multi-use trail projects as possible, especially the two I have mentioned. PS: Bicyclists tend to spend their money locally in their neighborhood shops and restaurants where they can ride or walk.

June 22, 2001
Stacey Seal
amuzzing01@yahoo.com
I would like to know when we are going to have a bike lane between Hollywood and Gateway. It is very difficult to travel on Halsey Street because there are no bike lanes or very few sidewalks. Also the highway exits are hard to get around.

June 27, 2001
Arien L. Sheldrake
1718 SW Parkview Court
Portland, OR 97221
The Eastbank Trail/Springwater Trail Connector is a vital link to our two wonderful but disconnected trails in the great Southeast Portland area. This project will vastly increase the use of the Springwater Trail. The Willamette Shoreline Rail/Trail Study is an under-used property and a natural for bike/pedestrian use, as well as an extension of the new streetcar system. In no way can we allow this right-of-way to revert to private ownership. The seven partners need to step up and fund the current maintenance needs of the existing rail.

June 28, 2001
R. Cummings
1536 SE 26th Ct.
Troutdale, OR 97060
I am against spending money on pedestrian improvements to 257th in Troutdale. Why would a pedestrian need a 9-ft. sidewalk? I am against spending money on that or on a pedestrian plaza or lighting. Also, I think raised center medians only encourage pedestrians to jay walk. I think the Columbia Pedestrian crossing is a good idea. Where we really need a light is at Columbia and Buxton. Why not put a divider down 257th Way at the Outlet Mall?
June 29, 2001
Jane Davis
janegary@msn.com
First and foremost, Highway 26 needs to be widened. Not everyone can take MAX or ride the bus or bike.

June 30, 2001
Phil Goff
1955 NW Hoyt Street, #24
Portland, OR 97209
Concerns him that the most money for MTIP funding will increase capacity for autos, leading to more pollution, congestion and sprawl. Our region gets more out of funding transit, bike, pedestrian and TDM projects. Believes that all bike projects on the list, and as many pedestrian and transit projects as possible, should be funded. The most appropriate use of MTIP funds is for the Morrison Bridge Bike/Pedestrian Facility. This will provide a crucial connection to inner eastside neighborhoods and to the Eastbank Esplanade. Urges Metro to maintain the continuity of the funding process for the Morrison Bridge by granting the construction funds this year.

June 30, 2001
Ernie Bonner
erbonner@teleport.com
A high priority should be placed on federal funds for three projects: Regional Pedestrian Access to Transit Program, the Eastbank Trail/Springwater Trail Connector and the Morrison Bridge Bike/Ped Facility. He thinks it is time to spend engineering money in a study on how to reduce traffic capacity on our major freeways in an attempt to force a reduction in demand for these overloaded facilities. Federal funds should not be used for projects that expand auto capacity, increase pollution and encourage sprawl.

July 1, 2001
Bill Hagerup
2560 NW 121st Place
Portland, OR 97229
Supports the Cornell Road Boulevard project between Murray and Saltzman to help the Cedar Mill Town Center Plan, which has broad community support. Without the additional funds for boulevard improvement, the result is likely to be an interim phase which is neither pedestrian friendly nor conductive to business success. If this happened, the Cedar Mill Town Center could likely fail. As a final benefit, implementing the Cornell Road Boulevard Project simultaneously, in cooperation with the Washington County street project, would result in increased tax efficiency.
July 1, 2001
Sharon Fekety, Community Liaison
Portland Wheelmen Touring Club
fekety@hevanet.com
Federal funds used for transit, bike and pedestrian projects and transportation demand management projects are the highest and best use of flexible federal dollars. These are the projects that the Portland Wheelmen Touring Club feel should be funded: Eastbank Trail/Springwater Trail Connector. This would create a 14-mile facility that would connect Boring, Gresham, Milwaukie, Sellwood, Brooklyn and downtown Portland. It would be a great route for bicycle commuters and recreational cyclists, removing many commuting cars. The Morrison Bridge Bike/Ped facility would provide safe and convenient access for all modes of transportation. Connections to the new Eastside Esplanade should not be limited to the Hawthorne and Steel bridges. The Regional Pedestrian Access to Transit Program should receive funding for pedestrian improvements to connect with light rail stations and the busiest bus routes in the region.

July 2, 2001
Chris Utterback
yamafarm@zzz.com
The Sunrise Corridor is the one project that stands above the rest as needing funding to help with regional transportation. There are no good ways to get east/west from the Portland and Beaverton area heading east except I-84. We need this road; we have done EAs and had a lot of public input. Please put this on the top of your list.

July 2, 2001
Nicholas B. Cowell
2611 NE Knott St.
Portland, OR 97201
Would like to see pedestrian and bicycle access on the Morrison Bridge. All non-freeway bridges should be safe and convenient for all modes of transportation. Each time a bridge has been made more accessible to bikes, there has been a dramatic increase in bicyclists using the bridge. The Morrison Bridge is the best connection for pedestrians and bikes from downtown to the eastside industrial area and the Buckman and Sunnyside neighborhoods. It is important to maintain the continuity of the project by granting the construction funds this year, or momentum will be lost and construction costs will go up.

July 3, 2001
Kim M. Hatfield
Watershed Coordinator
Johnson Creek Watershed Council
PO Box 82584
Portland, OR 97282
The Johnson Creek Watershed Council would like to express our support for the funding of improvements at Southeast Foster Road at 162nd Avenue. This project is urgently needed to solve a number of persistent problems at the intersection. The council has identified the Kelley Creek sub-watershed as a priority area for salmonid habitat
protection and restoration. As part of the project, a culvert will be replaced to remove a fish blockage on Kelley Creek. Removal of this significant fish passage barrier will improve not only fish access, but will also address major safety concerns of residents and other stakeholders in the watershed using Foster Road.

July 4, 2001
Linda Bauer
6232 Se 158th Ave
Portland, OR 97236
She is in favor of funding the project on SE Foster Road at 162nd Avenue. Pleasant Valley development needs infrastructure. There is a safety problem; a child was hit and paralyzed in an accident there.

July 4, 2001
Walt Mintkeski
6815 SE 31st Avenue
Portland, OR 97202
Supports request for improvements at SE Foster Road and SE 162nd Avenue. It is needed to resolve safety problems at the intersection, which has had many accidents, resulting in some fatalities. A culvert will be replaced to allow endangered fish to use riparian habitat in Kelley Creek.

July 6, 2001
Estee Segal
esteesegal@yahoo.com
Supports the Morrison Bridge bike/pedestrian project because it is a main connector to downtown Portland as is very dangerous for bikes or walkers to be on it. It is important to maintain the continuity of funding and grant construction funds this year.

July 9, 2001
Deborah Hofmann
6008 SE 21st Avenue
Portland, OR 97202
Supports completion of the Springwater Corridor and light rail as projects to be funded. The Springwater trail will be a seamless trail loop integral to our values of parks, natural areas and community. As for light rail, I strongly believe this alternative should be revisited. We cannot build our way out of problems associated with growth, especially via highway building. Future MAX lines would provide choice for workers in the area who don’t have the means or need to drive.

July 9, 2001
Keith Liden, Chair
Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee
bainbridge8@home.com
The BAC recommends that all bicycle projects on the MITP list be funded. There are three priority projects that would be especially effective: Morrison Bridge Bike/Ped
Access, completion of the Springwater Trail and construction of the Gresham/Fairview Trail. Each provides a crucial link in the network of bicycle routes and trails throughout the Portland region. The Morrison Bridge project has been a top priority for the BAC. It clearly deserves to be allocated funding. These three projects will significantly improve the quality of life for all people throughout the region.

**July 10, 2001**
Kay Larakin
larkink@ohsu.edu

It is important for bicycling and walking trails to be included in the transportation improvement plan. Well planned and maintained trails provide safe routes so that people do not need to use cars, thus reducing traffic and pollution. Because bike trails are inexpensive and reduce traffic, they are more economical than road building, which is expensive and tends to increase traffic.

**July 10, 2001**
Paul Croxton
6917 SE 155th Avenue
Portland, OR 97236
croxton1@yahoo.com

Has concerns about the safety of the SE Foster and 162nd Avenue intersection. It has very limited view lines and as traffic increases, accidents will also increase. As a parent of two small children, improving the safety of this intersection is a high priority to me. Also, the improvements can help the fish habitat on Kelley and Johnson creeks if done properly. Use funds to improve the SE Foster and 162nd Avenue intersection.

**No date**
Elizabeth Halley
1955 NW Hoyt Street, #24
Portland, OR 97209

I urge you to direct federal funding for the Morrison Bridge Bike/Ped facility and the Eastbank Trail/Springwater Corridor. The Morrison Bridge project will allow for a smooth connection for bicyclists and pedestrians from downtown Portland to the east side. It could serve as one of the most visually pleasing monuments to the friendliness and accessibility of Portland. I also urge you to allocate funds for the Eastbank Trail/Springwater Trail. By extending the Springwater Trail and further developing the Eastbank Trail, you will help create a 14-mile world class bike/ped facility that allows individuals to safely enjoy the natural beauty in our city limits.

**No date**
Daniel Stein
15280 SW Kilthuis Street
Beaverton, OR 97007

Funds for transit, bike and pedestrian projects are the most effective use of federal money. Expensive road and freeway projects should be paid for via state of Oregon gas taxes. He supports three projects: Gresham/Fairview Trail, Springwater Connection and
Morrison Bridge Bike/Ped improvements. The Morrison Bridge in particular will be extremely popular and provide an additional connection to the Eastbank Esplanade.

July 11, 2001
Mark Ginsberg, Esq.
851 SW 6th Avenue
Portland, OR 97204
I live in Portland and commute to work by bicycle every day. The Morrison Bridge provides an important connection from the heart of downtown to Portland’s Central Eastside Industrial District and the Sunnyside and Buckman neighborhoods. All non-freeway bridges in Portland should be made accessible to all modes of transportation. Safe and convenient access to Willamette River bridges is important for bike commuters. When approaches to the Broadway Bridge were made more bike friendly, bicycle trips over the bridge tripled. A more pedestrian and bike friendly bridge will improve access to the new Eastbank Esplanade. It is crucial that funding for construction come quickly after design and engineering.

July 11, 2001
Zelig Kurland
627 NE Fargo Street
Portland, OR 97212
zelig@noiseways.org
Votes for continued funding for non-automotive projects. Huge roadways foreclose all other possibilities, creating environments amenable only to large volumes of traffic. Walking, cycling, enjoying the public realm all become impossible when massive freeways are built.

July 11, 2001
Craig Horejsi
2330 SW Dolph Court
Portland, OR 97219
craighor@hotmail.com
Comment against Sunrise Corridor Phase I, PE. He believes that it is inappropriate to spend 4 million dollars on this project. There are still many areas that could use an increase in bike friendly, non-car uses. Concerned that this project is being proposed using a draft environmental impact statement from 1993 for the corridor. It is over eight years old and does not address important effects that the corridor will have on the surrounding environment, including compromised air and water quality, and threatened habitats of salmonids and cutthroat trout in the Clackamas River system. He is asking that no funding for this project be allocated.
July 11, 2001
Lynda Orzen-Szeplakay
Oregon City Planning Commission
Secretary, Citizens Involvement Committee
14943 Quinalt Ct.
Oregon City, OR 97045
orzep@bctonline.com
Supports the Washington Street Improvement, Phase I, 12th Street to 16th Street. This corridor was designated a priority for the region when Oregon City was designated a regional center. The accident rates at 12th and 15th are at or over the safety threshold. This section has no bicycle lanes, missing sidewalk sections, no ADA compliant curbs and a poorly functioning four-lane section with no median or turn pockets, resulting in high accident rates. This is more than a transportation project to the community. It is a matter of creating a more livable and inviting community for the citizens and visitors who come to Oregon City for its cultural and historical centers. Please help make Washington Street safer for all who use this corridor.

July 11, 2001
Ross Williams
Citizens for Sensible Transportation
1220 SW Morrison, Suite 535
Portland, OR 97205
ross@cfst.org
Citizens for Sensible Transportation believes that regional funds should not begin to fund freeway improvements. ODOT already receives federal funds for state highway work, in addition to proceeds from the gas tax dedicated to roads. The technical rankings need to create a common list of projects that can be compared. The division by mode makes it impossible to evaluate the relative merits of projects across modes. They believe the council criteria established in January provides a good basis for allocation of MTIP funds. They believe regional funds should be allocated for projects that do not increase motor vehicle capacity or VMT, with the exception of multi-use projects such as boulevards and road operations (ITS). Projects supported for MTIP funding are: Stark Street Boulevard, Division Boulevard, Gresham-Fairview Trail, Gresham TCL Service Expansion; Sunset Transit Center Improvements, Fanno Creek Trail, BVT/Tigard TCL Service Expansion, Forest Grove; Morrison Bridge bike/ped improvements, SE Foster Road and SE 162nd road; Springwater Trail, both McLoughlin Boulevard projects, South Corridor DEIS; Willamette Shoreline Study, Pedestrian Access to Transit, Continue Service on McLoughlin/Barber; all TDM/TMA projects, TOD program and all ITS projects. CST believes the Sunrise Corridor Final Design and the Highway 26 Expansion should not be funded.

July 11, 2001
Dave Thomson
Dave.Thomson@NWDC.IBS-LMCO.com
Believes the most important MTIP project is the East Bank Trail/Springwater Trail because it will provide a key connector between downtown Portland and much of the
eastside for bike commuters. Regional funds should not finance freeway construction because freeways will not improve the congestion problems. Technical ranking should favor multi-modal and local traffic improvements. Prioritize transit, bicycle and pedestrian projects, then local road improvements. Put freeways at the bottom of the list.

**July 11, 2001**  
Carol Palo  
crtraveler@earthlink.net  
I have heard that the Cornell/Barnes Road project is being moved to the back burner. I hope this is not true. The Project Advisory Committee believes that this funded project should be well thought out and kept on track. Thanks for your consideration.

**July 11, 2001**  
Magnolia Bartley  
Hawthorne Ridge resident  
Dana4454@aol.com  
We have lived at the Hawthorne Ridge subdivision for 7 months now. Going in and out of the Foster Road and 162\(^{nd}\) Intersection is very dangerous. I have witnessed several auto accidents in the intersection since moving here. I also got rear-ended while trying to make a left turn almost 3 months ago. There is inadequate sight distance due to a non-standard horizontal curve in the road. This intersection is definitely inadequate to handle the amount of traffic using it due to the increased development in the area. Improvement is a must. I am speaking on behalf of the residents of Hawthorne Ridge who speak of the same problems.

**July 11, 2001**  
Charles and Harriet Betz  
chbetz@juno.com  
8036 SE 162\(^{nd}\) Avenue  
Portland, OR  
We live near the intersection of SE 162\(^{nd}\) and Foster Road. It is an EXTREMELY DANGEROUS intersection. For several years, our Pleasant Valley Neighborhood Association fought against any development due to the traffic problems, landslides, flooding, etc. It is a thoroughfare for commuters from the Mt. Scott and Happy Valley areas to Gresham and beyond. Finally, the Hawthorne Ridge development was accepted based on the promise of the developer and City of Portland to install a traffic light at that intersection. Please fulfill this promise to the neighborhood for a traffic light.

**July 11, 2001**  
Sandy Van Bemmel  
14753 SE Monner Road  
Portland, OR 97236  
svanbemmel@earthlink.net  
The Sunrise Corridor does the opposite of what land-use planning is supposed to do. It creates sprawl by making it easier for people to live on Mt. Hood and work in Portland. It takes farmland along its proposed route, which will bring mass development. What are
we giving up for the Sunrise Corridor? What is this plan costing the county and Oregon? Meanwhile, Highway 212 is becoming more and more dangerous. Do the work needed to make Highway 212 and Highway 224 safe for all modes of transportation. We need to learn to live within our existing roadway system. Spend funds on improving what we have today.

July 11, 2001
Mark Ginsberg
markjginsberg@yahoo.com
It is very important to all of us and all future generations of people living in the Metro region that we use our funding to encourage multi-modal transportation. Specifically supports: Morrison Bridge Bicycle/Pedestrian Facility funding. It is crucial that the retrofit construction funding come quickly afterwards. All non-freeway bridges in Portland should be made accessible to all modes of transportation. Safe and convenient access to the Willamette River bridges is important for bike commuters. After approaches to the Broadway Bridge were made more bike-friendly, bicycle trips over the bridge tripled.

July 11, 2001
Board of Directors
Lake Oswego Chamber of Commerce
chrish@lake-oswego.com
The Lake Oswego Chamber of Commerce would like to weigh in on the importance of Boones Ferry Corridor, an incredibly important and overloaded east/west artery for Tualatin, West Linn and Lake Oswego. There are increasingly heavy traffic loads all day and evening, increasing commute times. There are over 40 recorded accidents this year alone on Boones Ferry Road between Kruse Way and the I-5 Corridor. Pedestrian usage is virtually nil, due to the lack of sidewalks and crosswalks. This project will foster a better sense of community and place, not to mention safety and functionality.

July 11, 2001
R. Richard White, DVM
rrwhite@teleport.com
Urges priority for the Cornell Road project in the MTIP ranking process. The business and citizens in this community have long awaited substantive progress in the town center and main street projects. Please facilitate this process to help prevent Cornell Road becoming just another 185th-type thoroughfare. We want to retain our identity and improve and preserve our quality of life for generations to come.

No date
Jennifer Bresnick
NE Portland
It is absolutely vital that investments should support the region’s 2040 plan and that money is allocated to improve our city for bicyclists and pedestrians – people not automobiles. Widening highways is incredible expensive and results in more drivers. Cars make pollution and pollution makes people sick. Money should be set aside to
create more bicycle paths and bike lanes. Make streets accessible by bus so that public transportation be faster. Some money should be set aside to maintain existing highways and streets. Portland is such a special place, let's keep it this way and make it better.

No date
Debbie DeRose
4907 NE 20th Avenue
Portland, OR 97211
Urges Metro to use federal transportation dollars on bicycle, pedestrian and mass transit projects, rather than on cars. More light rail, more bike lanes, less sprawl and exhaust fumes. Please keep our city beautiful and livable; your choices will affect us all for years to come.

No date
Greg Haun, Architect
2332 SE Brooklyn
Portland, OR 97202
Requests that transportation funds be allocated to bike and pedestrian usage. Wants to be able to experience the outdoors in daily life. Being forced to drive somewhere because there is no viable alternative robs him of this pleasure. It sucks money out of our pocket and spews pollution into our air. A co-worker no longer bikes to work because home and workplace are on opposite sides of the Morrison Bridge, which is dangerous and illegal to bike over. Please help fix these problems by allocating funds for bike and pedestrian projects.

No date
Jeremy Emmi
1012 SE Tacoma
Portland, OR
Urges support of transportation alternatives to help reduce dependence on the automobile. Would like to see money spent on projects such as bicycle lanes and paths, pedestrian crossings and sidewalks, light rail lines and other improvements that will make the metro area more livable for all its residents. Please support those causes that de-emphasize the automobile and put the pedestrian, bicyclist, and public transportation user at the front of concern.

June 17, 2001
Kevin Downing, President
Sellwood Moreland Improvement League
8210 SE 13th Avenue
Portland, OR 97202
SMILE recommends the East Bank Trail/Springwater Trail Connector as the number one priority in the current MTIP process. (Duplicate comment; see letter in written comments.)
Section Four

Post Cards
Please support full funding of the Springwater Trail as part of the 2002-2005 MTIP. This corridor is a crucial link to the central city for bicyclists and pedestrians from southeast Portland, Milwaukie, northern Clackamas County, and Gresham.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Organ.</th>
<th>Address1</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Sta</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hal</td>
<td>Hal</td>
<td>Ballard</td>
<td></td>
<td>14180 SW Allen</td>
<td>Beaverton</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brad</td>
<td>Brad</td>
<td>Baugher</td>
<td></td>
<td>5052 SE Nevada Ct.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dave</td>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
<td>11703 SW 33rd Pl.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Pamela</td>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Birkel</td>
<td></td>
<td>430 SW Hamilton St</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Karen</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Brinkmann</td>
<td></td>
<td>1114 SE Lexington St.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dave</td>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Brook</td>
<td></td>
<td>1905 NE Clackamas</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Jennifer J.</td>
<td>Jennifer J.</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>18761 SE Division St.</td>
<td>Gresham</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Hannah</td>
<td>Burton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4814 NE 14th Pl.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Amy</td>
<td>Callson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1805 SE Sherrett</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Jan Fenton and Mr. Tim</td>
<td>Jan Fenton and Mr. Tim</td>
<td>Calvert</td>
<td></td>
<td>8844 SE 15th Pl.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Anita</td>
<td>Anita</td>
<td>Cannell</td>
<td></td>
<td>3803 SE Filbert</td>
<td>Milwaukie</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Amy</td>
<td>Carlson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1805 SE Sherrett</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Matt</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3380 SE Deswell St.</td>
<td>Milwaukie</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Edward A.</td>
<td>Chang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1616 NE 16th Way #315</td>
<td>Gresham</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Joseph</td>
<td>Christman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2412 SE 32nd Ave.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Roger</td>
<td>Clermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9317 SW Viewpoint Terrace</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Delaney</td>
<td>Costello</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2107 SE Yukon</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Reilly</td>
<td>Costello</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2107 SE Yukon</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Paul</td>
<td>Coster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>247 SE Yukon</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Mary</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8225 SE 63rd Ave</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. David</td>
<td>DeVore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11368 SE 32nd Ave</td>
<td>Milwaukie</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Anna</td>
<td>DiBenedette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3203 SE Woodstock Blvd</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. J. A.</td>
<td>Elliott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>415 SE 45th</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Tad</td>
<td>Everhart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>539 SE 59th Ct.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Laura</td>
<td>Feldman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>817 SE 29th Ave.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Pedro</td>
<td>Fenbel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8512 SE 8th Ave.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Jan</td>
<td>Fenton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8844 SE 15th Pl.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sue</td>
<td>Fischer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9510 SE Fuller Rd.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Jane</td>
<td>Fortune</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4333 SW 4th</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Charles</td>
<td>Froelick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>817 SW 2nd Ave</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Given Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Zip Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Frost</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coalition for a Livable Future</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Jill</td>
<td>Fuglister</td>
<td></td>
<td>5764 SE Liebe St</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td></td>
<td>1220 SW Morrison Ste 535</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Gerharter</td>
<td></td>
<td>2412 NE 17th Ave.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Ginenthal</td>
<td></td>
<td>4205 NE 22nd Ave.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Kenan</td>
<td>Ginsberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>622 SE 28th Ave.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>Goff and Ms. Liza Halley</td>
<td></td>
<td>3024 SE 31st Ave., #1</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Greenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>1955 NW Hoyt #24</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Groff</td>
<td></td>
<td>7327 SE 37th Ave.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Kari</td>
<td>Grosvold</td>
<td></td>
<td>4205 SE Ramona</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Gutman</td>
<td></td>
<td>4512 N Congress</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Gutmann</td>
<td></td>
<td>2083 NW Johnson, #35</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Gutmann</td>
<td></td>
<td>8008 SE 6th Ave.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Ursula</td>
<td>Gutmann</td>
<td></td>
<td>2083 NW Johnson, #35</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Guttman</td>
<td></td>
<td>18011 SW Kelok Rd</td>
<td>Lake Oswego</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Hagerbaumer</td>
<td></td>
<td>1623 NE Couch</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>5214 SE Taylor St.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Phil Goff</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>7615 SE 19th Ave.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Hallez</td>
<td></td>
<td>1955 NW Hoyt, #24</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Harney</td>
<td></td>
<td>5615 SW Coronado</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Allan</td>
<td>Harwood</td>
<td></td>
<td>7817 SE 34th Ave.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Tigue</td>
<td>Howe</td>
<td></td>
<td>4140 SE Glenwood</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td>7910 SE Reed College Pl.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Johnsen</td>
<td></td>
<td>91731 Smith Lake Rd.</td>
<td>Warrenton</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td>3635 SE Johnson Creek Blvd</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td>4905 SE 48th Ave.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97206-4151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td>5624 SE Knight</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97206-6024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Edie</td>
<td>Kerbaugh</td>
<td></td>
<td>12341 SE 67th Ct.</td>
<td>Milwaukie</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Ralph and Lois Kiefer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15119 S. Oyer Dr.</td>
<td>Oregon City</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97045-7239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MTIP Priorities 2002 Project Ranking Public Comments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms.</th>
<th>Edie</th>
<th>Kierbaugh</th>
<th>12341 SE 67th Ct.</th>
<th>Milwaukie</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>97222</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councilor</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>City of Milwaukie</td>
<td>9877 SE 33rd</td>
<td>Milwaukie</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Klausman</td>
<td>1461 NE Paropa Ct.</td>
<td>Gresham</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Krain</td>
<td>1001 SW 5th Ave., Ste. 2200</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Jeanne</td>
<td>Kraje</td>
<td>3542 SE 28th PI</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Lacy</td>
<td>2003 NE 42nd Ave. #3</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Leasher</td>
<td>920 NW Naito</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Moshe</td>
<td>Lenske</td>
<td>4314 SE Crystal Springs Blvd</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Robin Vesey and Mr. Jack</td>
<td>Liskean</td>
<td>16 SW Canby St</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Lockwood</td>
<td>1308 SE 36th, B</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Evan</td>
<td>Manvel</td>
<td>PO Box 5067</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td>McCracken</td>
<td>3019 NE 143rd Ave</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>McElhoes</td>
<td>531 SW 5th St. Lake Oswego</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. and Mrs.</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>McElhoes</td>
<td>531 SW 5th St. Lake Oswego</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>2005 NE 56th Ave.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Nadine J</td>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>7106 SE 71st Ave.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Moulton</td>
<td>10577 SE Riverway Ln</td>
<td>Milwaukie</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Mower</td>
<td>5716 SW Brugger St</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Muench, M.D.</td>
<td>3676 SE Martins</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Newman</td>
<td>10952 SE 21st Ave. #6</td>
<td>Milwaukie</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Cathy &amp; Brad</td>
<td>Nostrand</td>
<td>604 SE Umatilla</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>Palmer</td>
<td>3947 SE Wake St.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>David C.</td>
<td>Parke</td>
<td>154 SE Condor Dr.</td>
<td>Gresham</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Pratt</td>
<td>PO Box 4222</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>Radcliffe</td>
<td>7090 SE 27th</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Shayna</td>
<td>Rebberg</td>
<td>1602 SE Flavel St.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>2938 NE 9th Ave.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>1581 SE Linn</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Maven</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td>1638 SE 12th Ave. #203</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>Schmidt</td>
<td>824 SE Lambert</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Schmidt</td>
<td>824 SE Lambert St.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Shapiro</td>
<td>1403 SE Salmon</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>Shorr</td>
<td>535 NE Laurelhurst</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Kenan</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>8008 SE 6th Ave.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Zip Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>Sohm</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Sohm</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Myles</td>
<td>Standish</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Sutherland</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Woody</td>
<td>Sutherland</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>Toffolon</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Ussher Groff</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>VanRaalte</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>VanRaalte</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Anton</td>
<td>Vetterlein</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Rex</td>
<td>Wardlaw</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Wolfe</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Yudkin and Ms. Edelman</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Zimmerman</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO LETTER SENT</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Five

Appendix
Priorities 2002 ads for MTIP meeting on June 18, 2001

Size of ad: 5 7/8” wide by 6 1/2” deep

The Oregonian, Metro Section
Run on Monday, May 21
Ad due Friday, May 18 at noon
(Dispatch to pick up in Metro Mail Room)
Tom Weaver, 221-8312

The Skanner
Run on Wed, May 23
Due Mon, May 21
Send to: skannadv@teleport.com
Ted Banks, 285-5555, ext. 507

Hillsboro Argus
Run on Thurs, May 24
Due Monday, May 21
Send to: ropads@hillsboroargus.com
Donna Marina, 648-1131

Beaverton, Tigard and Tualatin Times
Community Newspapers
Run on Thurs, May 24
Due Mon, May 21
Send to: email@commnewspapers.com
Patty Darney, 670-2808

Clackamas Review/Oregon City News
Run on May 24 (1/2 circulation)
Run on May 31 (1/2 circulation)
Due Mon, May 21
Send to: production@cr-ocnews.com
Dave McDowell, 786-1996

MM 5/17/01
Help make our transportation dollars count

There are many transportation projects needed in the region and not enough money to go around.

Only $38 million of federal flexible funding for transportation projects is available in this region in the next four years. Project requests through the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) far exceed that amount of money.

The list of requested MTIP projects includes bridge repairs, sidewalks and bicycle lanes, trails and boulevards, freight access, transit and road improvements and more.

Through the Priorities 2002 process, Metro wants to hear from you about how transportation projects should be ranked.

Public comments will be taken June 12 through July 11, 2001. Comments will be taken at a June 18 public comment meeting and by mail, fax, phone and e-mail.

Priorities 2002 open house and comment meeting

6 to 9 p.m.
Monday, June 18
Metro Regional Center
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland OR 97232

Comments also will be taken by:

- mail at the above address
- fax (503) 797-1929
- e-mail to trans@metro.dst.or.us
- transportation hotline (503) 797-1900, option 3

Maps will be available at the open house. For a project list and information packet, leave a message on the hotline or send an e-mail.

Metro's web page:
www.metro-region.org
Help make our transportation dollars count

Public comment June 12-July 11, 2001

Priorities 2002 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program project ranking

Public comment will be taken on the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) project ranking from June 12 through July 11, 2001. In addition, an open house on June 18 will provide an opportunity for you to review materials and make public comments on the rankings. See details to the right.

With only $38 million available to fund Portland metropolitan region transportation projects in 2002-2005, your ideas on how to prioritize projects are important.

At the June 18 meeting, you also will have an opportunity to review preliminary rankings of major regional transportation corridors. The Corridor Initiatives Study will have information about 18 corridors identified in the Regional Transportation Plan as having the greatest need for future improvements.

For questions or packets, call Metro at (503) 797-1839.

Public meeting
Monday, June 18
6 to 9 p.m.
Metro Regional Center
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland OR 97232.

Comments also will be taken by:
• mail at the return address
• fax (503) 797-1930
• e-mail to trans@metro.dst.or.us
• transportation hotline (503) 797-1900 option 3

Project list and packet
For a project list and information packet, leave a message on the hotline or send an e-mail.

Metro's web page:
www.metro-region.org
Finance Springwater's missing link

For bicyclists hardy enough to commute from Boring or Gresham into downtown Portland, the Springwater Corridor Trail is a big tease.

Look on a map, and you can see that the 17-mile former rail line comes tantalizingly close to doing the job. It peters out at the railroad tracks just east of McLoughlin Boulevard in Milwaukie.

Only a dedicated commuter bicyclist like Eugene Grant grits his teeth and keeps pedaling through the ensuing bicycle-hostile territory, including the slender sidewalk over the Sellwood Bridge. "If you fall off that sidewalk, the cars are right next to you," Grant says. "There's no room for error."

Grant, who works as a real estate attorney in downtown Portland, is mayor of Happy Valley, one of the eastside communities eager to see the Springwater Corridor Trail completed. Milwaukie residents feel so strongly that they're willing to put up a $26,000 local match, which is a lot in a town of 20,000. It amounts to $1.30 per capita.

You can see why they think the trail is so important, though: It has such potential to attract commuters. An estimated 100,000 people live within a half-mile of it; an estimated 600,000 people already use it for recreation.

This month, Metro will decide how to spend $38 million in federal transportation dollars, about half of which has to be earmarked for alternative modes of transportation. Completion of the Springwater Corridor Trail should be high on Metro's list.

It won't come cheap. The $4.2 million cost for a final McLoughlin to Sellwood section includes construction of bicycle/pedestrian bridges over Johnson Creek, McLoughlin and the Union Pacific Railroad line. But it's worth it.

This final segment of the trail will connect to another 3-mile stretch that the city of Portland has planned from the Sellwood Bridge to OMSI. From there, commuters like Grant could hop on the Hawthorne Bridge.

They'll still have to watch where they're going. But they might actually be able to enjoy the view.
For immediate release – June 12, 2001
Contact: Gina Whitehill-Baziuk, (503) 797-1746

Comments taken on ranking of transportation projects

Ranking of transportation projects for future funding will be the focus of a meeting on Monday, June 18. Metro Councilors and members of the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation will hear public comments at an open house from 6 to 9 p.m. at Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand Ave., Portland.

In addition, public comments will be accepted through July 11 on the preliminary project ranking through the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program, a funding allocation tool used by Metro to distribute federal and state transportation funds to projects recommended in the Regional Transportation Plan. Projects selected will be constructed in 2004 and 2005.

Only $38 million is available to fund the next round of transportation projects in this region. Of that amount, about half is limited to projects that improve air quality and the other half is available to all types of projects. Projects under review include freeway and road improvements, bridge repairs, sidewalks and bicycle lanes, freight access, transit projects and more.

Information on preliminary ranking of projects is available. Request a packet of materials by calling (503) 797-1839 or by leaving a message on the transportation hotline, (503) 797-1900 option 3. Or send e-mail to trans@metro.dst.or.us. The hearing impaired can call (503) 797-1804. For ranking updates, call Metro or visit www.metro-region.org.

Comments on the project rankings are due by 5 p.m. July 11. Comments can be mailed to Metro, 600 NE Grand Ave., Portland, OR 97232; e-mailed to trans@metro.dst.or.us; or sent by fax to (503) 797-1911. Brief oral comments can be left on the transportation hotline, (503) 797-1900 option 3. Anonymous comments cannot be accepted; name, address and phone number must be provided.

Metro, the regional government that serves 1.3 million people who live in Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties and the 24 cities in the Portland metropolitan area, provides planning and services that protect the nature of the region.
MTIP timeline of key milestones
September 2000 to September 2001

Sept. 25  Postcard notice of MITP proposed public process to 1,500 addresses (early 45-day public comment period kickoff)
Dec. 5    Postcard notification mailed regarding start of public comment period on MTIP process and selection criteria sent to 1,500
Dec. 18   Release of project ranking/selection process recommendations
Dec. 18 to Jan 16  Public comment period on process and selection criteria
   Jan 16
Jan. 10   News release sent to media on public hearing at Metro
Jan. 16   End of public comment period and MTIP hearing before Metro Community Planning Committee
Jan. 18   Publication of summary of public comments on MTIP process
Jan. 25   Metro Council approved process for selecting and ranking of MTIP projects
Feb. 6    First printing of MTIP fact sheet
Jan. 26 to April 2  Project solicitation period
   April 2
April 12  Release of nominated MTIP projects to JPACT
April 27  Fact sheet on MTIP process and public involvement reprinted
May 21-24 Placement of ads for public comment period and meeting
May 30    Post card notification of public comment period and meeting sent to 1,500
June 8    TPAC review of technical rankings (special meeting)
June 12   News release on public comment period and meeting
June 12 to July 11  MTIP project ranking public comment period
   July 11
June 18   Open house and public comment meeting at Metro, 6 to 9 pm
July 12   JPACT review of public comments
August 31  TPAC recommendation on final MTIP projects
September Proposed public hearing and tentative action by JPACT and Metro Council
Fall      JPACT/Metro Council final adoption and air quality conformity
Implementing the regional transportation plan

What Is the Regional Transportation Plan?

Metro's 2000 Regional Transportation Plan is a blueprint to guide new transportation investments in the Portland metropolitan region during the next 20 years. The plan begins to implement Metro's 2040 Growth Concept to protect the livability of this region in the face of an expected 50 percent increase in population and a 70 percent increase in jobs by 2020. The goal of the plan is to expand choices for travel in the region. To this end, the plan sets policies for traveling by cars, buses, light rail, walking, bicycling and movement of freight by air, rail, truck and water. The plan also sets policy for funding priorities through the MTIP.

What is the Transportation Improvement Program?

The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is a funding allocation tool used by Metro and Oregon Department of Transportation. (Metro's program is called the MTIP; the state's is called the STIP.) The TIP tracks the allocation and expenditure of federal and state transportation funds to projects identified in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The TIP also schedules phases of work needed to complete a project and identifies when funding will be available.

Why and how are funds allocated?

The need for transportation improvements greatly exceeds the available funding. Because the cost of all projects approved in the RTP exceeds available funds at any one time, Metro oversees a project nomination, ranking and selection process as new funds become available. The Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation and the Metro Council, local jurisdictions and the public approved a project nomination and ranking process to select projects for funding in the MTIP.

How is the MTIP project package updated?

On Jan. 25, 2001 the Metro Council approved the process for selecting and ranking a package of MTIP projects for fiscal years 2002-2005. Given limited resources, it was determined that the starting point would be projects left from the last allocation process. This is called the "base package." Each eligible project sponsor could submit up to five new projects not to exceed $2 million. Each sponsor could also substitute a new project or projects for any on the base package list. The cost of substituted projects could not exceed the cost of the removed projects by more than 10 percent.

Projects were submitted (by the closing date of April 2) on behalf of eligible sponsors by Metro, Tri-Met, Department of Environmental Quality, ODOT, city of Portland, Port of Portland, Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties and their cities, and recreation districts. Any new projects would have to have been taken from the Financially Constrained System of the 2000 RTP or would have to have been the result of a recently completed planning activity, such as the Gateway Regional Center Plan. Projects added to the base package must meet Metro's requirements for public involvement.
How will projects be ranked?
Projects proposed in the Priorities 2002 MTIP update will be ranked based on technical evaluation of how well they meet regional goals for each type of travel. JPACT and the Metro Council will also consider such non-technical factors as whether there is a past regional commitment to a project or whether significant local matching funds are being offered. Information on the proposed project package is now available. You can request the material by calling (503) 797-1900 option 3 or (503) 797-1757. Or visit www.metro-region.org.

How much money is available for projects?
Approximately $38 million of “regional flexible funds” are available to fund new transportation projects in our region in 2004 and 2005. Of that amount, about half are Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality funds limited to projects that improve air quality. The other half are STP funds available to all projects. ODOT has already allocated approximately $160 million to fund specific highway, bridge and freeway projects.

What is the main goal of the MTIP?
Implementing the Region 2040 land-use goals and the Regional Transportation Plan is the primary goal of the MTIP.

How are projects selected?
JPACT and the Metro Council will select a “package” of projects for funding that support many forms of travel and regional land-use objectives, consistent with priorities described in the Regional Transportation Plan. Priority will be given to a package of projects that will help provide geographic funding balance, enhance stability, and meet air quality standards. The projects will also need to address new federal environmental justice policies to ensure all members of the public benefit from federally funded projects.

How can I learn more about the nominated projects and rankings?
To request information, leave a message on the transportation hotline (503) 797-1900 option 3 or send e-mail to trans@metro.dst.or.us TDD (503) 797-1804.

A final list of project nominees will be posted on the web site at www.metro-region.org. To speak with a staff member, call (503) 797-1757. The hearing impaired can call TDD (503) 797-1804.
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DATE: August 2, 2001

TO: JPACT

FROM: Andy Cotugno

SUBJECT: HB-2142 Bond Program

Attached for your information is a series of items related to ODOT’s HB-2142 Bond Program. With this information, Dave Williams and myself will provide an overview of the process, schedule and criteria to select the projects that will be implemented with this program. Attachments are as follows:

1. A timeline and outreach schedule to submit project applications, consider recommendations from MPO’s and finalize the list by the Oregon Transportation Commission.

2. HB-2142 as adopted by the legislative.

3. Draft criteria to select projects under consideration by the OTC (they will be considering adoption at their meeting in Pendleton August 9).

4. A letter to Bruce Warner providing input on the criteria developed by TPAC at the direction of JPACT.

5. Metro staff’s initial evaluation of the MTIP projects that may be eligible for funding from the HB-2142 Bond measure. Note: this is strictly an eligibility assessment. These projects may or may not be highly rated under ODOT’s criteria. In addition, application to ODOT is not limited to these projects. At the meeting, we will attempt to provide an overview of other projects that may also be considered.
Timeline and Outreach Schedule for HB 2142
Schedule to Amend 2002 – 2005 STIP

**JULY 11, 2001 OTC MEETING**

OTC approves timeline and project selection schedule. Cities, Counties, ACTs, MPOs, COGs, LOAC, JPACT, CDO/RCST Field Teams, Governor’s Office, Freight Advisory Committee, STIP Stakeholder Committee, other transportation stakeholders, and the general public begin consultation on additional criteria and fund allocation targets.

**JULY 27, 2001 LOAC MEETING**

Deadline for recommendations on any additional criteria and lane capacity, bridge, preservation target allocation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week of July 30</th>
<th>ODOT staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review comments received by July 27 on criteria and allocations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recommend revisions to criteria to OTC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recommend initial target allocations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Send revised recommendation on criteria and initial targets to those who provided comments, ACTs, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AUGUST 9, 2001 OTC MEETING**

(OTC meets in Pendleton)

OTC expected to adopt criteria by which projects would be considered. OTC to set initial target percentages for lane capacity, bridge, and preservation project categories.

**AUGUST 10 - DECEMBER 12, 2001**

Public outreach effort engaged to identify lane capacity, bridge, and preservation projects for HB 2142 funding. Project input sought from cities, counties, ACTs, MPOs, COGs, LOAC, JPACT, CDO/RCST Field Teams, Governor’s Office, Freight Advisory Committee, STIP Stakeholder Committee, other transportation stakeholders, and the general public.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aug. 10 to Sept. 7</th>
<th>Cities Counties ODOT</th>
<th>project owners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prepare project proposals for pavement preservation projects on district highways, and load limited highways. Proposals identify the project owner, provide a brief description of the project, make a cost estimate, and provide information addressing the criteria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 10</td>
<td>State Bridge Engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Requests local gov’t bridge owners to nominate bridge projects for consideration by Local Bridge Selection Review Committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 10 to Sept. 7</td>
<td>Counties Cities ODOT</td>
<td>project owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nominate projects for local bridge rehabilitation and replacement projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nominations identify project owner, provide a cost estimate, and commit 10 percent local match contribution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 10 to Oct. 3</td>
<td>Cities Counties ODOT</td>
<td>project owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop project proposals for modernization projects (project scope, cost estimates, information addressing criteria).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Timeline and Outreach Schedule for HB 2142
### Schedule to Amend 2002 – 2005 STIP

**SEPTEMBER 7, 2001**

**Deadline for bridge, preservation and load limited Highways project submittals to ODOT Regions.**

| Week of Sept 10 | ODOT staff | • Compile proposals for pavement preservation and load limited projects received. Provide to ACTs, regional CST teams, etc.  
• Compile local bridge project nominations received and provide to Local Bridge Selection Review Committee. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept 10 to Oct. 5</td>
<td>Cities Counties ODOT project owners</td>
<td>• Continue work on modernization projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sept 10 to Oct. 8 | Local Bridge Selection Review Committee | • Review local bridge projects.  
• Develop draft recommendation.  
• Provide information to ACTs. |
| Sept 10 to Oct. 8 | State Bridge Engineer | • Develop draft recommendation for state bridges.  
• Provide information to ACTs. |
| September | ODOT staff | • Prepare recommendation to OTC on final target allocation between modernization, pavement preservation, and bridge. |
| Sept 17 to Nov. 30 | Regional CST teams | • Analyze proposals for pavement preservation projects and projects on load limited highways. Identify opportunities / issues. Prepare comments for ACTs.  
• Discuss comments with ACTs |
| Sept 17 to Nov. 30 | ACTs JPACT Others | • Consider proposals for pavement preservation projects and projects on load limited highways.  
• Discuss proposals with regional CST teams.  
• Receive information about state and local bridge rehabilitation and replacement projects. |

**SEPTEMBER 20, 2001 OTC MEETING**

(OTC meets in Eugene)

Draft Bridge project list presented to OTC for consideration. Public comment received

**OTC adopts temporary rule language defining District Highways.**

**OCTOBER 2001**

Rule defining District Highways is filed with Secretary of State to become effective 91st day following adjournment sine die (October 6, 2001).

**OCTOBER 5, 2001**

**Deadline for lane capacity and interchange(s) on multilane highway project submittals to ODOT Regions.**

| Week of Oct. 8 | ODOT staff | • Compile modernization project proposals received.  
• Provide to ACTs, regional CST teams. |

---

**July 25, 2001 DRAFT**
# Timeline and Outreach Schedule for HB 2142
## Schedule to Amend 2002 – 2005 STIP

### OCTOBER 8, 2001

Deadline for Draft Bridge, Preservation and Load limited Highways project recommendations developed and refined by ODOT, Cities, counties, Bridge Rating Committee, ACTs, MPOs, COGs, LOAC, JPACT, CDO/RCST Field Teams, Governor’s Office, Freight Advisory Committee, STIP Stakeholder Committee, other transportation stakeholders, and the general public.

| Oct. 17 to Nov. 30 | Regional CST teams | - Analyze modernization proposals. Identify opportunities / issues. Prepare comments for ACTs.  
- Discuss comments with ACTs |
| Oct. 17 to Nov. 30 | ACTs  
JPACT  
Others | - Consider modernization proposals.  
- Discuss proposals with regional CST teams.  
- Receive information about state and local bridge rehabilitation and replacement projects. |

### OCTOBER 16, 2001 OTC MEETING

Final Bridge/Preservation allocation presented to OTC for consideration. Public comment received.

### NOVEMBER 2, 2001

Deadline for Draft lane capacity and interchange(s) on multilane highway project recommendations developed and refined by ODOT, Cities, counties, ACTs, MPOs, COGs, LOAC, JPACT, CDO/RCST Field Teams, Governor’s Office, Freight Advisory Committee, STIP Stakeholder Committee, other stakeholders, and the general public.

| Week of Nov. 5 | ODOT staff | - Compile modernization project data received.  
- Provide to ACTs, regional CST teams. |

### NOVEMBER 8, 2001 OTC MEETING

Draft Preservation and load limited highway project list and Draft lane capacity project list presented to OTC for consideration and comment. Public comment received.

| ... to Nov. 30 | ACTs | - Complete reviews of proposals.  
- Finalize recommendations.  
- Forward to OTC. |

### DECEMBER 1, 2001

Deadline for all ACTs/Regional Advisory Groups to submit their project recommendations to the OTC Chairman.

| Week of Dec. 3 | ODOT staff | - Compile recommendations from ACTs, JPACT, and others.  
- Prepare analysis for OTC on issues, regional distribution. |
**Timeline and Outreach Schedule for HB 2142**
**Schedule to Amend 2002 – 2005 STIP**

### DECEMBER 12, 2001 OTC MEETING

- Updated draft project list for Bridge, Preservation, lane capacity and interchange(s) on multilane highway projects presented to OTC for consideration and comment. Final opportunity for public comment on project lists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dec. 13 to Dec. 31</th>
<th>ODOT staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Follow up on OTC identified issues and concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prepare final recommendations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### JANUARY 16, 2002 OTC MEETING

- OTC Approval of Bridge, Preservation, Lane capacity and interchange(s) on multilane highway projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jan. 17 onward</th>
<th>ODOT staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Package projects for bond issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prepare bond issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Draft agreements with local government for local projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jan. 17 onward</th>
<th>Cities Counties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sign agreements for local projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FEBRUARY, 12, 2002 OTC MEETING

- Technical corrections to HB 2142 projects (if needed).

### APRIL 2002 – AUGUST 2005

- **Bond Financing Timeline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April 2002</th>
<th>ODOT staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Work with Treasury to issue first bonds under Oregon Transportation Investment Act.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April 2002 onward</th>
<th>ODOT staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sign agreements with local government for local projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Begin implementation of ODOT projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April 2002 onward</th>
<th>Cities Counties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sign agreements for local projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Begin implementation of cities and county owned projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER

AN ACT

Relating to motor vehicles; creating new provisions; amending ORS 366.524, 367.605, 367.620, 803.090 and 821.040; prescribing an effective date; and providing for revenue raising that requires approval by a three-fifths majority.

Be It Enacted by the People of the State of Oregon:

SECTION 1. ORS 367.620 is amended to read:

367.620. (1) Except as provided in subsection (2) of this section, the principal amount of Highway User Tax Bonds issued under ORS 367.615 shall [not exceed in the aggregate a principal sum of $138.4 million] be subject to the provisions of ORS 286.505 to 286.545.

(2) Highway User Tax Bonds may be issued under ORS 367.615 for the purposes described in section 2 of this 2001 Act in an aggregate principal amount sufficient to produce net proceeds of not more than $400 million. The provisions of ORS 286.505 to 286.545 do not apply to bonds described in this subsection.

SECTION 2. (1) As used in this section:
(a) "Highway" has the meaning given that term in ORS 801.305.
(b) "Modernization" has the meaning given that term in ORS 184.651.
(c) "Preservation" has the meaning given that term in ORS 184.651.

(2) Bonds described in ORS 367.620 (2) shall be used to finance preservation and modernization projects chosen by the Oregon Transportation Commission. The commission shall select projects from among the following:
(a) Highways that need increased lane capacity.
(b) Highways and bridges that have weight limitations.
(c) State and local bridges.
(d) Interchanges on multilane highways.
(e) District highways in cities and counties that require preservation. The Department of Transportation shall adopt rules defining "district highway" for purposes of this paragraph.

(3) In choosing projects under subsection (2) of this section, the commission shall use the following criteria, in addition to any criteria developed under section 3 of this 2001 Act:
(a) Lane capacity projects shall be chosen from a financially constrained list.
(b) Bridge projects shall be chosen on the basis of a bridge inventory or rating system recognized by the commission.
(c) Priority for interchange projects shall be given to projects on multilane highways where safety can be enhanced by constructing a grade-separated interchange to replace an at-grade crossing.

(d) Priority for district highway preservation projects shall be given to those projects that may facilitate transfer of jurisdiction over the highway from the state to a local government.

(e) Projects selected for financing under this section shall be equitably distributed throughout the state, using the criteria for distribution of projects that are used for the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program.

SECTION 3. In establishing criteria other than those specified in section 2 of this 2001 Act for selection of projects, and in choosing projects under section 2 of this 2001 Act, the Oregon Transportation Commission shall consult with local governments, metropolitan planning organizations and regional transportation advisory groups.

SECTION 4. Projects to be funded from the proceeds of the bonds described in ORS 367.620 (2) shall be chosen by February 1, 2002.

SECTION 5. ORS 366.524 is amended to read:

366.524. The taxes collected under ORS 319.020, 319.530, 803.090, 803.420, 818.225, 825.476 and 825.480, minus $71.2 million per biennium, shall be allocated 24.38 percent to counties under ORS 366.525 and 15.57 percent to cities under ORS 366.800.

SECTION 6. Each biennium, $71.2 million of moneys available to the Department of Transportation shall be used to pay any principal and interest due on bonds described in ORS 367.620 (2). However, any portion of the $71.2 million that is not needed for payment of principal and interest on the bonds shall be allocated 50 percent to the Department of Transportation, 30 percent to counties and 20 percent to cities. Moneys allocated to counties and cities under this section shall be distributed in the same manner as moneys allocated under ORS 366.524 are distributed.

SECTION 7. ORS 803.090 is amended to read:

803.090. The following fees are the fees for the transaction described:

(1) The transfer fee under ORS 803.092, $10:

(a) For a salvage title, $17.

(b) For a trailer over 8,000 pounds, a motor vehicle with a gross vehicle weight rating of 26,000 pounds or more or a truck tractor, $90.

(c) For vehicles not described in paragraph (b) of this subsection, $30.

(2) The fee for issuance of a certificate of title under ORS 803.045 or a salvage title certificate under ORS 803.140, $10:

(a) For a trailer over 8,000 pounds, a motor vehicle with a gross vehicle weight rating of 26,000 pounds or more or a truck tractor, $90.

(b) For vehicles not described in paragraph (a) of this subsection, $30.

(3) The fee for issuance of a salvage title certificate under ORS 803.140, $17.

(4) The fee for issuance of a duplicate or replacement certificate of title or salvage title certificate under ORS 803.065, $10:

(a) For a duplicate or replacement salvage title certificate, $17.

(b) For a trailer over 8,000 pounds, a motor vehicle with a gross vehicle weight rating of 26,000 pounds or more or a truck tractor, $90.

(c) For a vehicle not described in paragraph (b) of this subsection, $30.

(5) The fee under [this] subsection (4) of this section must be paid at the same time as a transfer fee under this section if application is made at the same time as application for transfer.

(6) The fee for issuance of a new certificate of title under ORS 803.220 indicating a change of name or address, $10:

(a) For a new salvage title certificate, $17.

(b) For a trailer over 8,000 pounds, a motor vehicle with a gross vehicle weight rating of 26,000 pounds or more or a truck tractor, $90.
(c) For a vehicle not described in paragraph (b) of this subsection, $30.

[(5)] (7) The fee for late presentation of certificate of title under ORS 803.105, $25 from the 31st day after the transfer through the 60th day after the transfer and $50 thereafter.

[(6)] (8) The fees for title transactions involving a form of title other than a certificate shall be the amounts established by the Department of Transportation by rule under ORS 803.012.

SECTION 8. ORS 367.605 is amended to read:

367.605. This section establishes the moneys available for use or pledge for purposes of issuing bonds under ORS 367.615 or 367.670. Such moneys are established as provided under the following:

(1) Except as provided in subsection (2) of this section, moneys, once deposited in the highway fund established under ORS 366.505, from all of the following sources are subject to the use or pledge described by this section:

[(a) Moneys credited to the highway fund under ORS 153.630.1
[(b) (a) Moneys from the tax on motor carriers imposed under ORS 825.474 and 825.480.
[(c) (b) Moneys from the tax on motor vehicle fuel imposed under ORS 319.020.
[(d) (c) Moneys from the tax on fuel used in motor vehicles imposed under ORS 319.530.
[(e) (d) Moneys described under ORS 803.090 from the titling of vehicles.
[(f) (e) Moneys described under ORS 803.420 from the registration of vehicles.
[(g) (f) Moneys described under ORS 807.370 relating to the issuance of driver licenses and driver permits.
[(h) Moneys received by the Department of Transportation from taxes, fees or charges imposed after January 1, 2001, or other revenues received by the department from sources not listed in paragraphs (a) to (f) of this subsection that are available for the use or pledge described by this section.

[(i) Any other moneys legally available to the department for the use or pledge described in this section.

(2) Moneys described under subsection (1) of this section do not include any moneys described in the following:

(a) Moneys provided for appropriations to counties under ORS 366.525 to 366.540.
(b) Moneys provided for appropriations to cities under ORS 366.785 to 366.820.
(c) Moneys in the account established under ORS 366.512 for parks and recreation.

(3) Notwithstanding ORS 366.507, the lien or charge of any pledge of moneys securing bonds issued under ORS 367.615 or 367.670 shall be superior or prior to any other lien or charge and to any law of the state requiring the department to spend moneys for specified highway purposes.

SECTION 9. ORS 821.040 is amended to read:

821.040. (1) A person commits the offense of operation of an off-road vehicle without required equipment if the person is operating a vehicle described in ORS 821.010 in an area described in ORS 821.020 and the vehicle is not equipped in compliance with all of the following:

(a) The vehicle must be equipped with a muffler that meets the standards for noise emissions established under ORS 821.030.

(b) The vehicle must be equipped with brakes that meet the requirements established under ORS 821.030.

(c) The vehicle must be equipped with a windshield wiper if the vehicle is equipped with a windshield.

(d) When the vehicle is operated on sand, the vehicle must be equipped with a flag that meets the requirements established under ORS 821.030.

(e) The vehicle must be equipped with any safety equipment required under ORS 821.030.

(f) At any time from one-half hour after sunset to one-half hour after sunrise, the vehicle must be equipped with and display headlights and taillights.

(2) Motorcycles and mopeds are not required by this section to be equipped with windshield wipers [or flags].
(3) The offense described in this section, operation of off-road vehicle without required equipment, is a Class C traffic violation.

SECTION 10. This 2001 Act takes effect on the 91st day after the date on which the regular session of the Seventy-first Legislative Assembly adjourns sine die.

Received by Governor.

Passed by House May 29, 2001

Enrolled House Bill 2142 (HB 2142-A)
MAJOR IMPROVEMENTS

Background

Since road construction is very expensive and funding is very limited, it is unlikely that many new highways will be built in the future. Instead, the emphasis will be on maintaining the current system and improving the efficiency of the highways the State already has. The Major Improvements Policy reflects this reality by directing ODOT and local jurisdictions to do everything possible to protect and improve the efficiency of the highway system before adding new highway facilities. This policy carries out the direction of the Oregon Benchmarks. This direction includes improving traffic operations and maintaining the roadway for legal size vehicle travel. These priorities-laid out in Action 1 G.1-take precedence over the other actions in this policy.

Policy 1 G: Major Improvements

It is the policy of the State of Oregon to maintain highway performance and improve safety by improving system agency and management before adding capacity. ODOT will work in partnership with regional and local governments to address highway performance and safety needs.

Action 1 G.1

Use the following priorities for developing corridor plans, transportation system plans, the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program, and project plans to respond to highway needs. Implement higher priority measures first unless a lower priority measure is clearly more cost-effective or unless it clearly better supports safety, growth management, or other livability and economic viability considerations. Plans must document the findings, which support using lower priority measures before higher priority measures.

1. Protect the existing system. The highest priority is to preserve the functionality of the existing highway system by means such as access management, local comprehensive plans, transportation demand management, improved traffic operations, and alternative modes of transportation.

2. Improve efficiency and capacity of existing highway facilities. The second priority is to make minor improvements to existing highway facilities such as widening highway shoulders or adding auxiliary lanes, providing better access for alternative modes (e.g., bike lanes, sidewalks, bus shelters), extending or connecting local streets, and making other off-system improvements.
3. Add capacity to the existing system. The third priority is to make major roadway improvements to existing highway facilities such as adding general purpose lanes and making alignment corrections to accommodate legal size vehicles.

4. Add new facilities to the system. The lowest priority is to add new transportation facilities such as a new highway or bypass.

**Action 1 G.2**

Support any major improvements to state highway facilities in local comprehensive plans and transportation system plans only if the improvements meet all of the following conditions:

- The improvement is needed to satisfy a state transportation objective or objectives;

- The scope of the project is reasonably identified, considering the long-range projection of need;

- The improvement was identified through a planning process that included:
  - Thorough public involvement;
  - Evaluation of reasonable transportation and land use alternatives including measures for managing the existing transportation system and for reducing demands for highway capacity; and
  - Sufficient environmental analysis at the fatal flaw planning level.

The plan includes measures to manage the transportation system, but these measures will not satisfy identified highway needs during the planning period or there is a need to preserve a future transportation corridor for future needs beyond the planning period;

The improvement would be a cost-effective means to achieve the objective(s);

The proposed timing of the improvement is consistent with priorities established in corridor plans and regional transportation plans and the financing program identifies construction as being dependent on the future availability of funds;

Funding for the project can reasonably be expected at the time the project is ready for development and construction;
2001 OTC Act, etc.

Modernization

Screening Criteria
- Lane capacity, etc. (Sec. 2(2)(a)&(d) and (3)(a) of HB 2142)¹
- Consistent with applicable acknowledged comprehensive plans and/or adopted TSPs²
- Project readiness³
- Where applicable Consistency with OHP policy 1.G.1

Prioritizing Factors
- Grade-separated Interchange projects (Sec. 2, (3) (c) of HB 2142)
- Access to intermodal facilities
- Where applicable, project supports important community areas⁴
- Freight Mobility⁵
- Safety⁶
- Other fund leverage and public benefits⁷

Preservation

Screening Criteria
- District highways (Sec. 2, (2)(e) of HB 2142)
- Load limited highways (Sec. 2, (2)(b) of HB 2142)
- Consistent with plans (etc.)
- Project readiness

Prioritizing Factors
- Jurisdictional transfer projects (Sec. 2, (3)(d) of HB 2142)
- Pavement management system
- Where applicable, project supports important community areas
- Freight mobility
- Safety
- Other fund leverage and public benefits

Bridge

Screening Criteria
- State and local bridges (Sec. 2, (2)(c) of HB 2142)
- Load limited bridges (Sec. 2, (2)(b) of HB 2142)
- Project readiness

Prioritizing Factors
- Bridge management system (Sec. 2, (3)(b) of HB 2142)
- Where applicable, project supports important community areas
- Freight mobility
- Safety
- Other fund leverage and public benefits
Additional Guidance

I. Screening Criteria

The purpose of screening is to focus the projects to get through the first sieve and is in a sense the bare minimum. The prioritization factors identify the intent of the type of projects to be considered. Neither list is in any particular order or are any of the bulleted items weighted differently. At a minimum, the project list submitted to the OTC for their approval needs to satisfy the identified criteria but a local government or ACT can use additional criteria in identify and prioritizing projects.

1 Lane Capacity Projects

Projects that increase lane capacity can include more than additional lanes. They may also include passing lanes, signalization, etc....

2 Comprehensive Plans and Transportation System Plans (TSP)

All local governments have an adopted comprehensive plan but not all communities have an acknowledged and/or an adopted Transportation System Plan. The intent is to require consistency with acknowledged and/or adopted TSPs which recognizes the work and direction of the local government. If the local government TSP was adopted after March 1999, the adoption date for the Oregon Highway Plan, then a finding can be made that the TSP has addressed the prioritization criteria found in policy 1.G.1. If the local government does not have or need to have a TSP then identified projects should not be “inconsistent” with their adopted plan. Local governments rely on their comprehensive plan or a TSP adopted and/or acknowledged prior to March 1999, findings need to be based on OHP policy 1G1 prioritization criteria.

3 Project Readiness

The intent of this screening criteria is to identify a project that can be delivered within the timeframe allowed under bonding requirements. The project does not have to have been on the “shelf” but there needs to be information that indicates that the project can get the necessary permits and be built in the timeframe indicated. Areas to assess readiness include, but are not limited to environmental, right-of-way, alternative analysis and consistency with state land use goals.
II. Prioritization Factors

The prioritization factors are guidance offered by the Oregon Transportation Commission to ensure consistent consideration of projects by ACTs and others.

4 Livable Communities

The intent of this prioritization factor is to support projects that are consistent with the Livability Initiative where applicable. These projects assist in the following:
- Stimulate economic opportunities in rural and distressed communities
- Help revitalize or enhance a downtown, main street, etc. and if located outside such an area does not promote sprawl.

5 Freight Mobility

Projects identified should address the following concerns:
- How it provides for an efficient movement of freight
- Demonstrate that it will not negatively affect freight movement.
Projects may include farm to market roads.

6 Safety

A project that focuses on an area (or areas) with a high Safety Program Index System number would more likely to be funded, all other things being equal, and where appropriate, projects should also address safety for other modes.

7 Leverage and Public Benefit

Proposed projects can be leveraged by collateral community benefits and/or additional funding. Examples could include:
- Fish enhancement
- Other funding contributions
- Bundling with other infrastructure projects
July 27, 2001

Mr. Bruce Warner  
Director of Transportation  
ODOT  
Transportation Building Room 135  
Salem, OR 97310

Dear Bruce:

On behalf of the Portland metropolitan region, we are pleased to comment on the proposed criteria for selection of projects to be funded with the bond funds expected from HB 2142. These comments have been developed in cooperation with JPACT and the Metro Council.

1. We concur with your desire to have an open process and congratulate you for involving metropolitan planning organizations, area commissions on transportation and other stakeholders. We look forward to participating through JPACT for the Metro area but also recognize that you will be dealing with project priority questions outside Metro's boundary within Multnomah, Clackamas and Washington Counties.

2. We concur with your overriding criteria that funding should be committed to projects that can clearly be successfully within the time limits of HB 2142. It is important that ODOT demonstrate to the Legislature that a good program of projects can be delivered efficiently so that they are supportive of future funding packages.

3. There should be a clear delineation of what types of projects are eligible according to HB 2142 and that those limitations are absolute, while other prioritization criteria will assist in ranking projects within those eligible categories.

4. Projects selected should be consistent with and implement the Governor's Quality Development Objectives. We understand that while for certain projects these criteria may not be applicable, where they are applicable, ODOT should ensure they are implemented. However, in areas with Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), we believe ODOT should encourage the development of criteria for projects that are consistent with the unique goals for project development in their region. We further believe that the Oregon Transportation Commission should consider the recommendation of JPACT and the Metro Council for the final program of projects to be funded with HB 2142 funding.

5. Projects that impact streams for which there is a listing for endangered salmonids should be designed to be fish “friendly” and mitigate past fish “unfriendly” designs.

6. Projects should be rated based upon their economic importance, including access to intermodel terminals in particular and for freight movement generally.

7. You have suggested that projects be rated taking into account leveraging of local, private or toll funding. We are encouraged by your interest in toll projects but would expect that these types of projects may not meet your project readiness criterion due to the controversial nature of tolling. Despite this, we would encourage you to continue to pursue tolling, if not through these funds, through some other mechanism.
8. Also related to leveraging local funds, we agree that this is a good indicator of local support for "Modernization" projects and would suggest that this consideration be applied to locally (or regionally) controlled federal funds, such as STP, forestry receipts and HUD funding.

9. Within the "Bridge" category, before using the existing bridge rating system, we recommend reviewing it to account for the following considerations:
   • Whether the unique needs of moving bridges are adequately accounted for; for example, the current split between ODOT bridge needs (73 percent), local small bridge needs (21 percent) and local big bridge needs (6 percent) is based upon bridge area rather than bridge cost due to federal requirements. It may be appropriate to alter this approach since federal funds are not involved.
   • The 10 percent local match is singled out as a requirement for bridges and not "Modernization" or "Preservation" which appears to be a carry over from the current bridge program. All three categories should prioritize taking into consideration leveraging local funds that may or may not be 10 percent.
   • In addition to the current rating system, criteria should be applied taking into consideration the economic importance of the bridge, impact on freight movement, local fund leverage, quality development objectives and safety.

10. Also within the "Bridge" category, if a high bridge sufficiency rating is due to traffic volumes and results in a project that would add lanes, it should be rated using the "Modernization" criteria.

11. Selection of projects for this Bond program raises questions about the relationship to the remainder of the ODOT State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). For example, last year, the decision was made to reduce the Transportation Enhancement Program in order to prioritize "Preservation" and "Bridge" projects. Since there is now a significant increase in "Preservation" and "Bridge" funding, this decision should be revisited. Similarly, the funding did nothing for funding critical transit needs. In the future, when we consider methods to improve transportation in key ODOT corridors, flexible funding toward the transit projects in these corridors should also be considered. Finally, getting the bond measure projects ready to go will consume ODOT’s energies resulting in inadequate progress for the next generation of projects to be funded either through the normal STIP or a future state bond program. As such, we recommend ODOT restore the "Development" section of the STIP to clearly define which projects are being developed beyond the current STIP and HB 2142 bond program.

12. Although these funds are not Federal Highway Funds, the federal Clean Air Act still applies. As such, it will be necessary to demonstrate conformity with air quality standards assuming these projects are built even if they don’t include federal funds.

The Bond program provided by HB 2142 provides a critical opportunity to begin addressing some long overdue needs. We look forward to working with ODOT to select the projects to implement this program. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Sincerely,

Rod Monroe
Chair
Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
**CANDIDATE PROJECT POTENTIALLY ELIGIBLE FOR STATE BOND PROGRAM**

**Road Modernization Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code &amp; Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Federal Funds Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WM3 Cedar Hills Blvd./Barnes Rd. Intersection Improvement Washington County</td>
<td>Design, acquire and construct additional right/left/through lanes at this intersection, and provide significant multi-modal amenities. STATE BOND PROGRAM ELIGIBLE.</td>
<td>$1,980,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM4 SW Greenburg Rd.: Washington Square Dr./Tiedeman City of Tigard</td>
<td>Right of way and partial construction funding, (supplements previous regional design funds), to widen Greenburg Rd. from three to five lanes, modify one signal and signing, striping and transitional road segments between Tiedeman and Washington. COULD BE SPLIT TO $390,000 ROW PHASE. STATE BOND PROGRAM ELIGIBLE.</td>
<td>$774,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM6 I-5/Nyberg Interchange Widening City of Tualatin</td>
<td>Right of Way and construction funds to widen Nyberg O'Xing of I-5 from two to four lanes, improve signal operations at the interchange, widen ramp structures in tandem with separate ODOT project and provide bike and ped facilities. STATE BOND PROGRAM ELIGIBLE.</td>
<td>$3,507,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM7 Farmington Rd.: Hocken Ave./Murray Blvd. City of Beaverton</td>
<td>Right of way and construction funding, (supplements previously allocated regional design funds), to widen Farmington Rd. at the Murray intersection to accommodate double left turn bays and to provide appropriate Boulevard amenities at the Farmington/Murray intersection per regional design guidelines, upgrade signals, address significant safety issues and integrate multimodal facilities at the Farmington /Murray and Farmington/Hocken intersections. COULD BE SPLIT TO $4.3 MILLION ROW PHASE. STATE BOND PROGRAM ELIGIBLE.</td>
<td>$8,210,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Freight Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code &amp; Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Federal Funds Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PF1</strong></td>
<td>Columbia/Killingsworth East End Connector</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port/Portland/ODOT</td>
<td>Thirty-three percent of design funds, to augment Port overmatch, for new, $34 million, grade-separated Columbia/Killingsworth intersection and rail crossing. STATE BOND PROGRAM ELIGIBLE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PF2</strong></td>
<td>N. Lombard RR O'Xing: N. Burgard Ave./N. Rivergate Blvd.</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
<td>Supplemental construction funds to cover design changes for habitat protection needs of this otherwise fully funded project to widen N. Lombard from two to four lanes, add five foot bike lanes, a four foot median and one seven foot sidewalk, and to grade separate the street crossing of the BN and SP rail lines. STATE BOND PROGRAM ELIGIBLE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: August 1, 2001

TO: Oregon Transportation Commission

FROM: Bruce A. Warner
Director

SUBJECT: House Bill 2142 – 2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act

Requested Action:
Request the Oregon Transportation Commission to:

- Approve revised HB 2142 timeline and project selection schedule.
- Adopt criteria by which HB 2142 projects would be considered.
- Establish allocation targets of at least 50 percent of the HB 2142 bond proceeds being directed toward bridge and preservation projects while up to 50 percent targeted to projects that add capacity or new facilities.

Background:
House Bill 2142 directs the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) to consult with local governments, metropolitan planning organizations and regional transportation advisory groups when establishing criteria and in choosing projects. The Commission, at its July 11, 2001 meeting expanded this mandated consultation group to include any and all other transportation stakeholders with the desire to engage and share input on the criteria, the outreach process and/or project selection.

To jump-start an aggressive HB 2142 public outreach effort, an electronic mailing of materials related to the Act was launched Friday, July 6, 2001, to a comprehensive transportation stakeholder grouping. This mailing included a message from OTC Chairman Steven H. Corey requesting mobilization and engagement related to HB 2142 activities, a definition of District Highway (to be used in a rule-making effort as mandated in HB 2142), a draft timeline and outreach process, and draft criteria by which projects would be considered.
Timeline:
At its July 11, 2001 meeting, the Transportation Commission considered the proposed timeline for implementation of HB 2142. The OTC approved the timeline after making some revisions to clarify the outreach process and the Commission's action at certain points in time.

Some conflicts in the schedule became apparent when the approved timeline was prepared. Significantly, staff failed to catch the three-day window between the deadline for submission of bridge projects (September 7) and preparation of the draft bridge project recommendations (September 10). The revised timeline now shows the latter deadline at October 8. Additionally, a draft bridge project list was to be presented to the OTC for consideration at its September 20 meeting, the revised timeline now shows this presentation taking place at the October 16 OTC meeting.

Attached is a copy of the revised OTC Approved Timeline and Outreach Schedule for HB 2142. (See Attachment A.)

Criteria:
The date of July 27, 2001, was established as the deadline to receive recommendations on the criteria. By close of business on July 27, 2001, ODOT had received twenty-six sets of comments on the draft criteria. ODOT staff collected, formatted and summarized these comments in the attempt to capture the tenor of these inputs.

Based on this input, ODOT staff has prepared a recommendation (see Attachment B) on the 2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act project eligibility criteria and prioritizing factors to be applied by the Area Commissions on Transportation and/or regional transportation advisory groups. Additionally, staff has produced a process description and guidance document, which articulates in greater detail the criteria to be used to select projects. (See Attachment C.)

Upon adoption of the project selection criteria, ACTs/regional advisory groups are to use the criteria as a guide when they evaluate projects to recommend for funding to ensure consistent application of project eligibility criteria and prioritizing factors. The Commission will rely on the advice and recommendations that it receives from Area Commissions on Transportation and the regional advisory groups. The Oregon Transportation Commission will make the final selections for projects to be funded under the 2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act.
Allocation:
In establishing allocation targets, the Commission is faced with the challenge to develop and use the existing highway system successfully while addressing the additional capacity necessary to meet major growth and demand.

Within the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) is a series of four funding scenarios to use in planning and prioritizing programs at a range of potential funding levels. The Plan recognizes that at the lowest funding levels, the emphasis is on doing as much as possible to operate the highway system safely and efficiently and to preserve what already is in place. The second funding scenario is in alignment with the intent of HB 2142. The aim of this scenario is to make investments to improve infrastructure conditions and to add new facilities or capacity to address critical safety problems, critical levels of congestion and support desirable economic development.

An affirmation that at least 50 percent of the bond proceeds be directed toward projects that protect the existing system through preservation and minor improvements, and up to 50 percent of the proceeds targeted to projects that add capacity or new facilities meets the range of treatments discussed in Policy Action 1G.1. This preservation/modernization funding mix allows the OTC to protect the existing system and improve the efficiency and capacity of existing highway facilities as well as meet the intent to make significant improvements through an infusion of funding proscribed in HB 2142.

You will recall that under the current Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), modernization funds are distributed based on a variety of criteria that result in a modernization equity split. The criteria consists of population, vehicle miles traveled, ton miles traveled, total revenue, and modernization needs based on the Oregon Highway Plan. This resulted in the following allocation for the current STIP. (Taking these allocation percentages and relating them to HB 2142 – the modernization dollars flowing to the ODOT Regions are roughly as follows:)

Region 1 - 35 percent or $70 million
Region 2 - 34 percent or $68 million
Region 3 - 14 percent or $28 million
Region 4 - 10 percent or $20 million
Region 5 - 7 percent or $14 million
Initial feedback concerning the allocation formula between pavement and bridge preservation has suggested that this decision will be made in a more informed manner after a listing of proposed projects and their respective funding levels is able to be reviewed. The OTC adopted timeline for the 2001 Oregon Transportation Act allows the Commission to reassess and finalize this issue at its October 16, 2001 meeting. It is believed that a clearer picture of the need will be realized and the bridge/pavement preservation allocation conversation can be engaged.

Attachments:
A. Revised HB 2142 timeline and outreach schedule
B. Project eligibility criteria and prioritizing factors
C. Process description and guidance
D. Definition for the term “financially constrained”
E. Policy Action 1G.1 from 1999 Oregon Highway Plan
F. Summary of comments on criteria
G. Individual comment letters

Copies (w/attachments) to:
Tom Lulay  Cathy Nelson
Mike Marsh  Doug Tindall
Patrick Cooney  Don Aman
Matthew Garrett  Region Managers
Joan Plank  Area Managers
Victor Dodier  Dan Fricke
Kelly Taylor
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### ATTACHMENT A

**Revised timeline and outreach schedule for HB 2142**  
**Schedule to Amend 2002 – 2005 STIP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JULY 11, 2001 OTC MEETING</td>
<td>OTC approves timeline and project selection schedule. Cities, Counties, ACTs, MPOs, COGs, LOAC, JPACT, CDO/RCST Field Teams, Governor’s Office, Freight Advisory Committee, STIP Stakeholder Committee, other transportation stakeholders, and the general public begin consultation on additional criteria and fund allocation targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY 27, 2001 LOAC MEETING</td>
<td><strong>Deadline</strong> for recommendations on any additional criteria and lane capacity, bridge, preservation target allocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST 9, 2001 OTC MEETING (OTC meets in Pendleton)</td>
<td>OTC expected to adopt criteria by which projects would be considered. OTC to sets initial target percentages for lane capacity, bridge, and preservation project categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST 10 - DECEMBER 12, 2001</td>
<td>Public outreach effort engaged to identify lane capacity, bridge, and preservation projects for HB 2142 funding. Project input sought from cities, counties, ACTs, MPOs, COGs, LOAC, JPACT, CDO/RCST Field Teams, Governor’s Office, Freight Advisory Committee, STIP Stakeholder Committee, other transportation stakeholders, and the general public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER 7, 2001</td>
<td><strong>Deadline</strong> for bridge, preservation and load limited Highways project submittals to ODOT Regions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER 20, 2001 OTC MEETING (OTC meets in Eugene)</td>
<td>OTC <strong>adopts</strong> temporary rule language defining District Highways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER 2001</td>
<td>Rule defining District Highways is filed with Secretary of State to become effective 91st day following adjournment sine die.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER 5, 2001</td>
<td><strong>Deadline</strong> for lane capacity and interchange(s) on multilane highway project submittals to ODOT Regions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

August 1, 2001  
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OCTOBER 8, 2001

Deadline for Draft Bridge, Preservation and Load limited Highways project recommendations developed and refined by ODOT, Cities, counties, ACTs, MPOs, COGs, LOAC, JPACT, CDO/RCST Field Teams, Governor’s Office, Freight Advisory Committee, STIP Stakeholder Committee, other transportation stakeholders, and the general public.

OCTOBER 16, 2001 OTC MEETING
(OTC meets in Forest Grove)

Final Bridge/Preservation allocation presented to OTC for consideration. Public comment received.

Draft Bridge project list presented to OTC for consideration. Public comment received.

NOVEMBER 2, 2001

Deadline for Draft lane capacity and interchange(s) on multilane highway project recommendations developed and refined by ODOT, Cities, counties, ACTs, MPOs, COGs, LOAC, JPACT, CDO/RCST Field Teams, Governor’s Office, Freight Advisory Committee, STIP Stakeholder Committee, other stakeholders, and the general public.

NOVEMBER 8, 2001 OTC MEETING
(OTC meets in Hillsboro)

Draft Preservation and load limited highway project list and Draft lane capacity project list presented to OTC for consideration and comment. Public comment received.

DECEMBER 1, 2001

Deadline for all ACTs/Regional Advisory Groups to submit their project recommendations to the OTC Chairman.

DECEMBER 12, 2001 OTC MEETING

Updated draft project list for Bridge, Preservation, lane capacity and interchange(s) on multilane highway projects presented to OTC for consideration and comment. Final opportunity for public comment on project lists.

JANUARY 16, 2002 OTC MEETING

OTC Approval of Bridge, Preservation, Lane capacity and interchange(s) on multilane highway projects.

FEBRUARY, 12, 2002 OTC MEETING

Technical corrections to HB 2142 projects (if needed).

APRIL 2002 – AUGUST 2005

Bond Financing Timeline
2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act
RECOMMENDED Project Eligibility Criteria and Prioritizing Factors
Established by the Oregon Transportation Commission

Process Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modernization</th>
<th>Pavement Preservation</th>
<th>Bridge Replacement / Rehabilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied by ACTs</td>
<td>Applied by ACTs</td>
<td>Applied by Bridge Project Selection Committees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Eligibility Criteria:** (used to determine if a project is eligible for funding under HB 2142)

- **Modernization projects that:**
  - Increase lane capacity [sections 2(2)(a) and 2(3)(a) of HB 2142] or involve interchanges on multilane highways [section 2(2)(d) of HB 2142].
  - Are consistent with applicable acknowledged comprehensive plans and/or adopted Transportation System Plans.
  - Are consistent with the Oregon Highway Plan policies on Land Use and Transportation (IB) and Major Investment (I.G.1), where applicable.
  - Have achieved project readiness.

- **Pavement Preservation projects that:**
  - Are located on District Highways [section 2(2)(e) of HB 2142] or be on a load limited highway [section 2, (2)(b) of HB 2142].
  - Are consistent with applicable acknowledged comprehensive plans and/or adopted Transportation System Plans.
  - Have achieved project readiness.

- **Bridge replacement and rehabilitation projects that:**
  - Are load limited bridges [section 2(2)(b) of HB 2142] or are state or local bridges [section 2(2)(c) of HB 2142].
  - Have achieved project readiness.

**Prioritizing Factors:** (used to select projects for funding from the pool of eligible projects)

- **Modernization**
  - Interchange projects on multi-lane highways [section 2(3) (c) of HB 2142].
  - Projects that support important community areas, where applicable.
  - Projects that enhance Freight Mobility, including access to intermodal facilities.
  - Projects that enhance the safety of the transportation system.
  - Projects that leverage other funds and public benefits.

- **Pavement Preservation**
  - Projects that facilitate jurisdictional transfer [section 2(3)(d) of HB 2142].
  - Projects identified by the Pavement Management System.
  - Projects that support important community areas, where applicable.
  - Projects that enhance Freight Mobility, including access to intermodal facilities.
  - Projects that enhance the safety of the transportation system.
  - Projects that leverage other funds and public benefits.

- **Bridge Replacement / Rehabilitation**
  - Projects identified by the Bridge Management System [section 2(3)(b) of HB 2142].
  - Projects that support important community areas, where applicable.
  - Projects that enhance Freight Mobility, including access to intermodal facilities.
  - Projects that enhance the safety of the transportation system.
  - Projects that leverage other funds and public benefits.
2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act
RECOMMENDED Project Eligibility Criteria and Prioritizing Factors
Established by the Oregon Transportation Commission

Process Description and Guidance

This document outlines the project selection process for the 2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act. The Oregon Transportation Commission will make the final selections for projects to be funded under the 2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act. The Commission will rely on the advice and recommendations that it receives from Area Commissions on Transportation (ACTs).

ACTs should use this document as a guide when they evaluate projects to recommend for funding to ensure consistent application of project eligibility criteria and prioritizing factors. It may also provide information to those who are preparing project proposals.

ACTs may use additional criteria to select and rank projects provided that the criteria are consistent with the criteria adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission. If an ACT chooses to use additional criteria, the ACT must inform those developing project proposals about the criteria.

The 2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act shall be used to finance modernization and preservation projects.

- Modernization projects: A “modernization project” is any project includes improvements that add capacity to highways, including but not limited to new or widened lanes and new bypasses. Projects that build bridges in places where there was no bridge or that rebuild a bridge to add travel lanes are modernization projects.

- Preservation: A “preservation project” is any project which includes paving, striping and reconstruction designed to add useful life to existing highways. Preservation include bridge replacement and rehabilitation projects so long as capacity is not added.
I. Project Eligibility Criteria

Area Commissions on Transportation (ACTs), the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), or any other body advising the Oregon Transportation Commission on the selection of projects for funding shall apply the project eligibility criteria. The project eligibility criteria are a first screen so that additional efforts can be focused to determine what projects they will evaluate further for funding under the 2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act. The eligibility criteria are not listed in any particular order. Projects must satisfy these criteria, at a minimum, before they are given further consideration.

Lane Capacity Projects and Interchange Projects

The 2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act funds modernization projects on:

- Highways that need increased lane capacity where lane capacity projects are chosen from a constrained list [sections 2(2)(a) and 2(3)(a) of House Bill 2142].
- Interchange projects on multi-lane highways [section 2(2)(d) of House Bill 2142].

The phrase “lane capacity projects” may be understood broadly. Lane capacity projects may include any project intended to address capacity problems. This includes bypasses, adding a lane or lanes to an existing facility, passing lanes, turn refuges, signalization, lane widening or alignment, bus turnouts, and bicycle lanes.

The term constrained list has different meaning depending on whether a project is located inside or outside a metropolitan planning organization’s (MPO) boundaries. The term does not restrict the consideration of modernization projects to only those projects located within MPO boundaries.

- **Inside MPO boundaries:** TSP or transportation improvement programs are developed following a federally-prescribed process. This includes a financial plan that demonstrates which projects can be implemented using current revenue sources and which projects are to be implemented using proposed revenue sources (while the existing transportation system is being adequately operated and maintained). (See Attachment D, an excerpt from the Code of Federal Regulations.)
- **Outside MPO boundaries:** The legislature recognized that documents such as TSPs, transportation improvement programs, corridor plans, or capital improvement programs have considered and listed projects that would not be built using the resources for the current Statewide Transportation Improvement Program.
Comprehensive Plans and Transportation System Plans (TSP)

All local governments have an acknowledged comprehensive plan. Not all local governments have an adopted acknowledged and/or an adopted Transportation System Plan (TSP).

A project must be consistent with acknowledged and/or adopted TSPs which recognizes the work and direction of the local government. This does not require a project to be listed in the subject TSP. Rather, it requires the project proposal to make a finding:
- If the local government TSP was acknowledged after March 1999, the adoption date for the Oregon Highway Plan, then the finding can be made that the TSP has addressed the prioritization criteria found in policy 1.G.1 of the Oregon Highway Plan.
- If the local TSP was adopted before March 1999, then the finding should address how the project is consistent with policy 1.G.1. (see Attachment E.)
- If the local government does not have, or is not required to have a TSP, then the finding should show how the identified projects is not “inconsistent” with the local government’s adopted comprehensive plan and how it is consistent with policy 1.G.1.

Consistency with Oregon Highway Plan policies on Land Use and Transportation (1.B) and Major Investment (1.G.1)

To show consistency with Policy 1.B of the Oregon Highway Plan, a project should not detract from efforts to improve downtowns and main streets and to reduce sprawling development patterns.

A project should also be consistent with Policy 1.G.1, Major Investment. In order to demonstrate that a project is consistent, the proposal must show that (1) the project was development pursuant to a TSP acknowledged after March 1999; or, (2) the project was developed using a process consistent with the process outlined in policy 1.G.1 (see Attachment E, an excerpt from the Oregon Highway Plan).

Please note: Conditions for project approval may be negotiated with an applicant to enhance community livability or to preserve the capacity of the state highway for long-distance travel. If any conditions are required, conditions will be negotiated at the ACT level when projects are reviewed by the ACT.

Project Must Be Ready

The intent of the “project readiness” screening criteria is to identify projects that can be delivered within the timeframe allowed under bonding requirements. The project does not have to have been on the “shelf,” but there needs to be information that indicates that the project can get the necessary permits and be built in the timeframe indicated. Areas to assess readiness include,
are not limited to environmental, right-of-way, alternative analysis and consistency with state land use goals.

"Project readiness" responds to a commitment to the Legislative Assembly to move quickly to implement the 2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act. The Act is intended to make visible improvements to Oregon’s highways, roads and streets. It should be possible to move a project from design to construction, meeting the normal public outreach, environmental requirements, and land use requirements with a minimum of delays.

In addition, bond proceeds will be used to finance projects under the 2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act. Bonding imposes requirements (for example, to spend proceeds within three years) that emphasize the need to move quickly.

The department anticipates three bond issues associated with 2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act, with the last occurring about October 2005. Final project should be finished and all expenditures complete before October 2008.
II. Prioritization Factors

The prioritization factors are guidance offered by the Oregon Transportation Commission to ensure consistent consideration of projects by ACTs. ACTs may use additional criteria to rank projects provided that the factors are consistent with the criteria adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission. If an ACT chooses to use additional prioritization factors, the ACT must inform those developing project proposals about the factors.

5 Livable Communities

The intent of this prioritization factor is to support projects that are consistent with the Livability Initiative where applicable. These projects assist in the following:
- Stimulate economic opportunities in rural and distressed communities
- Help revitalize or enhance a downtown, main street, etc. and, if located outside such an area, does not promote sprawl.
- Include land use and transportation elements that discourage commercial strip development or other sprawl patterns and protect the integrity of the transportation system.

6 Freight Mobility

Freight mobility means the safe, reliable, and efficient movement of goods between and among local, national, and international markets. In considering projects, ACTs should evaluate how a project:
- Provides for an efficient movement of freight
- Demonstrates that it will not negatively affect freight movement.

Projects that address freight mobility concerns may include access to intermodal terminals and may ensure movement of farm and forest equipment.

7 Safety

A project that focuses on an area (or areas) with a high Safety Program Index System number would more likely to be funded, all other things being equal. Where appropriate, projects should also address safety for other modes.
Leverage and Public Benefit

ACTs should evaluate how proposed projects leverage additional funding or collateral community benefits and make wise and efficient use of infrastructure and natural resources. Examples of leverage could include:

- Other funding contributions, such as additional federal funds, local matching funds or provision of project right-of-way, private funding
- Bundling with other infrastructure projects (provided there is no adverse affect on project readiness)
- Fish enhancement, such as culvert replacement and improved drainage
- Transfer of jurisdiction from state to local control

District Highways

The Oregon Department of Transportation is engaged in an administrative rule-making to define “district highway.” The department will make a recommendation to the Oregon Transportation Commission at its September meeting to adopt an administrative rule defining “district highway.” The proposed rule would define a district highway as below:

“District Highway” means a state facility of county-wide significance that functions largely as a county and city arterial or collector.

The comment period for the temporary rule has closed.

Bridge Prioritization

STATE BRIDGE PROJECT SELECTION

State bridge projects proposed for funding under the Oregon Transportation Improvement Act were selected based on the desire to maintain and improve transportation’s role in Oregon’s economy.

Focusing on the Interstate Highway and Freight Route systems, bridges were considered as candidates based on the following:

- Bridges that are presently load restricted
- Bridges that have needed temporary repair, but still have some load restrictions.
- Bridges that have deterioration that will cause load restrictions in the near future.

With bridges being inspected at least every two years, the most current inspection information was used to develop a list of bridges meeting the criteria above. This list contained 137 bridges at an uninflated replacement cost of $585 million.
Process Description and Guidance

The list was further prioritized by listing only Interstate Highway system bridges that matched the criteria. This reduced the proposed list to 42 bridges, at an uninflated replacement cost of $220 million.

Due to the magnitude of bridge needs, an additional prioritization was necessary to further reduce the bridge list. Only the bridges on the Interstate Highway system that have experienced load restrictions in the recent past and those that have deterioration that will cause load restrictions in the near future were considered. This resulted in the current list of candidate State Bridge projects and consists of 13 bridges, at an uninflated replacement cost of $115 million.

LOCAL BRIDGE PROJECT SELECTION

Local bridges that are currently load restricted may become candidates for funding through the Oregon Transportation Improvement Act. ODOT maintains data in the National Bridge Inventory System and a record of inspections on bridges owned by local jurisdictions.

Deficient bridges with a sufficiency rating of 80 or less will be considered for rehabilitation. Those bridges with a sufficiency rating of 50 or less will be considered for replacement. This follows the methodology outlined in Sections XIII through XVII of the 2001-03 Federal-Aid Agreement.

The State Bridge Engineer will request that bridge owners indicate by letter which bridges should be considered for funding by the Oregon Transportation Investment Act. The letters of request will be submitted to the ODOT Region Manager who will forward the information to the State Bridge Engineer and the Local Bridge Selection Review Committee. Only those bridges requested by owners will be considered for funding.

The Local Bridge Selection Review Committee will consider bridges in two categories: small bridges (deck area less than 30,000 square feet) and large bridges (deck area of 30,000 square feet or more).

The Local Bridge Selection Review Committee will compile and rank small bridge projects in priority order according to the Technical Ranking System (TRS). The TRS formula considers factors such as the structural condition, average daily traffic, detour length, safety features, construction cost and the bridge’s load capacity; providing a single point total number for each candidate bridge project. Higher point totals signify a higher priority.

For candidate large bridges (deck area of 30,000 square feet or greater), the Local Bridge Selection Review Committee will review the applications and prioritize the projects based upon the bridge’s service to the state and local economy.
Financially constrained list. From §450.324(e) of the Code of Federal Regulation.

(e) The TIP shall be financially constrained by year and include a financial plan that demonstrates which projects can be implemented using current revenue sources and which projects are to be implemented using proposed revenue sources (while the existing transportation system is being adequately operated and maintained). The financial plan shall be developed by the MPO in cooperation with the State and the transit operator. The State and the transit operator must provide MPOs with estimates of available Federal and State funds which the MPOs shall utilize in developing financial plans. It is expected that the State would develop this information as part of the STIP development process and that the estimates would be refined through this process. Only projects for which construction and operating funds can reasonably be expected to be available may be included. In the case of new funding sources, strategies for ensuring their availability shall be identified. In developing the financial analysis, the MPO shall take into account all projects and strategies funded under title 23, U.S.C., and the Federal Transit Act, other Federal funds, local sources, State assistance, and private participation. In nonattainment and maintenance areas, projects included for the first two years of the current TIP shall be limited to those for which funds are available or committed.
Major Improvements

Background
Since road construction is very expensive and funding is very limited, it is unlikely that many new highways will be built in the future. Instead, the emphasis will be on maintaining the current system and improving the efficiency of the highways the State already has. The Major Improvements Policy reflects this reality by directing ODOT and local jurisdictions to do everything possible to protect and improve the efficiency of the highway system before adding new highway facilities. This policy carries out the direction of the Oregon Benchmarks. This direction includes improving traffic operations and maintaining the roadway for legal size vehicle travel. These priorities—laid out in Action 1G.1—take precedence over the other actions in this policy.

Policy 1G: Major Improvements

*It is the policy of the State of Oregon to maintain highway performance and improve safety by improving system efficiency and management before adding capacity. ODOT will work in partnership with regional and local governments to address highway performance and safety needs.*

**Action 1G.1**

Use the following priorities for developing corridor plans, transportation system plans, the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program, and project plans to respond to highway needs. Implement higher priority measures first unless a lower priority measure is clearly more cost-effective or unless it clearly better supports safety, growth management, or other livability and economic viability considerations. Plans must document the findings which support using lower priority measures before higher priority measures.

1. **Protect the existing system.** The highest priority is to preserve the functionality of the existing highway system by means such as access management, local comprehensive plans, transportation demand management, improved traffic operations, and alternative modes of transportation.

2. **Improve efficiency and capacity of existing highway facilities.** The second priority is to make minor improvements to existing highway facilities such as widening highway shoulders or adding auxiliary lanes, providing better access for alternative modes (e.g., bike lanes, sidewalks, bus shelters), extending or connecting local streets, and making other off-system improvements.

3. **Add capacity to the existing system.** The third priority is to make major roadway improvements to existing highway facilities such as adding general purpose lanes and making alignment corrections to accommodate legal size vehicles.

4. **Add new facilities to the system.** The lowest priority is to add new transportation facilities such as a new highway or bypass.
### Summary of Comments

**Draft Project Selection Criteria for the Oregon Transportation Investment Act**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue/Commentor</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Action Recommended to OTC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocation of funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1. South West Area ACT</td>
<td>• Concur with $200 million mod / $200 million preservation allocation. (1)</td>
<td>• Allocate at least 50% ($200 million) to preservation of pavements and bridges and up to 50% ($200 million) for modernization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2. Cascades West ACT</td>
<td>• Concur with $150 million bridge / $50 million pavement allocation. (1)</td>
<td>• Delay set targets for the allocation of money to pavements and bridges until more is known about the relative needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3. Northeast Area</td>
<td>• Delay decision to allocate money to bridge or pavement preservation. If decision is made, allocate at least $100 million to pavement. (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concur with $150 million bridge / $50 million pavement allocation. (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocation of funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1. Rogue Valley Council of Governments</td>
<td>• Add a geographic allocation of funds for preservation projects. It would allow each region to address priority preservation projects on a regional, rather than a statewide basis. (1) &amp; (2)</td>
<td>• Distribute preservation projects based on need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2. Rogue Valley ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocation of funds: Load Limited Highways</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1. Cascade West ACT</td>
<td>• Fund load-limited highway projects from the $200 million allocated to modernization projects.</td>
<td>• Continue with initial approach treating load-limited highways as preservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocation of funds: District Highways</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1. Northeast Area</td>
<td>• Clarify district highway criteria. What projects would compete on a statewide basis. (1) &amp; (2)</td>
<td>• Concur with the concept of district highway. Note that the proposed rule will define a district highway on function, not classification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2. Washington County Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>• Allocate preservation money regionally. (1) &amp; (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Expand “district highway” to include not only highways that ODOT classifies as district highways, but also highways that function as district highways. (1) &amp; (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocation of funds: Bridge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1. Metro</td>
<td>• Consider the unique requirements of moveable bridges in allocating resources between state and local bridge.</td>
<td>• Concur with comment concerning projects that add capacity to a bridge. These will be considered as modernization projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Require that bridge projects that add capacity be funded as modernization projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue/Commentor</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Action Recommended to OTC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screening Criteria</td>
<td>• Use 1999 Oregon Highway Plan Policy 1G as screening criteria for modernization and bridge. (1)</td>
<td>• Use Policy 1G1 to determine project eligibility. Project proposals must document compliance with policy 1G1 either by showing that the project is listed in a TSP acknowledged after March 1999 OR by showing that the project is a result of a planning process that complies with Policy 1G1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| #1. Bicycle Transportation Alliance | • Require that all projects that add auto capacity to first demonstrate inability to meet 1.G.1.2. (1)  
• Use OHP Policy 1.G.1 as a prioritizing factor. (2)  
• Require that modernization projects demonstrate that efficiency of existing system has been maximized. (3)  
• Require that modernization projects have least social cost. (3)  
• Require that impacts of project on environment be fully mitigated. (3)  
• Retain consistency with Policy 1G1 of Oregon Highway Plan, where applicable. (4) | • Ensure through project development that projects address access management and mitigate environmental impacts. \( \text{See overview and guidance materials.} \) |
| Screening Criteria | • Assess safety across all modes (children walking & bicycling to school, senior citizens, and people with disabilities) in addition to auto safety when prioritizing projects. (1)  
• Assess safety across all modes. (2) & (3) | • Assess all safety aspects of projects. \( \text{See guidance materials on prioritizing factors.} \) |
| #2. Local Officials Advisory Committee | | |
| #3. Oregon Environmental Council | | |
| #4. STIP Stakeholder Committee | | |
| Screening Criteria | • Add a new criterion: Consistent with Policy 1B of the Oregon Highway Plan, the project does not detract from efforts to improve downtowns and main streets and reduce sprawling development patterns. | • Use policy 1B to determine project eligibility. \( \text{See overview and guidance materials.} \) |
| #1. Community Development Office | | |
| Screening Criteria | • Elevate lane capacity and interchange projects to modernization screening criteria per language of the HB 2142, Sec. 2. (1) & (2)  
• Elevate district highway and load limited highway to preservation screening criteria per language of HB 2142 Sec. 2. (1) & (2) | • Concur with comments; use statutory language to determine project eligibility. \( \text{See overview and guidance materials.} \) |
| #1. Local Officials Advisory Committee | | |
| #2. STIP Stakeholder Committee | | |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other suggested screening criteria</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Action Recommended to OTC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1. Lane County Board of Commissioners</td>
<td>Should consider allowing types of safety improvements rather than only interchanges.</td>
<td>Do not expand eligibility for stand-alone projects beyond the statutory language of HB 2142. Include safety related improvements for all modes as project elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project readiness: #1. Northwest Community Solutions Team</td>
<td>Do not use project constructability as a screening criterion. (1)</td>
<td>Use “project readiness” to determine project eligibility. It was legislative intent to quickly implement projects funded by HB 2142. Do not allow “project readiness” for HB 2142 to prejudice consideration of projects for inclusion in 2004-07 or later update of the STIP or in the development section of the STIP, if one is authorized by the OTC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2. Citizens for Sensible Transportation</td>
<td>Support using readiness as major criterion. Show visible results. (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3. Local Officials Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Elevate “project readiness” to a screening criteria for modernization, preservation, and bridge project selection. (3), (4) &amp; (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4. Lower John Day ACT</td>
<td>Add new screening criterion: “Modernization projects as defined by ORS 184.651.”</td>
<td>Concur. Both “modernization” and “preservation” are defined in guidance using words from statute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5. STIP Stakeholder Committee</td>
<td>Use Oregon Highway Plan and Quality Development Objectives. Emphasize Policy 1G (Major Improvements), 4D (TDM), and 5A (Environmental Resources).</td>
<td>See discussion of Policy 1G1 above. Relate Policy 4D to investigation of innovative financing as authorized by other bills passed by the 2001 Legislature. Ensure that project development address the environmental impacts. Apply conditions to projects as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1. Mid-Willamette Valley Area Commission on Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td>See overview and guidance materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Environmental Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>See overview and guidance materials.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue / Commentor</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Action Recommended to OTC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Acknowledged comprehensive and transportation system plans&quot;</td>
<td>Reward &quot;acknowledged&quot; to &quot;adopted&quot; because there are a limited number of acknowledged plans. (1), (2), (3) &amp; (4)</td>
<td>Concur with comments to reword: Consistent with applicable acknowledged comprehensive and/or adopted transportation system plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1. Community Solutions Team Coos-Curry-Douglas Region</td>
<td>Reward: Consistent with applicable acknowledged comprehensive and/or adopted transportation system plans. (5) &amp; (6)</td>
<td>Clarify what is required to document “consistency” with acknowledged or adopted plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2. Rogue Valley Council of Governments</td>
<td>Concern that rural areas do not have acknowledged or adopted TSPs. (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3. South West Area ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4. Rogue Valley Area Commission on Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5. Local Officials Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6. STIP Stakeholder Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7. South Central Oregon ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Highways that need increased lane capacity&quot;</td>
<td>The term “lane capacity” should be interpreted in its broadest sense. It should include passing lanes, and urban and rural modernization projects containing a combination of capacity, geometric or safety components.</td>
<td>Concur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1. Lane County Board of Commissioners</td>
<td></td>
<td>See guidance materials on project eligibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2. Cascade West ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3. ODOT Region 2 Planners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Financially constrained list&quot;</td>
<td>The term should be clarified. On its face, the term appears to limit projects to metro areas. Do not restrict lane capacity projects to metro areas. (2)</td>
<td>Concur. Legislative intent was to distribute funds equitably across the state, using the criteria for distribution of projects that are used for the STIP [section 3 of HB 2142]. An equitable distribution is not possible if modernization projects are restricted to MPO areas located west of the Cascades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1. Lane County Board of Commissioners</td>
<td></td>
<td>See guidance materials on project eligibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2. Cascade West ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3. ODOT Region 2 Planners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritizing factors: “Support livable communities”</td>
<td>Should remain as a prioritizing factor and not become a screening criteria. (1)</td>
<td>Revise the wording of the livable communities factor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1. Northwest Community Solutions Team</td>
<td>Give priority to projects that enhance livability over projects that only provide transportation benefits to thru-traffic. (2)</td>
<td>See guidance materials on prioritization factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2. Citizens for Sensible Transportation</td>
<td>Define term “livable communities” for rural areas. (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3. CPACT</td>
<td>Modify the “livable communities” factor: Support efforts to improve downtowns, main</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4. Community Development Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5. Local Officials Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6. Oregon Environmental Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7. STIP Stakeholder Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Prioritizing factors: "Support livable communities" (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue / Commentor</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>streets, community centers, special transportation areas or other important community areas and reduce sprawl or can be designed so as not to detract from such efforts. Revise explanatory information to support the new wording. (4)</td>
<td>- Revise explanatory information for livability. (5) &amp; (7) - Require that projects demonstrate that they support compact urban development and foster local economic opportunity. (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other suggested prioritizing factors: Freight Mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Add &quot;freight mobility&quot; to the farm to market factor. (1) &amp; (2) OR - Revise to “Enhance freight mobility.” (3) - Revise: Projects should improve the efficient movement of freight throughout the state and must demonstrate that they do not adversely impact freight movement. (4) - Give priority to projects that provide substantial public transit and freight movement benefit over projects that only serve autos. (5) - Add freight mobility criteria: Enhance existing freight routes. Term will become unwieldy without a tight definition. (6) - Add freight mobility criterion. (7) - Revise wording: Freight mobility including farm to market roads and access to intermodal facilities. (8) - Rate projects on their economic importance, including access to intermodal terminals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Action Recommended to OTC

- Concur with inclusion of a prioritization factor for freight mobility. Include consideration of farm to market roads within the overall of freight mobility. See guidance materials on prioritization factors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prioritizing factors: Leverage</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Action Recommended to OTC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1. City of Forest Grove</td>
<td>Expresses concern that the leverage factor may be counter-productive to long term state interest. Essentially, why both assume long term responsibility for a project and contribute to it. Leverage should not be a factor when community agrees to jurisdictional transfer. (1) Leverage should include federal and state funds as well as local and private funds and tolls. (2) Revise prioritizing factor: Local funding and other investments that leverage. Interpret “leverage” broadly. (4) Retain local match provision, but recognize the responsibility that a jurisdiction that accepting a transfer assumes. (5)</td>
<td>Concur. Use the term leverage broadly. Revise guidance information concerning prioritization factors. See guidance materials on prioritization factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2. Cascade West ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3. Local Officials Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4. Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5. Washington County Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prioritizing factors: local matching funds for bridge</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Action Recommended to OTC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1. CPACT</td>
<td>Consider soft match or contributed ROW. Some communities are not able to provide cash match.</td>
<td>Concur; remove requirement for a 10 percent match for local bridges. See discussion of leverage above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other suggested prioritizing factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1. Rogue Valley Council of Governments</td>
<td>Should add a new factor: “Enhances the local transportation system.” These would be projects that could be packaged with other local projects that contribute to the overall transportation system. (1) &amp; (2)</td>
<td>Do not add this as new statewide prioritizing factor. While desirable, it may add to the documentation requirements for proposals. The factor could be used as a local prioritizing factor, if an ACT chose to use it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2. Rogue Valley ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Other suggested prioritizing factors                  |         |                          |
| #2. Rogue Valley ACT                                  |         |                          |

| Other suggested prioritizing factors                  |         |                          |
| #1. South West ACT                                   | Add consideration of freight and/or expressway designation in selection of modernization projects. | Do not add consideration of freight and/or expressway designation. There was no legislative intent to give special consideration to classifications other than “district highways” as called out in HB 2142. |

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue / Commentor</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Action Recommended to OTC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Other suggested prioritizing factors #1. Salem-Keizer Area Transportation Study | Add factors for modernization projects:  
- Improves operation of the existing system.  
- Represents an opportunity to defer or delay a major capital expenditure.  
- Supports the use of alternative modes.  
- Is likely to reduce the incidence of air quality “hot spots.”  
- Has minimal negative impacts on surrounding neighborhoods and other resources such as parks and schools. | Do not add as new statewide prioritizing factors. While desirable, they add to the documentation requirements for proposals. The factors could be used as local prioritization, if an ACT chose to use them. |
| Other suggested prioritizing factors #1. Governor Kitzhaber | Investments should improve Oregon’s economy, its communities and environment.  
Keep Oregon Community Objectives as codified in HB 3948 when making funding decisions. | Concur. Revise factor for “support livable communities” to reflect comments.  
See guidance on prioritizing factors. |
| Other suggested prioritizing factors #1. Mid-Willamette Valley ACT | Add new factors:  
- Project that will assist in rebuilding rural and/or distressed economies or strengthens local and/or regional economies.  
- Highway capacity improvement projects where downtowns can be revitalized by reducing congestion.  
- Improvements at an interchange that serves more than one community.  
- Support alternative modes (note: this criterion should not be used to disqualify otherwise worthy rural projects).  
- Supports past and planned improvements. | Incorporate concept of rural development and support for distressed communities and downtown revitalization into livable communities factor.  
Do not add others as new statewide prioritizing factors. While desirable, they add to the documentation requirements for proposals. The factors could be used as local prioritization, if an ACT chose to use them. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue / Commentor</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Action Recommended to ORC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other suggested prioritizing factors &lt;br&gt;#1. Citizens for Sensible Transportation</td>
<td>• Give priority to projects that improve mobility in urban areas where most of people's daily trips occur.  &lt;br&gt;• Give priority to projects that provide benefits throughout the days as opposed to only at rush hour.  &lt;br&gt;• Give priority to projects that provide substantial public transit and freight movement benefit over projects that only serve autos.  &lt;br&gt;• Choose a large number of smaller projects that affect facilities used by most people over a smaller number of large projects that are used less frequently by most people.</td>
<td>• Do not add as new statewide prioritizing factors. While desirable, they add to the documentation requirements for proposals. The factors could be used as local prioritization, if an ACT chose to use them.  &lt;br&gt;Note that the Legislature intended to fund highway improvements in HB 2142. The Legislature provided funding for rail and public transportation in other bills it passed during the 2001 session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other suggested factors: modernization &amp; preservation projects &lt;br&gt;#1. Cascade West ACT</td>
<td>Add new factors: &lt;br&gt;• Projects that provide connectivity and access to multi-modal facilities (modernization)  &lt;br&gt;• Projects designed to address problems likely to arise from manmade or natural disasters and to provide to emergency services.  &lt;br&gt;• Importance of a project to the functioning of the larger transportation network.</td>
<td>• Do not add as new statewide prioritizing factors. While desirable, they add to the documentation requirements for proposals. The factors could be used as local prioritization, if an ACT chose to use them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other suggested factors: bridge projects &lt;br&gt;#1. Cascade West ACT</td>
<td>Add new factors: &lt;br&gt;• Importance of a bridge to the functioning of the larger transportation network.  &lt;br&gt;• Projects designed to address problems likely to arise from manmade or natural disasters and to provide to emergency services.  &lt;br&gt;• The use of state resources to support livable communities.</td>
<td>• Note that function of a bridge is an element in the analysis of bridge needs. State bridge proposals will focus bridges on the interstate highways. Analysis of local bridge needs considers traffic volume (a proxy for importance).  &lt;br&gt;Add livable community aspect to consideration of bridge projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other suggested factors &lt;br&gt;#1. Lower John Day ACT  &lt;br&gt;#2. South Central Oregon ACT</td>
<td>• Interpret criteria based on where a project may be located: Urban, Urban/Rural, or Rural Frontier. (1) &amp; (2)  &lt;br&gt;• Add prioritizing factor: Rural Access Lifelines / Emergency Preparedness. (1)</td>
<td>• Do not divide the process into three segments. While there is merit, this proposal would add complexity to the review process. It would also have the effect of segmenting the funding decisions. ACTs can evaluate how a project in the context of the area where it is located without creating a statewide process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue/Commentor</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Action Recommended to OTC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other comments</strong></td>
<td><strong>#1. Rogue Valley Council of Governments</strong></td>
<td><strong>Asks that ACTs be given fund flexibility in using all funds to meet regional transportation system needs, provided adopted criteria and factors are observed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>#2. Rogue Valley ACT</strong></td>
<td><strong>Allow ACTs to interpret criteria broadly. (3) &amp; (4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>#3. Central Oregon ACT</strong></td>
<td><strong>Criteria developed for 1999 bond program and quality development objectives are a strong foundation.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>#4. Lower John Day ACT</strong></td>
<td><strong>Apply criteria to all projects. Generate findings that demonstrate how, and to what extent, a project implements, ignores, or defies Oregon’s land use and transportation policies.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other comments</strong></td>
<td><strong>#1. 1000 Friends of Oregon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Involve ACTs in the selection of district highway projects to be funded.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Involve ACTs in the selection of non-local bridge projects.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Revise timeline to accommodate ACT review of bridge projects by delaying presentation of bridge list to OTC until after October 25th.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other comments: process</strong></td>
<td><strong>#1. Cascade West ACT</strong></td>
<td><strong>Revise timeline to accommodate ACT review of modernization, preservation bridge projects by delaying presentation of preservation and bridge lists to OTC until after Region 2 ACT meeting of October 25th.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other comments: timeline</strong></td>
<td><strong>#1. Cascade West ACT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*August 1, 2001*  
*Attachment F*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue/Commentator</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Action Recommended to OTC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other comments: bridge #1. Citizens for Sensible Transportation</td>
<td>• Treat bridges that add capacity as modernization projects.</td>
<td>• Concur. Projects that build a bridge in a new location or rebuild a bridge so as to add lanes will be considered to be modernization projects. See guidance materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments #1. Citizens for Sensible Transportation</td>
<td>• Use transportation need to drive project development, rather than available staffing. Allocate sufficient resources to manage the number of projects selected.</td>
<td>• Concur. The need for transportation projects will determine what is funded by HB 2142.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments #1. Community Development Office</td>
<td>• Require applicants to demonstrate how projects meet criteria as a part of the project information. • Inform applicants that conditions may be negotiated with them to enhance community livability and/or preserve capacity of state highway for long-distance travel.</td>
<td>• Concur. The project proposal outline also requires documentation so that ACTs can evaluate how the project meets the eligibility criteria and prioritization factors. See guidance information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments #1. Metro</td>
<td>• Clearly differentiate between project eligibility where limitations are absolute and prioritizing factors used to rank eligible projects. • Consider Metro &amp; JPACT recommendations in making final funding decisions. • Restore the “Development” section of the STIP. • Require that projects demonstrate air quality conformity as required by the federal Clean Air Act.</td>
<td>• Concur with the need to clearly differentiate between the criteria used to determine project eligibility and the factors used to rank projects for funding. • Concur with the request to consider Metro and JPACT recommendations. • Take the proposal to restore the “development” section of the STIP under advisement. It is more properly considered by the STIP Stakeholder Committee. • Concur with the comment that projects must demonstrate air quality conformity. While the legislative discussion about HB 2142 carried a sense of urgency, there was no legislative intent to provide an exemption from normal environmental analysis and public outreach process. Projects that cannot meet the timeframes for HB 2142 funding should be considered for HB 2142. See guidance information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Comments
**Draft Project Selection Criteria for the Oregon Transportation Investment Act**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue / Commentor</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Action Recommended to OTC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Other comments    | • Require a mini project prospectus for each project.  
                   • Project estimate cost should all components necessary to meet qualify development objectives. | • Concur with the need for consistent information. In addition, it is clear that project cost estimates must be complete in the sense that they must include all the components for their successful construction. |
| #1. Oregon Environmental Council | | |
| Other Comments    | • Focus on funding project construction rather than project development activities.  
                   • Require that project proposals be submitted directly to ODOT for evaluation and funding consideration. | • Do not change focus. While “deliverable projects” was clearly a part of the legislative discussion, neither state nor local jurisdictions have projects designed and ready to be put out for bid. Project development is a necessary part of preparing projects for construction.  
                   • Do not concur with the suggestion that all projects be submitted directly to ODOT. While the OTC must make the final decision on project selection, it will rely on recommendations made by the ACTs.  
                   • See guidance materials. |
| #1. Washington County Transportation Advisory Committee | | |
Comments Received
Concerning
Draft Project Selection Criteria for the Oregon Transportation Investment Act

Comments were received from 26 individuals and organizations.

Governor John Kitzhaber / Community Development Office
STIP Stakeholder Committee
Local Officials Advisory Committee

Region 1
City of Forest Grove
Metro
Northwest CST
Washington County Transportation Advisory Committee

Region 2
Cascades West ACT
CPACT
Lane County Board of Commissioners
Mid-Willamette Valley ACT
Salem-Keizer Area Transportation Study (SKATS)

Region 3
Coos Curry Douglas CST
Rogue Valley ACT
Rogue Valley Council of Governments
South West ACT

Region 4
Central Oregon ACT
Lower John Day ACT
South Central Oregon ACT

Region 5
Morrow County
Northeast Area

Other Interested Parties
1000 Friends of Oregon
Bicycle Transportation Alliance
Citizens for Sensible Transportation
Oregon Environmental Council
Oregon Freight Advisory Committee
August 7, 2001

Andy Cotugno  
Metro  
600 NE Grand Ave  
Portland, OR 97232

Dear Mr. Cotugno,

The Tualatin Chamber Board of Directors is writing this letter on behalf of the Tualatin Transportation Management Association to express to you our regret that the TMA may have to close its doors as of October 1st 2002. Unless you can help us positively resolve the issue of on-going regional support for existing TMA's.

As you know, in late 1999/early 2000, TPAC directed the TDM Sub-committee to address the issue of on-going regional funding for TMAs and asked that they come back to TPAC before the next MTIP/STIP cycle to make a final recommendation (Please refer to Resolution 99-2864). To date this has not happened.

For the past two years, the Tualatin TMA has patiently participated with the TDM Sub-committee in a variety of discussions surrounding the importance of TMAs in the region and the appropriate level of regional TMA funding. As of today, the new MTIP/STIP cycle is almost complete and still the TDM Sub-Committee has no recommendation on the on-going regional TMA funding issue and no time frame has been set for its resolution.

This is a significant concern to Tualatin, because as it stands now, the current Metro TMA policy only allows for the funding of new or "start up" TMAs. Tri-Mets Board of Directors approved Tri-Met's application for FY 2004-05 MTIP funding for TMAs based on the understanding that a new Metro policy would be in place supporting existing TMAs. We are increasingly concerned that this new policy hasn't been created and that the TDM Sub-committee is moving forward on approving the funding of new TMAs without having an understanding of the ramifications such actions will have on existing TMAs. This places existing TMAs like the Tualatin TMA in an increasing unstable financial condition and provides no on-going funding direction for future TMAs.
Despite all our efforts and the extensive support of our business community, without additional regional commitment the TMA will be $13,000 under budget in FY 2002. To add to this, the existing TMAs have no regional dollars allocated to them in FY2003/04. Even if we were able to come up with the additional funds needed to carry us through 2002 and were to receive MTIP funds in 2004/2005, we would have to survive a year with no regional support. We simply do not have the financial capacity to do this.

The region has put in more than $150,000 to our organization, and we have had many successes. We currently run a shuttle that provides an important transit link to our industrial area. The TMA provides an important service where there is a gap in our regional transit system. People commute to Tualatin from Vancouver to Salem and use our shuttle as their final transit link, and throughout all our efforts, the Tualatin business community has played an important role in supporting such services. We also hope to be an important transit link for the opening of Commuter Rail in 2004. Without our shuttle service commuters will have no way to get to employment sites in the industrial area of the city.

We would like to request that the TDM Sub-Committee do a number of things. First, place a moratorium on new TMA’s, until a decision has been made about where the committees support lies for existing TMA’s and second, consider the financial instability of some current TMA’s, before moving to approve new start-ups.

Finally we would like to point out that it is now nationally recognized that TMA’s should operate on a budget of at least $60,000 a year. And that of this figure 1/3 should come from private revenues such as membership dues, and 2/3 from public regional and local dollars. Our TMA brings in over $20,000 in membership dues annually and about $5,000 in in-kind services. But this alone is not enough to support our operation.

Thank you in advance for consideration of our request for support.

Respectfully

Neta George
President, Tualatin Chamber of Commerce

Lou Ogden
Major, City of Tualatin

Cc: Rod Monroe – Chairperson, JPACT
Cc: Mike Hoglund – Metro
Cc: Fred Hansen – Tri-Met
Date: August 2, 2001

To: Rod Park, Chair
Metro Council Community Planning Committee

From: Mike Hoglund, Director
Regional Planning Division

Re: Summary of Functional Plan Compliance

A number of jurisdictions have unfinished Functional Plan compliance work.

The City of Durham has not incorporated the requirements of Title 3 into its Comprehensive Plan. However, as Durham is within the jurisdiction of the Clean Water Agency (formerly Unified Sewerage Agency), the requirements of Title 3 are being met in the City.

The City of Gresham has adopted a design type map and has not met the requirements of Titles 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. The City has provided a map with the design type boundary to Metro to be used for analysis purposes.

The City of Happy Valley has not adopted a design type map and has not forwarded an employment and housing capacity analysis. With its recent annexations, the City believes it will be able to meet both the housing and employment capacity targets and will forward the analysis once it has been finalized. In addition, the City is considering requesting a mixed-use designation in the newly annexed Rock Creek Area.

The City of Lake Oswego has not adopted minimum densities and has not met all of the requirements of Titles 3.

The City of Oregon City has not met the requirements of Titles 1, 4 and 5. The City continues to work on compliance but staff shortages and turnover have hindered its progress.

The City of Portland has not adopted a design type map and has not met the Water Quality Performance Standards of Title 3 or the requirements of Title 6. The City has provided a map with the design type boundary to Metro to be used for analysis purposes.

The City of West Linn has not met the requirements of Title 3 and has requested an extension to January 1, 2002.

The City of Wilsonville has not adopted a design type map and has not forwarded an employment and housing capacity analysis. The City has not met the requirements of Titles 5 and 6. The City's compliance work was held up during the prison siting process.
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**Multnomah County** has not met the requirements of Titles 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. The bulk of the County’s planning responsibilities are undertaken by the adjacent incorporated jurisdiction. The County will complete its compliance work once the Cities’ have completed their compliance work.

Letters were sent to these jurisdictions requesting updated time lines for completion of the outstanding compliance work.

A number of the jurisdictions with unfinished compliance work are in final hearings. Staff has reviewed the proposed code and, if adopted, has determined that it would be in compliance with the requirements of the Functional Plan.

**The City of Beaverton** has taken their proposed design type map through the public hearing process and is now in the adoption process.

**The City of Fairview** is in the process of adopting a revised development code that will meet the requirements for minimum densities and Title 3.

**The City of Hillsboro** will hold final hearings to adopt the requirements of Title 4 on August 7, 2001. The City of Lake Oswego will be beginning the hearings process for the Title 6 requirements in August 2001.

**The City of Milwaukie** will be beginning the hearings process for the cul de sac and block length requirements of Title 6 in August 2001.

**The City of Portland** began the hearings for the adoption of minimum densities standards on May 15, 2001.

**The City of Tigard** has addressed the requirements of Title 6 in its Transportation System Plan that is in final hearings.

**The City of West Linn** has addressed the requirements of Title 6 in its Transportation System Plan that is in final hearings.

Five jurisdictions have asked for time extensions to complete their compliance work pending resolution of Measure 7. These include:

- City of Beaverton on Title 4
- City of Gladstone on Titles 3, 4
- City of Milwaukie on Title 3
- City of Rivergrove – Title 3
- City of Tigard – Title 3 (implementing the regulations through the Clean Water Agency)

Exception requests have been received from the City of Durham for minimum densities and some parking maximums and from the City of Maywood Park housing and employment capacity.

In addition, Metro and Clackamas County staff are continuing to work together to finalize the County’s Title 3 compliance and Washington County will comply with the street design requirements of Title 6 through their current Transportation Systems Update work.
### JPACT Members and Alternates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>LAST NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>REPRESENTING</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>FAX</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Bragdon</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>97232-</td>
<td>503-797-1588 503-797-1793 Pat Manhalter, x1709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Monroe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>Councillor Monroe</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR 97232-</td>
<td>503-797-1546 503-797-1793 Sheri Humble, x1543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rex Burholder</td>
<td></td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>Councillor Burholder</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR 97232-</td>
<td>503-797-1547 503-797-1793 Rooney Barker, x1941</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mero</td>
<td>Councillor Park</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR 97232-</td>
<td>503-797-1549 503-797-1793 Rooney Barker, x1941</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Hosticka</td>
<td></td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>Councillor Hosticka</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR 97232-</td>
<td>503-797-1549 503-797-1793 Rooney Barker, x1941</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Kennebrew</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
<td>Commissioner Kennebrew</td>
<td>Oregon City</td>
<td>OR 97045-</td>
<td>503-655-8581 503-650-8944 Sherry McGinnis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonnie Roberts</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
<td>Commissioner Roberts</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR 97214-</td>
<td>503-988-5213 503-988-5262 Bret Walker, 503-988-5213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Rogers</td>
<td>Tom Cruz</td>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
<td>Commissioner Rogers</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR 97214-</td>
<td>503-988-5213 503-988-5262 Bret Walker, 503-988-5213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Hales</td>
<td>Vera Katz</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>Commissioner Hales</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR 97204-</td>
<td>503-823-4682 503-823-4040 Robbie S23-3007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Rohde</td>
<td>Brian Newman</td>
<td>City of Lake Oswego</td>
<td>Councilor Rohde</td>
<td>Lake Oswego</td>
<td>OR 97222-</td>
<td>503-636-2452 503-636-2532 Himself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Jowie</td>
<td>James Kight</td>
<td>City of Gresham</td>
<td>Councilor Kight</td>
<td>Gresham</td>
<td>OR 97204-</td>
<td>503-636-2452 503-636-2532 Himself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Drake</td>
<td>Lou Ogden</td>
<td>City of Beaverton</td>
<td>Mayor Drake</td>
<td>Beaverton</td>
<td>OR 97204-</td>
<td>503-636-2452 503-636-2532 Himself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Hansen</td>
<td>Neil McFarlane</td>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
<td>Mr. Hansen</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR 97204-</td>
<td>503-636-2452 503-636-2532 Himself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Van Sickel</td>
<td>Bruce Warner</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>Ms. Van Sickel</td>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>OR 97301-</td>
<td>503-986-3435 503-986-3432 Katie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Hallock</td>
<td>Andy Ginsburg</td>
<td>DEQ</td>
<td>Ms. Hallock</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR 97204-</td>
<td>503-229-5300 503-229-5850 Linda Fernandez,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette Liebe</td>
<td></td>
<td>DEQ</td>
<td>Ms. Liebe</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR 97204-</td>
<td>503-229-5300 503-229-5850 Linda Fernandez,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Wagner</td>
<td>Mary Legry</td>
<td>WSDOT @ Olympia</td>
<td>Mr. Wagner</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>WA 98668-</td>
<td>360-905-2001 360-905-2222 Kim Dabney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melvyn Galligan</td>
<td>David Lohman</td>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
<td>Mr. Galligan</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR 97208-</td>
<td>360-905-2222 Kim Dabney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royce Pollard Dean</td>
<td>Lookingbill</td>
<td>City of Vancouver</td>
<td>Mayor Pollard</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>WA 98668-</td>
<td>360-696-8484 360-696-8049 Peggy Furnow (or Jan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Pridemore</td>
<td>Peter Capell</td>
<td>Clark County</td>
<td>Commissioner Pridemore</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>WA 98666-</td>
<td>360-397-2232 360-397-6058 Susan Wilson or Tina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Susie Lohsene will be in attendance.

Contact Information:
- Susan Wilson or Tina Lohsene, x4111
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Betty Allibone</td>
<td>Westside Economic Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilda Hulst</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Williams</td>
<td>CST/CLF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Caliver</td>
<td>Parsons Brinckerhoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nel McFarlane</td>
<td>Tri Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lon Weinman</td>
<td>Clackamas Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Kloster</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Williams</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Hoekum?</td>
<td>METRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Papsdorf</td>
<td>City of Gresham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April Siebenaler</td>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Paine</td>
<td>Multnomah County Dist 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Lasley</td>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Seybold</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark Kenny</td>
<td>Wash. Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Peterson</td>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Stewart</td>
<td>THE OREGONIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>AFFILIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Cundren</td>
<td>Clackamas Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Rouse</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Heguy</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Fisher</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Van Sickle</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Roper</td>
<td>Mult. Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette Aze</td>
<td>DEQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Hauchoh</td>
<td>Gresham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Rogers</td>
<td>Wash. Cty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Hansen</td>
<td>TRIMET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Park</td>
<td>Metro (Coun.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andre Company</td>
<td>Metro Coun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Monroe</td>
<td>Cities of Wash. County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Drake</td>
<td>Presiding Officer, Metro. Coun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dare Branden</td>
<td>City of Happy Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou Dijen</td>
<td>Cities of Wash. (Act)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Redd</td>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMITTEE TITLE: JPACT

DATE: August 9, 2001

NAME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian Newman</td>
<td>Milwaukee Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike McEwan</td>
<td>City of Portland staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Dotteron</td>
<td>City of Tualatin staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Lehman</td>
<td>City of Wilsonville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Floyd</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernie Bottomly</td>
<td>SMART City of Wilsonville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis A. Ornelas</td>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brion Barnett</td>
<td>OHSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Cowan</td>
<td>City of Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecky Blizzard</td>
<td>City of Wilsonville Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephan Lasheen</td>
<td>City of Wilsonville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Lashene</td>
<td>Park of PSE # of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina Whitehill-Bazinik</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Whisler</td>
<td>Washco MPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey Wet</td>
<td>Angeroady &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Angeles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>