

Memorandum Date: August 18, 2008  
Meeting Date: September 3, 2008

---

---

TO: Board of County Commissioners

DEPARTMENT: Public Works

PRESENTED BY: Celia Barry, Transportation Planning

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: PUBLIC HEARING AND ORDER/In the Matter of Commenting to the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) on Region 2, Area 5 Earmarks Requests List Priorities

---

---

I. MOTION

Move approval of the Order (**Attachment A**).

II. AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) requests that the Board take public input and comment on a list of priority modernization projects to be sent to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC), requesting the projects be added to the statewide Earmarks Requests List.

III. BACKGROUND/IMPLICATIONS OF ACTION

A. Board Action and Other History

Earlier this year ODOT established a "Policy on Federal Reauthorization Highway Program Earmark Requests". The policy was adopted by OTC and took effect May 13, 2008. The Board took action commenting on the policy in March 2008 by Board Order 08-3-19-12. Now ODOT is inviting Lane County and other stakeholders to participate in creating the official OTC Earmarks Requests List.

On April 30, 2008, the Board took action to adopt Order 08-4-30-10, a potential list of priorities for the 2010-2015 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), given a large funding package made available by the 2009 legislature. This list was the basis for the recommendation contained herein, along with a Franklin Boulevard project that was included by the Cities of Eugene and Springfield in the United Front document.

On June 16, 2008, Transportation Planning staff informed all Lane County cities (public works staff, city managers, mayors, and transportation staff) that ODOT was requesting input on OTC Earmarks Priorities. Recipients were notified that a specific public hearing date would be forthcoming. The notice will be sent out the week of August 18 and information will be published on the Transportation Planning Division website.

The Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) took action on July 10, 2008 and developed a prioritized list of seven projects that are incorporated into the recommendation in

the proposed Board Order, attached. The Roads Advisory Committee will be asked to comment on the attached proposal on August 27, 2008. Staff will report on their comments at your work session.

Staff also wants to update the Board on ODOT changes to the Earmarks List policy that occurred after your action in March. After hearing from Lane County, the Central Lane MPO, and others in the state, ODOT clarified the policy language. The final policy is in **Attachment B**. A summary of changes to the policy is in **Attachment C**. This issue is discussed further in Section IV., Recommendations, below.

In order to meet an internal deadline, on August 1, ODOT Region 2, Area 5 staff submitted the forms attached to the Board Order (**Attachment A**) to the ODOT Freight Advisory Committee so they can also provide comments to OTC. If your adopted recommendations are different than what is proposed in Attachment A, OTC will be notified of the change. The composition of the Freight Committee can be found at [http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/FREIGHT/OFAC\\_Membership\\_List.shtml](http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/FREIGHT/OFAC_Membership_List.shtml).

#### **B. Policy Issues**

TransPlan is the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area Transportation System Plan and includes the following Finance Policy #3: *Set priorities for investment of Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and federal revenues programmed in the region's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to address safety and major capacity problems on the region's transportation system.*

The City of Coburg has its own Transportation System Plan that was co-adopted by Lane County as part of the County Comprehensive Plan. The Coburg/Interstate 5 Interchange Refinement Plan is incorporated into the City-County adopted document.

The Lane County Transportation System Plan (TSP) adopted by the Board in June 2004 does not list state highway projects individually, instead providing supportive policy language for state highway projects under TSP Goal 2: *Promote a safe and efficient state highway system through the State Transportation Improvement Program and support of ODOT capital improvement projects.*

#### **C. Board Goals**

The following Strategic Plan Goal statements relate to this Board item:

- Provide opportunities for citizen participation in decisionmaking, voting, volunteerism and civic and community involvement; and
- Contribute to appropriate community development in the areas of transportation and Telecommunications infrastructure, housing, growth management and land development.

#### **D. Financial and/or Resource Considerations**

The financial implications of taking action on this item relates to the potential of federal funding for state highway improvements upon adoption of the federal highway bill, anticipated in 2009. Other than that, at this time, there are no direct financial implications with regard to County revenues or expenditures as a result of taking action on this item as proposed.

E. Analysis

SAFETEA-LU is the federal highway bill that authorizes the Federal surface transportation programs for highways, highway safety, and transit for the 5-year period 2005-2009. With reauthorization anticipated in 2009, ODOT wants to prepare for requesting federal earmarks for state highway modernization projects. In the past local agencies have successfully lobbied for earmarks independent of ODOT, in some cases obtaining funding that did not entirely cover project costs, for state highway projects that were not necessarily ODOT's top priorities. ODOT has devised this process to involve local stakeholders in its priority setting process and to set expectations for what ODOT would be willing to support and fund.

The recommendations proposed in the Order Exhibit for the OTC Earmarks List reflect the MPC's and Board's top modernization priorities for the 2010-2015 STIP, adopted in actions earlier this year. Additionally the recommendation includes a proposal for Franklin Boulevard/Ferry Street Bridge to Springfield Bridge, which was part of the most recent United Front document.

ODOT Region 2 staff indicated there will be an attempt to balance the requests among all Areas with perhaps five projects allotted to each area. The Transportation Advisory Subcommittee for the MPO area (TASC) decided to list more projects as a strategy to increase the chance of getting at least five on the OTC list.

The Junction City Highway 99 project that was included by the Board in the 2010-2015 STIP was not included on the earmark list because that project will require vacation of a rail line, and proposing an earmark for it, for the five year period between 2009-2013, is thought to be premature.

Attached to the proposed Board Order are "Reauthorization Earmark Proposal Forms" that ODOT Area 5 staff completed for purposes of your adoption and to submit to OTC. Details of each project can be found in the forms. As you know Lane County is ODOT Region 2, Area 5. ODOT's Area 5 manager supports the proposed list.

Following is a table summarizing the proposed Board recommendation.

<b>Proposed Lane County (Region 2, Area 5) OTC Earmarks List Priorities</b>	
<b>Requested funding is for Construction (C-STIP), and not Development (D-STIP), unless otherwise noted</b>	
1. I-5 @ Beltline Interchange	\$ 35.0 million
2. Gateway/Beltline: International Way to Postal Way	\$ 15.0 million
3. I-5 @ Coburg Interchange \$19.5 million	\$ 19.5 million
4. Beltline Highway: River Rd. to Coburg Rd. (Phase I)	\$ 20.0 million
5. Highway 126W/Veneta to Green Hill Rd. (D-STIP)	2.0 million
6. Franklin Blvd., Ferry St. Bridge to Springfield Bridge	25.0 million
7. Eugene-Springfield Highway (SR 126) @ Main St.	50.0 million
8. W. 11 <sup>th</sup> /Terry St. to Green Hill Rd.	\$20.0 million

#### IV. Alternatives/Options

1. Approve the proposed Order
2. Approve a modified version of the Order
3. Decline to adopt the proposed Order

#### V. TIMING/IMPLEMENTATION

It is staff's understanding that the Board recommendation will be submitted directly to OTC on or before September 30, 2008.

#### VI. RECOMMENDATION

County staff recommend the first option, approval of the proposed Order. This would advance MPO area priorities, and show local support for improving safety on Highway 126 West and for the City of Veneta's economic development objectives.

As a "Transportation Management Area" the MPO has independent decisionmaking authority over its priorities within the federally funded STIP system. The Board could decide to re-order the placement of the Highway 126 West project among the MPO area project priorities.

The Board could also elect not to participate in this process by declining to adopt the Board Order. When the Board commented on the new Earmarks Priorities List policy in March 2008, you were unsupportive of the policy for the following reasons:

- It gave ODOT the authority to disallow using locally gained earmark money for local match requirements at a time when money is most scarce given the loss of Secure Rural Schools funding;
- The policy seemed to indicate a lack of interest in local priorities despite a stated concern for them;
- It minimized the importance of local support for a project to its success in obtaining federal earmark money; and
- It could send the wrong message to federal legislators if earmarked projects cannot go forward due to strict adherence to the policy.

After you and others provided comments, ODOT made changes to the policy addressing some of your concerns. With regard to your substantive concern in the first bullet above, ODOT eliminated language prohibiting the use of locally obtained earmarks for federal matches. New language states that local agencies can count federal earmarks toward local contributions only when a project is fully funded. Otherwise, the earmark must be used to close any funding gap, and any remaining funds could be applied to the local contribution.

The Board could choose to decline to participate in this process by not adopting the Order. However staff believes there is little to be gained by that course of action, and potential losses to the community in much needed federal transportation dollars.

VII. FOLLOW-UP

No follow-up at this time is necessary.

VIII. ATTACHMENTS

- A Proposed Board Order and Exhibits A and B
- B ODOT Policy on Federal Reauthorization Highway Program Earmark Requests (Final)
- C Summary of Changes to the Draft Policy, resulting in Attachment B

**IN THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF LANE COUNTY  
STATE OF OREGON**

**ORDER NO.** ) In the Matter of Commenting to the Oregon  
) Department of Transportation (ODOT) on Region  
) 2, Area 5 Earmarks Requests List Priorities

**WHEREAS**, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) requested input from the Lane County Board of Commissioners on Oregon Transportation Commission's (OTC) official Earmarks Requests List; and

**WHEREAS**, on July 10, 2008, the Metropolitan Policy Committee took action to recommend priorities for the Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization area; and

**WHEREAS**, On August 27, 2008, the Roads Advisory Committee provided comment on county-wide priorities; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board of Commissioners held a public hearing on September 3, 2008 to accept public comment on the matter; and

**WHEREAS**, priorities are generally consistent with Statewide Transportation Improvement Program priorities as reflected in Board action on April 30, 2008, by Board Order -08-3-19-12, and with recent United Front priorities; now, therefore, it is hereby

**ORDERED** that a letter substantially in conformance with the letter contained in Exhibit A, stating priorities in priority order, in support of the projects described in detail in Exhibit B, be submitted to the ODOT Region 2, Area 5 Manager for OTC consideration.

Dated this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of September, 2008.

---

Faye Stewart, Chair  
Lane County Board of Commissioners

APPROVED AS TO FORM

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Lane County

---

OFFICE OF LEGAL COUNSEL

**Exhibit A**

September 3, 2008

Mr. Sonny Chickering, Manager  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Region 2, Area 5  
644 "A" Street  
Springfield, OR 97477

Dear Mr. Chickering,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the official Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) Earmarks Requests List priorities. The Lane County Board of Commissioners held a public hearing on September 3, 2008 on this matter.

Lane County is responding with unanimous support for the following priorities, in priority order, for Region 2, Area 5.

Proposed Lane County (Region 2, Area 5) OTC Earmarks List Priorities	
Requested funding is for Construction (C-STIP), and not Development (D-STIP), unless otherwise noted	
1. I-5 @ Beltline Interchange	\$ 35.0 million
2. Gateway/Beltline: International Way to Postal Way	\$ 15.0 million
3. I-5 @ Coburg Interchange \$19.5 million	\$ 19.5 million
4. Beltline Highway: River Rd. to Coburg Rd. (Phase I)	\$ 20.0 million
5. Highway 126W/Veneta to Green Hill Rd. (D-STIP)	2.0 million
6. Franklin Blvd., Ferry St. Bridge to Springfield Bridge	25.0 million
7. Eugene-Springfield Highway (SR 126) @ Main St.	50.0 million
8. W. 11 <sup>th</sup> /Terry St. to Green Hill Rd.	\$20.0 million

The Metropolitan Policy Committee for Area 5 took action on July 10, adopting recommendations 1 through 5, and 7 through 8, for the Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization area, as their seven priorities. We have adopted the same list with the addition of the Highway 126W/Veneta to Green Hill Rd. project as priority #5.

We look forward to working with our regional partners on these projects.

Sincerely,

Faye Stewart  
Chair

c: Jane Lee, ODOT Region 2 Manager  
Erik Havig, Planning and Development Manager

# REAUTHORIZATION EARMARK PROPOSAL FORM

Please fill out this form to propose that a project be considered by an ACT or similar body for inclusion on an Earmark Recommendation List that will be sent to the Oregon Transportation Commission and Oregon's congressional delegation. Supplemental information will be requested for each project included on an Earmark Recommendation List to determine whether it meets the Commission Earmark Request Criteria. Filling out this form does not constitute an application for funding.

## Instructions

- Please carefully read the Oregon Transportation Commission's Policy on Federal Reauthorization Highway Program Earmark Requests as well as the associated Guidance for Preparing Earmark Recommendation Lists before filling out this form. The policy and guidance are available at [www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/federal\\_affairs.shtml](http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/federal_affairs.shtml).
- To ensure consistency, please fill out form using 10 point Arial font.
- Letters of support may be attached.
- E-mail completed form to ACT and ODOT staff listed in the table below by **July 7**.
- Please direct any questions to the ODOT Area Manager or to Travis Brouwer, ODOT Federal Affairs Advisor, at (503) 986-3448 or by e-mail to [travis.brouwer@odot.state.or.us](mailto:travis.brouwer@odot.state.or.us).

Area of State	ODOT Staff	ACT Staff
Central Oregon ACT: Deschutes, Crook, Jefferson counties	Gary Farnsworth, <a href="mailto:gary.c.farnsworth@odot.state.or.us">gary.c.farnsworth@odot.state.or.us</a>	Andrew Spreadborough, <a href="mailto:aspreadborough@coic.org">aspreadborough@coic.org</a>
Cascades West ACT: Linn, Benton, Lincoln counties	Vivian Payne, <a href="mailto:vivian.b.payne@odot.state.or.us">vivian.b.payne@odot.state.or.us</a>	Scott Wilson, <a href="mailto:swilson@ocwcoq.org">swilson@ocwcoq.org</a>
Hood River County	Rich Watanabe, <a href="mailto:richard.f.watanabe@odot.state.or.us">richard.f.watanabe@odot.state.or.us</a>	--
Lane County	Sonny Chickering, <a href="mailto:sonny.p.chickering@odot.state.or.us">sonny.p.chickering@odot.state.or.us</a>	--
Lower John Day ACT: Wasco, Sherman, Gilliam, Wheeler counties	Sam Wilkins, <a href="mailto:sam.l.wilkins@odot.state.or.us">sam.l.wilkins@odot.state.or.us</a>	Michelle Colby, <a href="mailto:michelle.colby@co.gilliam.or.us">michelle.colby@co.gilliam.or.us</a>
Portland Metropolitan Region: Multnomah, Washington, Clackamas counties	Travis Brouwer, <a href="mailto:travis.brouwer@odot.state.or.us">travis.brouwer@odot.state.or.us</a>	--
Mid Willamette Valley ACT: Marion, Polk, Yamhill counties	Tim Potter, <a href="mailto:james.t.potter@odot.state.or.us">james.t.potter@odot.state.or.us</a>	Richard Schmid, <a href="mailto:rschmid@mwvcoq.org">rschmid@mwvcoq.org</a>
Northeast ACT: Morrow, Umatilla, Union, Wallowa, Baker counties	Frank Reading, <a href="mailto:frank.h.reading@odot.state.or.us">frank.h.reading@odot.state.or.us</a>	Glenis Harrison, <a href="mailto:glenis.harrison@odot.state.or.us">glenis.harrison@odot.state.or.us</a> and Nancy Martin, <a href="mailto:nancy.e.martin@odot.state.or.us">nancy.e.martin@odot.state.or.us</a>
Northwest ACT: Columbia county	David Kim, <a href="mailto:david.kim@odot.state.or.us">david.kim@odot.state.or.us</a>	Mary McArthur, <a href="mailto:mbmcarthur@att.net">mbmcarthur@att.net</a>
Northwest ACT: Clatsop and Tillamook counties	Larry McKinley, <a href="mailto:larry.mckinley@odot.state.or.us">larry.mckinley@odot.state.or.us</a>	Mary McArthur, <a href="mailto:mbmcarthur@att.net">mbmcarthur@att.net</a>
Rogue Valley ACT: Josephine and Jackson counties	Art Anderson, <a href="mailto:arthur.h.anderson@odot.state.or.us">arthur.h.anderson@odot.state.or.us</a>	Pat Foley, <a href="mailto:pfoley@rvcoq.org">pfoley@rvcoq.org</a>
South Central ACT: Klamath and Lake counties	Butch Hansen, <a href="mailto:norman.c.hansen@odot.state.or.us">norman.c.hansen@odot.state.or.us</a>	Christina Ingram, <a href="mailto:christina@scoedd.org">christina@scoedd.org</a>
South East ACT: Harney, Malheur, Grant counties	Rena Cusma, <a href="mailto:rena.m.cusma@odot.state.or.us">rena.m.cusma@odot.state.or.us</a>	Sondra Lino <a href="mailto:slino@orednet.org">slino@orednet.org</a>
South West ACT: Douglas, Coos, Curry counties	Mark Usselman, <a href="mailto:mark.usselman@odot.state.or.us">mark.usselman@odot.state.or.us</a>	Yvonne Lind, <a href="mailto:Yvonne.Lind@odot.state.or.us">Yvonne.Lind@odot.state.or.us</a>

<b>Project name (route and segment):</b>	I-5/Beltline Interchange
<b>Jurisdiction owning facility:</b>	Oregon Dept. of Transportation
<b>Entity proposing project:</b>	Oregon Dept. of Transportation
<b>Contact information for proposer (name, phone number, e-mail):</b>	Savannah Crawford, 541-747-1354, Savannah.Crawford@odot.state.or.us
<b>Is this project inside an MPO boundary? If so, please list the MPO and note whether the project is included in the Regional Transportation Plan.<sup>1</sup></b>	Central Lane MPO. This project is listed in the Regional Transportation Plan
<b>Estimated total project cost for phases that have not been completed:</b>	\$100,000,000
<b>Has this estimate been determined through a valid and detailed cost estimate?<sup>2</sup></b>	Yes
<b>At what stage in the project development process was this estimate completed?</b>	2002 EA and 2003 REA; validated during 2007 project development
<b>Total funding currently dedicated to the project:</b>	Unit 1 and Unit 2 total of \$94,000,000
<b>Amount of earmark funds requested:</b>	\$35,000,000
<b>Phase(s) for which earmark is requested:</b>	Unit 3 and 4
<b>Expected start date(s) for phase(s) for which funding is requested:</b>	2012
<b>Describe the problem this project is designed to solve.<sup>3</sup> Please limit this description to 350 words or less.</b> The I-5/Beltline Highway OR569 interchange is one of the major congestion chokepoints in the Eugene/Springfield area. Area growth has created a variety of deficiencies for this interchange, including geometric, operational, and safety. This interchange is in the States top 10% for highest crash rates. Prior funding sources, such as a previous earmark, have allowed ODOT to start rebuilding the interchange; however, many primary components cease to be built due to funding constraints. After Unit 1 is complete this fall and Unit 2 is complete in 2010, several ramps will remain deficient and weaving will occur at several locations. Completing these improvements will allow the interchange to operate to standard and as designed.	
<b>Describe the project and how it will solve the problem described above. Please limit this description to 350 words or less.</b> The continuation of the improvements identified in the Interchange Area Management Plan and Revised Environmental Assessment will help solve the remaining problems which exist at this interchange by allowing a smoother transition from I-5 to Beltline, allowing a safer movement for motorists. Unit 3 and Unit 4 of the project consist of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construct D Line and Soundwall: Eastbound Beltline auxiliary lane &amp; southbound I-5 onramp; soundwall southside of Beltline, west of I-5.</li> <li>• Construct F Line: Southbound I-5 off ramp to westbound Beltline.</li> </ul> <p>These improvements can be made individually. With the funding requested, we can complete several more elements of this project to allow for better operations at the interchange. These improvements, when made, will create free-flowing traffic movement to safely move people and goods throughout the region.</p>	
<b>List agencies, organizations, businesses, and others who support this project.</b> Central Lane MPO, Lane County, Lane Transit District, Oregon Dept. of Transportation, City of Eugene, City of Springfield, City of Coburg and FHWA.	

<sup>1</sup> ACTs and similar advisory bodies should consult with MPOs on any project within an MPO boundary.

<sup>2</sup> To be valid, a cost estimate should, at minimum, be expressed in year of expenditure dollars, using accepted rates of project cost inflation.

<sup>3</sup> This should be consistent with problem statements from planning or NEPA documents.

<b>Project name (route and segment):</b>	Gateway/Beltline: International to Postal Way
<b>Jurisdiction owning facility:</b>	City of Springfield/ODOT
<b>Entity proposing project:</b>	City of Springfield
<b>Contact information for proposer (name, phone number, e-mail):</b>	Tom Boyatt, 541-744-3373 tboyatt@ci.springfield.or.us
<b>Is this project inside an MPO boundary? If so, please list the MPO and note whether the project is included in the Regional Transportation Plan.<sup>1</sup></b>	Central Lane MPO. Project is in the Regional Transportation Plan on the Financially Constrained Projects list
<b>Estimated total project cost for phases that have not been completed:</b>	\$15,000,000
<b>Has this estimate been determined through a valid and detailed cost estimate?<sup>2</sup></b>	Yes
<b>At what stage in the project development process was this estimate completed?</b>	2002 EA and 2003 REA; validated during 2007 project development
<b>Total funding currently dedicated to the project:</b>	\$10,000,000 for Phase 2, Unit 1
<b>Amount of earmark funds requested:</b>	\$15,000,000
<b>Phase(s) for which earmark is requested:</b>	Phase 2, Unit 2
<b>Expected start date(s) for phase(s) for which funding is requested:</b>	2010
<b>Describe the problem this project is designed to solve.<sup>3</sup> Please limit this description to 350 words or less.</b>	
<p>The Gateway area has a high concentration of hotels and motels, making it a convenient travel layover destination. Traffic volumes were low when the intersection was originally constructed, and the distance of 625 feet between the interchange ramps and Gateway did not create any traffic issues. However, today this close spacing and heavy traffic create problems for this intersection and the I-5/Beltline interchange. In addition to spacing, this intersection has a northbound storage queue which backs up significantly, creating congestion and delay to businesses. Without proposed improvements, this will continue to be congested with long queues that block freeway ramps, roadways and accesses, making travel difficult.</p> <p>The project will also improve safety and traffic flow by reducing congestion in the interchange area, including the I-5 mainline and local street intersections. While improvements to the I-5/Beltline interchange are underway (funded in part by prior federal earmarks), this intersection improvement is a vital segment of the overall project in terms of moving traffic safely and efficiently from I-5 to the local system thus protecting ongoing and planned investments at the interchange.</p>	
<b>Describe the project and how it will solve the problem described above. Please limit this description to 350 words or less.</b>	
This project is to correct the operational and safety deficiencies of the existing intersection.	

<sup>1</sup> ACTs and similar advisory bodies should consult with MPOs on any project within an MPO boundary.

<sup>2</sup> To be valid, a cost estimate should, at minimum, be expressed in year of expenditure dollars, using accepted rates of project cost inflation.

<sup>3</sup> This should be consistent with problem statements from planning or NEPA documents.

Improvements would meet current and projected traffic demands at key locations of the area's transportation system, support community vitality and livability, improve bike/ped connectivity, and minimize impacts to the natural and human environment.

Improvements identified in the Revised Environmental Assessment to improve safety, operations, and congestion consist of:

- Improvements to Beltline Road east of I-5 to Game Farm Road South eastbound – Three 12 foot through travel lanes plus right or left-turn lanes at intersections. Beltline Road westbound would have two 12-foot lanes from Game Farm Road South to the Kruse Way/Hutton Road intersection and three 12-foot lanes west of Gateway Street. Auxiliary left- and right-turn lanes are provided. Access would be limited. This section includes in both directions a variable-width planted median, a 6-foot bicycle lane, a 6-foot planter strip, and a 6-foot sidewalk
- From International Way to Beltline Road, improvements would consist of two 12-foot through travel lanes, a 6-foot bicycle lane, a 6-foot planter strip, and a 6-foot sidewalk. Auxiliary left- and right-turn lanes would be provided. Raised medians are proposed on Gateway Street from Game Farm Road East to Beltline Road. Access to adjacent properties would be right-in/right-out.
- Gateway Street from Beltline Road to Kruse Way would become one-way south bound consisting of three 12-foot travel lanes, a 6-foot bicycle lane, a 6-foot planter strip, and a 6-foot sidewalk. The left-most lane would be dropped as a stop sign controlled left-turn lane at Kruse Way. In the vicinity of Kruse Way, northbound traffic along Gateway Street would curve to the right along a modified alignment of Kruse Way to the east, curving north to the Beltline/Hutton intersection. The northbound segment would consist of three 12-foot travel lanes, a 6-foot bicycle lane, a 6-foot planter strip, and a 6-foot sidewalk. Gateway Street to the south of Kruse Way would return to two-way traffic and match into the existing section. There would be no raised medians in the one-way segments and access would consist of right-in/right-out or left-in/left-out depending on the proper direction and flow of traffic.

This improvement is a piece of the larger I-5/Beltline project, and one that is necessary to avoid degrading investments on the interchange side of the project where a significant investment has been made for current improvements.

**List agencies, organizations, businesses, and others who support this project.** Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), Lane County, Lane Transit District, Oregon Department of Transportation, City of Eugene, City of Springfield, the City of Coburg, and FHWA.

<b>Project name (route and segment):</b>	I-5/Coburg Interchange
<b>Jurisdiction owning facility:</b>	Oregon Dept. of Transportation
<b>Entity proposing project:</b>	Oregon Dept. of Transportation
<b>Contact information for proposer (name, phone number, e-mail):</b>	Savannah Crawford, 541-747-1354, Savannah.Crawford@odot.state.or.us
<b>Is this project inside an MPO boundary? If so, please list the MPO and note whether the project is included in the Regional Transportation Plan.<sup>1</sup></b>	Central Lane MPO. This project is included in the Regional Transportation Plan.
<b>Estimated total project cost for phases that have not been completed:</b>	\$19,500,000
<b>Has this estimate been determined through a valid and detailed cost estimate?<sup>2</sup></b>	Yes
<b>At what stage in the project development process was this estimate completed?</b>	Design/Engineering
<b>Total funding currently dedicated to the project:</b>	Unit 1 - \$15,668,000
<b>Amount of earmark funds requested:</b>	\$19,500,000
<b>Phase(s) for which earmark is requested:</b>	Phase 2
<b>Expected start date(s) for phase(s) for which funding is requested:</b>	2011-2013
<b>Describe the problem this project is designed to solve.<sup>3</sup> Please limit this description to 350 words or less.</b> This interchange serves as one of the few primary accesses to the City of Coburg. Significant numbers of regional residents currently travel to employment in the city of Coburg and use the Coburg/I-5 interchange. Most of the existing Coburg employment centers are located within the Coburg/I-5 study area. Most of the planned employment is also slated for the same general area, and is anticipated to generate even greater levels of traffic during the peak periods of travel.	
The interchange is insufficient to meet the demands of the large employment centers that exist within this area. Several large manufacturing companies rely on this interchange to move people, goods, and services throughout the region. This area serves as a major employment hub for the entire region and substandard ramps and other geometric deficiencies create problems at this interchange.	
The existing interchange ramps and bridge are not anticipated to be able to accommodate planned future (year 2025) traffic growth. Intersections located close to the interchange also are expected to contribute to congestion, due to queuing and delay related to vehicles turning onto Pearl Street. All of the primary intersections in the study area (Interstate 5 northbound and southbound ramps, Pearl Street & Industrial Way, Pearl Street & Roberts Road) are anticipated to operate worse than standards by 2025 without infrastructure or policy improvements. The addition of a traffic signal at the I-5 northbound ramps intersection was a recent effort to improve traffic operations in the interchange study area.	
Along with congestion, there are some safety concerns in the interchange study area. The Pearl Street/Coburg Industrial Way intersection has a worse than average crash rate. Rear-end and turning crashes are the most common incidents at this location, indicating driver impatience. The sight distance at the interchange ramp terminals and grades approaching the interchange bridge restrict motorist line of	

<sup>1</sup> ACTs and similar advisory bodies should consult with MPOs on any project within an MPO boundary.

<sup>2</sup> To be valid, a cost estimate should, at minimum, be expressed in year of expenditure dollars, using accepted rates of project cost inflation.

<sup>3</sup> This should be consistent with problem statements from planning or NEPA documents.

sight and create navigation problems for trucks. The bridge structure is very narrow, and allows virtually no room for pedestrians, bicyclists or vehicular emergencies.

**Describe the project and how it will solve the problem described above. Please limit this description to 350 words or less.** This project is anticipated to complete Phase 2 by: 1) replace the structure over Interstate 5 (I-5) with a modern structure to appropriate width that includes adequate bicycle and pedestrian facilities; 2) realign ramps as needed; 3) signalize the southbound ramp terminal intersection; 4) realign a local road south of the interchange to improve intersection spacing standards on the crossroad; and, 5) improve access control on the north side of the interchange by acquiring access control and developing a system of frontage and or local roadways.

**List agencies, organizations, businesses, and others who support this project.** Central Lane MPO, Lane County, Lane Transit District, Oregon Department of Transportation, City of Eugene, City of Springfield, and the City of Coburg.

<b>Project name (route and segment):</b>	Beltline Facility: River Road to Coburg Rd
<b>Jurisdiction owning facility:</b>	Oregon Dept. of Transportation
<b>Entity proposing project:</b>	Oregon Dept. of Transportation
<b>Contact information for proposer (name, phone number, e-mail):</b>	Savannah Crawford, 541-747-1354, <a href="mailto:Savannah.Crawford@odot.state.or.us">Savannah.Crawford@odot.state.or.us</a>
<b>Is this project inside an MPO boundary? If so, please list the MPO and note whether the project is included in the Regional Transportation Plan.<sup>1</sup></b>	Central Lane MPO. This project is included in the Regional Transportation Plan.
<b>Estimated total project cost for phases that have not been completed:</b>	\$100,000,000
<b>Has this estimate been determined through a valid and detailed cost estimate?<sup>2</sup></b>	This estimate is conceptually based from the Regional Transportation Plan
<b>At what stage in the project development process was this estimate completed?</b>	Pre-Planning
<b>Total funding currently dedicated to the project:</b>	\$0
<b>Amount of earmark funds requested:</b>	\$20,000,000
<b>Phase(s) for which earmark is requested:</b>	Phase 1
<b>Expected start date(s) for phase(s) for which funding is requested:</b>	2013
<b>Describe the problem this project is designed to solve.<sup>3</sup> Please limit this description to 350 words or less.</b>	
<p>The Beltline Highway (OR569) provides the only crossing of the Willamette River between the I-105/Washington Street Bridge in Eugene and the Highway 99E Bridge in Harrisburg. Almost 40 years old, it was constructed by Lane County in the 1960s; ownership transferred to ODOT in 1978. When it was built, it was largely surrounded by rural land uses and very low density suburban land uses; its design reflected that kind of demand. As the community has grown around the Beltline Highway, the intensity of land uses has increased and traffic volumes have grown, various safety problems associated with the interchange and ramp spacing being inadequate for the more intense urban travel demands have arisen. The high traffic volumes and capacity problems on the Beltline Highway are further compounded by its design elements.</p> <p>This segment of Beltline Highway carries more vehicle traffic than the nearby Interstate 5 segment. The high volume results in periods of congestion and in a high number of vehicle crashes. This facility does not meet state standards for highways within its classification, nor is it adequate to carry the amount of traffic it is currently experiencing, or will continue to experience in the future. The four interchanges that exist within this corridor all experience heavy traffic volumes and delays on the system. Each of them has geometric deficiencies, experience high volumes of traffic, and experience high crash rates; putting some in the top 5% for highest crashes within the state. As outlying areas continue to grow, and east-west connectivity is limited, this corridor will worsen for both operations and safety.</p> <p>Due to a high vehicle volumes, crash rates, and other deficiencies listed in this section, in addition to the</p>	

<sup>1</sup> ACTs and similar advisory bodies should consult with MPOs on any project within an MPO boundary.

<sup>2</sup> To be valid, a cost estimate should, at minimum, be expressed in year of expenditure dollars, using accepted rates of project cost inflation.

<sup>3</sup> This should be consistent with problem statements from planning or NEPA documents.

regional significance the Beltline Highway carries for this region, the MPO and Board of County Commissioners have designated this segment of highway as 'top priority for the region' in identifying improvements and potential funding to implement the preferred alternative from the planning and NEPA process.

**Describe the project and how it will solve the problem described above. Please limit this description to 350 words or less.** This will implement measures resulting from Planning and NEPA evaluation to improve operation, increase capacity, and address safety concerns. This will also help address connectivity issues within the project area. This process is currently involved in an extensive planning process, looking at geometry, operations, safety, and land use, in addition to linking it to the NEPA process – funds for NEPA have been requested for the draft 2010-2013 STIP.

**List agencies, organizations, businesses, and others who support this project.** Central Lane MPO, Lane County, Lane Transit District, Oregon Department of Transportation, City of Eugene, City of Springfield, and the City of Coburg.

<b>Project name (route and segment):</b>	Hwy 126: Greenhill to Veneta
<b>Jurisdiction owning facility:</b>	Oregon Dept. of Transportation
<b>Entity proposing project:</b>	City of Veneta
<b>Contact information for proposer (name, phone number, e-mail):</b>	Ric Ingham, City Administrator, 541-935-2191. Ringham@ci.veneta.or.us
<b>Is this project inside an MPO boundary? If so, please list the MPO and note whether the project is included in the Regional Transportation Plan.<sup>1</sup></b>	No.
<b>Estimated total project cost for phases that have not been completed:</b>	\$2,000,000
<b>Has this estimate been determined through a valid and detailed cost estimate?<sup>2</sup></b>	This estimate is conceptually based from the Regional Transportation Plan
<b>At what stage in the project development process was this estimate completed?</b>	Pre-planning
<b>Total funding currently dedicated to the project:</b>	\$0
<b>Amount of earmark funds requested:</b>	\$2,000,000
<b>Phase(s) for which earmark is requested:</b>	Planning and NEPA work
<b>Expected start date(s) for phase(s) for which funding is requested:</b>	2011
<b>Describe the problem this project is designed to solve.<sup>3</sup> Please limit this description to 350 words or less.</b> This segment of Highway 126W is experiencing a significant increase in traffic volumes due to land use patterns, such as commercial and residential, developing in outlying areas. Currently, no planned transportation improvements exist for this corridor, which is subject to high levels of traffic during peak times.	
Several safety studies have been completed, such as the Interim Corridor Strategy, Florence-Eugene Conditions Report, and the Oregon 126 Safety Study, which identify problems that exist within the corridor. These studies indicate this segment is carrying an extreme amount of traffic than what it was designed. This segment is a narrow two-lane highway and cannot accommodate the expected future traffic volumes of close to 20,000 ADT. This road configuration, high speeds, and high traffic volumes create a traffic hazard for motorist – traveling a primary route to cities such as Veneta and Florence.	
<b>Describe the project and how it will solve the problem described above. Please limit this description to 350 words or less.</b> This project is intended to begin the planning process to identify the problems and solutions for this corridor. This project can utilize past safety studies and will allow funding to complete technical analysis, identify problems, and identify potential solutions; ultimately, leading to the environmental process known as NEPA.	
<b>List agencies, organizations, businesses, and others who support this project.</b> The Metropolitan Planning Organization, Lane Transit District, Oregon Department of Transportation, Siuslaw Tribe, City of Florence, City of Veneta, and City of Eugene.	

<sup>1</sup> ACTs and similar advisory bodies should consult with MPOs on any project within an MPO boundary.

<sup>2</sup> To be valid, a cost estimate should, at minimum, be expressed in year of expenditure dollars, using accepted rates of project cost inflation.

<sup>3</sup> This should be consistent with problem statements from planning or NEPA documents.

<b>Project name (route and segment):</b>	Franklin Blvd: Ferry Street to Springfield Bridges
<b>Jurisdiction owning facility:</b>	City of Eugene, ODOT
<b>Entity proposing project:</b>	City of Eugene, Lane Transit District, City of Springfield
<b>Contact information for proposer (name, phone number, e-mail):</b>	Tom Boyatt, 541-744-3373 tboyatt@ci.springfield.or.us
<b>Is this project inside an MPO boundary? If so, please list the MPO and note whether the project is included in the Regional Transportation Plan.<sup>1</sup></b>	Yes - Central Lane MPO. Eastern segment of project from I-5 to Willamette River is in the RTP as study, bike lane and urban standards projects. Project extent is identified as Bus Rapid Transit corridor in RTP. RTP further designates four nodal development areas along project corridor between the new Wayne Morse Federal Courthouse in Eugene and the Springfield Bridges in Glenwood.
<b>Estimated total project cost for phases that have not been completed:</b>	\$100,000,000
<b>Has this estimate been determined through a valid and detailed cost estimate?<sup>2</sup></b>	The \$100m is concept-level placeholder for this important multi-modal project.
<b>At what stage in the project development process was this estimate completed?</b>	Project identification phase.
<b>Total funding currently dedicated to the project:</b>	\$1,500,000
<b>Amount of earmark funds requested:</b>	\$25,000,000
<b>Phase(s) for which earmark is requested:</b>	NEPA, Preliminary and Final Design, R/W acquisition
<b>Expected start date(s) for phase(s) for which funding is requested:</b>	NEPA – September 2009 Design – January 2011 R/W Acq. – September 2011
<b>Describe the problem this project is designed to solve.<sup>3</sup> Please limit this description to 350 words or less.</b>	Franklin Boulevard is a key regional transportation link that connects Eugene and Springfield and serves the University of Oregon (UO) and other important activity centers. It also acts as a primary entrance for visitors to Eugene and Springfield. A significant upgrade of this part of the transportation system to modern multi-modal standards is essential to the successful mixed use redevelopment of the Franklin corridor and the Glenwood area riverfront district. A redesign and reconstruction of Franklin Boulevard can provide a number of benefits to the community. Including support for economic development, improved mobility, high quality mode choices for non-auto travel, safety enhancements, and a more attractive entrance into the community.

<sup>1</sup> ACTs and similar advisory bodies should consult with MPOs on any project within an MPO boundary.

<sup>2</sup> To be valid, a cost estimate should, at minimum, be expressed in year of expenditure dollars, using accepted rates of project cost inflation.

<sup>3</sup> This should be consistent with problem statements from planning or NEPA documents.

The eastern end of the Franklin Boulevard corridor, between the Springfield Bridges and Interstate 5, serves the Glenwood area. This roadway section has five travel lanes, but only intermittent sidewalks, very few bicycle facilities, and the bus rapid transit system operates in mixed traffic. In many sections, the right-of-way is only about five feet wider than the street width, leaving few options to easily add sidewalks, bicycle lanes, transit facilities, and landscaping. The street design is unsafe and inconvenient for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users.

The section of Franklin Boulevard west of Interstate 5 serves the UO, the new Federal Courthouse, and retail and commercial uses. The roadway has six lanes and a planted median throughout most of this section. There is a high level of pedestrian activity and business access. There are marginal bicycle facilities and limited pedestrian crossing opportunities, which fosters a high level of jaywalking. In addition, many of the intersections do not align properly, which creates safety issues for both pedestrians and motorists. Despite the high level of pedestrian activity, sidewalks have minimum width and many are immediately adjacent to the street (without a landscaping strip).

There is significant evidence of accelerated development activity throughout the corridor. The UO is beginning construction of a 13,000 seat arena which will lead to increased traffic in all modes, and exacerbate existing deficiencies in the segment west of I-5. Springfield has been approached by a number of potential development opportunities along the corridor east of I-5, and the adjoining north/south street (McVay Highway). Any of these potential opportunities will severely tax the existing facility

**Describe the project and how it will solve the problem described above. Please limit this description to 350 words or less.**

Reducing reliance on the automobile will not occur until new infrastructure that meshes with high-density mixed use redevelopment is put into place. This exciting, cutting edge project brings that vision together by leading the urban reinvestment in the metropolitan area's center through provision of modern transportation infrastructure.

The intent of the project is to construct a modern multi-way urban boulevard that includes dedicated bus rapid transit EmX guide ways and high quality bicycle and pedestrian facilities. This modern urban roadway form accommodates both vehicular throughput along with access lanes to serve "back of walk" commercial and residential re-development. Intersection alignments are improved, direct accesses to the roadway are largely eliminated, pedestrian crossings and overall the walking and cycling environment is dramatically improved, and infrastructure impediments to high density urban mixed use development and re-development is made feasible where it is not today based on the existing infrastructure form.

High density, mixed use re-development in the heart of the metropolitan area between the two downtowns of Eugene and Springfield will depend on the ability of agency and jurisdictional partners to make key multi-modal roadway and transit investments along the Franklin corridor. The proposed multi-modal improvements and the associated evolution and redevelopment of land uses along the corridor are essential to implementing the land use/transportation connection and providing both built environment and constructed transportation alternatives to auto travel.

**List agencies, organizations, businesses, and others who support this project.** Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization, Lane County, Lane Transit District, Oregon Department of Transportation, City of Eugene, City of Springfield, and the City of Coburg.

<b>Project name (route and segment):</b>	OR126/Main Street Intersection
<b>Jurisdiction owning facility:</b>	ODOT
<b>Entity proposing project:</b>	City of Springfield
<b>Contact information for proposer (name, phone number, e-mail):</b>	Tom Boyatt, 541-744-3373 tboyatt@ci.springfield.or.us
<b>Is this project inside an MPO boundary? If so, please list the MPO and note whether the project is included in the Regional Transportation Plan.<sup>1</sup></b>	Yes - Central Lane MPO. Yes, it is in the Regional Transportation Plan and contained on the Financially Constrained Projects list.
<b>Estimated total project cost for phases that have not been completed:</b>	\$50,000,000
<b>Has this estimate been determined through a valid and detailed cost estimate?<sup>2</sup></b>	Yes
<b>At what stage in the project development process was this estimate completed?</b>	Planning
<b>Total funding currently dedicated to the project:</b>	\$500,000
<b>Amount of earmark funds requested:</b>	\$50,000,000
<b>Phase(s) for which earmark is requested:</b>	NEPA, Design, R/W Acquisition, Phase 1 Construction
<b>Expected start date(s) for phase(s) for which funding is requested:</b>	NEPA – 2010 Design, R/W – 2012 Phase 1 Const. - 2013
<b>Describe the problem this project is designed to solve.<sup>3</sup> Please limit this description to 350 words or less.</b>	
<p>OR 126 is a Statewide Expressway and an OTC designated Freight Route.</p> <p>The OR 126 and McKenzie Highway (Main Street) intersection is approaching full capacity during peak travel times,<sup>4</sup> and heavy traffic congestion and delay are anticipated at several intersections in the area by 2025 if no improvements are made. There is also anticipated congestion along the OR 126 mainline north of the intersection during p.m. peak travel periods.</p> <p>The existing volume/capacity (v/c) ratio at OR 126 and McKenzie Highway (Main Street) is 0.93, where 1.00 represents the roadway filled to capacity during peak travel time. Future (2025) operational analysis shows that operations at the OR 126 and McKenzie Highway (Main Street) intersection are anticipated to exceed a v/c ratio of 1.0 by 2025 without improvements. In addition, these v/c ratios do not meet ODOT highway standards.<sup>5</sup> Congestion at other intersections in the immediate area is also expected to worsen over time.</p> <p>Crash trends show a pattern of rear-end collisions at the OR 126 and McKenzie Highway (Main Street)</p>	

<sup>1</sup> ACTs and similar advisory bodies should consult with MPOs on any project within an MPO boundary.

<sup>2</sup> To be valid, a cost estimate should, at minimum, be expressed in year of expenditure dollars, using accepted rates of project cost inflation.

<sup>3</sup> This should be consistent with problem statements from planning or NEPA documents.

<sup>4</sup> The peak hour of travel is 5:00-6:00 p.m.

<sup>5</sup> Standards: At OR 126/Main: v/c = 0.80 (Oregon Highway Plan) and v/c = 0.75 (Highway Design Manual); At 54<sup>th</sup>/Main: v/c = 0.80 (Oregon Highway Plan) and v/c = 0.75 (Highway Design Manual); At 58<sup>th</sup>/Main: v/c = 0.80 (Oregon Highway Plan) and v/c = 0.75 (Highway Design Manual); At Jasper Rd/Mt. Vernon Rd: v/c = 0.90 (Oregon Highway Plan).

intersection (15 of 20 total crashes from 1998-2002). There is a perception that the OR 126 Expressway and McKenzie Highway (Main Street) intersection is challenging for pedestrians and bicyclists due to the crosswalk length and lack of defined bicycle facilities on the north side of McKenzie Highway (Main Street). Students and other pedestrians use an informal crossing of the OR 126 mainline north of the intersection (near A Street) to travel to and from the high school and other areas. There are several private driveways and public roadways along McKenzie Highway (Main Street) located very close to the OR 126 and McKenzie Highway (Main Street) intersection, which can slow traffic operations and lead to opportunities for crashes.

In summary, the OR126/Main Street intersection is currently operating below the City of Springfield and ODOT's operating standards and will worsen as traffic volumes continues to increase. The geometry of the intersection and increasing traffic volumes create a hazardous environment for motorists. Traffic crashes result from high speeds, poor geometry, and high traffic volumes.

**Describe the project and how it will solve the problem described above. Please limit this description to 350 words or less.**

Improving this intersection with a modern interchange is necessary to alleviate the safety, capacity and mobility problems that exist at this intersection. Roadway improvements will allow for more free-flow movements through the intersection and increased capacity, and address the safety problems in the intersection area.

**List agencies, organizations, businesses, and others who support this project.**

Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), Lane County, Lane Transit District, Oregon Department of Transportation, City of Eugene, City of Springfield, and the City of Coburg.

<b>Project name (route and segment):</b>	West 11 <sup>th</sup> Avenue Improvement Project: Terry to Greenhill
<b>Jurisdiction owning facility:</b>	Oregon Department of Transportation/City of Eugene
<b>Entity proposing project:</b>	City of Eugene
<b>Contact information for proposer (name, phone number, e-mail):</b>	Rob Inerfeld, Transportation Planning Manager, 541-682-5343 Rob.inerfeld@ci.eugene.or.us
<b>Is this project inside an MPO boundary? If so, please list the MPO and note whether the project is included in the Regional Transportation Plan.<sup>1</sup></b>	Central Lane MPO. This project is in the Regional Transportation Plan.
<b>Estimated total project cost for phases that have not been completed:</b>	\$20,000,000
<b>Has this estimate been determined through a valid and detailed cost estimate?<sup>2</sup></b>	This estimate is conceptually based from the Regional Transportation Plan
<b>At what stage in the project development process was this estimate completed?</b>	Pre-Planning
<b>Total funding currently dedicated to the project:</b>	\$0
<b>Amount of earmark funds requested:</b>	\$20,000,000
<b>Phase(s) for which earmark is requested:</b>	Planning, NEPA, and Construction
<b>Expected start date(s) for phase(s) for which funding is requested:</b>	2010-2013
<b>Describe the problem this project is designed to solve.<sup>3</sup> Please limit this description to 350 words or less.</b> West Eugene is experiencing significant growth due to land use patterns, such as commercial and residential, developing in outlying areas. Currently, no planned transportation improvements exist for this corridor segment, which is subject to high levels of traffic during peak times. Improvements to relieve congestion in West Eugene were identified in the West Eugene Parkway, since eliminated as a potential project, and a void now exist for planned improvements to increase safety and operations on this corridor.	
This segment is a narrow two lane road that carries heavy traffic volumes to and from the Eugene area and is one of the primary routes leading to coastal cities. A variety of groups and planning projects are underway to begin the identification of problems and solutions for this corridor. A committee called the West Eugene Collaborative, not affiliated with a government entity, has formed to start identifying issues and solutions for West 11 <sup>th</sup> Avenue, which includes this segment of highway. The City of Eugene is also in support of starting a planning process in the near future to begin planning for this corridor.	
<b>Describe the project and how it will solve the problem described above. Please limit this description to 350 words or less.</b> This project is intended to continue the planning process to identify the problems and solutions for this corridor. This project will allow funding for technical analysis to be complete, identification of problems, and identification of potential solutions. Ultimately, leading to an environmental process and the start of construction for phases identified in the planning and	


<sup>1</sup> ACTs and similar advisory bodies should consult with MPOs on any project within an MPO boundary.

<sup>2</sup> To be valid, a cost estimate should, at minimum, be expressed in year of expenditure dollars, using accepted rates of project cost inflation.

<sup>3</sup> This should be consistent with problem statements from planning or NEPA documents.

environmental process.

**List agencies, organizations, businesses, and others who support this project.** Lane County, Lane Transit District, Oregon Department of Transportation, City of Eugene, City of Springfield, and the City of Coburg.

 <b>POLICY</b>	NUMBER Transportation Commission-10	SUPERSEDES New
	EFFECTIVE DATE 05/13/2008	PAGE NUMBER 01 OF 03
	VALIDATION DATE	
	REFERENCE <b>Oregon Transportation Commission                  Minutes, May 13, 2008</b>	
SUBJECT <b>Federal Reauthorization Highway                  Program Earmark Requests</b>		

**PURPOSE**

The Oregon Transportation Commission (Commission) establishes the following policy on highway program earmark requests in the federal surface transportation reauthorization legislation in order to ensure input from local stakeholders on the Oregon Department of Transportation’s (Department) earmark requests, advance broadly supported projects that are recognized as regional or statewide priorities, clearly explain expectations for earmarks for state highway projects, strengthen regional prioritization processes, and secure funding that will help deliver projects.

**POLICY**

In the next surface transportation authorization legislation, the Commission intends to present Oregon’s congressional delegation a limited number of earmark requests for transportation projects that are strategic investments in Oregon’s transportation system, address important transportation problems, and have broad support. In advancing these projects, the Department commits to delivering each project if a sufficient earmark is secured by the congressional delegation. The Department shall provide or help provide matching funds and make up any shortfalls for projects on the official Commission Earmark Requests List to ensure these projects are delivered.

In developing the official Commission Earmark Requests List, the Commission shall consider recommendations from Area Commissions on Transportation (ACTs), Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), and other advisory bodies, as well as statewide priorities and available budget for providing required match and fully funding the project.

Department region staff and local government agencies shall work together through the ACT or similar bodies to identify and recommend appropriate projects that are high priorities for the area, have broad support, and meet the criteria laid out in this policy. Because of the important role MPOs play in determining transportation priorities within urban areas, ACTs are expected to coordinate with MPOs, seek their input for projects within MPO boundaries, and consider MPO priorities as they recommend projects. ACTs shall also seek input from any other important transportation advisory bodies within their boundaries.

ACTs and similar advisory bodies are to prepare Earmark Recommendation Lists and supporting documentation that demonstrates how each project meets the Earmark Request Criteria set forth in this policy. The Commission shall review and consider projects on the Earmark Recommendation

Lists to prepare the official Commission Earmark Requests List. The Commission may also consider recommendations from its statewide advisory committees such as the Oregon Freight Advisory Committee (OFAC) and MPO priority lists submitted to ACTs or similar bodies.

Projects that have the support of multiple parties including local governments, area and statewide transportation advisory committees, and the Department region shall be preferred over ones that have less support. The Commission may give preference to earmark requests that will complete the funding necessary to fully construct a project over requests that will fund only earlier phases, such as project development activities or right-of-way acquisition, or that only contribute to but do not fully fund construction of a new project.

The Department's limited resources dictate that earmarks requested from the congressional delegation should complete or nearly complete the funding needed to deliver a project so there is no need for a significant additional infusion of resources. The Commission may give preference to earmark requests that provide the "last dollar" for a project or project phase to fill a shortfall after other funding has been allocated.

#### *Earmark Request Criteria*

The Commission establishes the following criteria for earmark requests made by the Department. The Commission shall only make requests for projects that meet these criteria.

- *Strategic Investment:* The project is a strategic investment that addresses problems on Oregon's transportation system, is included in or consistent with an existing transportation plan document or needs list, and has been identified as a regional or state priority. Projects shall provide significant benefits to Oregon and its transportation system in areas such as economic development, freight mobility, environmental quality, congestion relief and mobility improvement, safety, and other priority areas.
- *Meets STIP Criteria:* Projects recommended for earmark requests shall meet the approved Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) criteria as set forth in the *STIP Project Eligibility Criteria and Prioritization Factors*.
- *Support:* The project has strong support, including support from local government agencies, area and/or statewide advisory bodies, the public, and the business community.
- *Readiness:* The project has been developed enough to identify potential concerns and demonstrate that it has no known fatal flaws. The work shall begin during the timeframe of the transportation authorization legislation (2010-2015).
- *Funding:* Earmark funding, when combined with funding already committed to the project and additional available resources, shall be used to complete the project or a project phase, which may include planning, environmental work and project development, preliminary engineering, right of way acquisition, or construction. Construction of the project may be structured in phases so that the earmark funds received will complete construction of a segment of the project.

#### *Earmark Sponsor Roles and Responsibilities*

Any local agency<sup>1</sup>, organization, business, or other entity that requests and secures earmark funding for a project not on the official Commission Earmark Requests List takes on the role of the project's sponsor. The earmark requestor shall be expected to provide the required non-federal matching funds. When a project not on the Commission Earmark Requests List receives an earmark, the

---

<sup>1</sup> For purposes of this policy, the definition of "local agency" includes, but is not necessarily limited to, cities, counties, metropolitan planning organizations, ports, special districts, federally recognized Native American tribes, and other units of government.

**Commission Policy No: 10**  
**Page 3 of 3**

Department may provide additional funds for the project only in accordance with the Department's funding priorities and only to the extent funds are available after Commission approved earmark requests are fully funded and after other funding priorities have been met. This policy shall apply when the local agency's earmark is for a project on the state system in addition to when the earmark is for a project on the local agency's system. A local agency that secures an earmark for a local agency project also is responsible for developing and delivering the project according to all applicable federal and state requirements, with oversight and technical assistance from the Department.

Nothing in this policy is intended to prevent a local agency from seeking an earmark for a project on the state or local transportation system. Rather, this policy is intended to foster partnerships with local agencies, explain how the Department intends to invest its scarce resources, and explain the circumstances under which the Commission and Department shall accept responsibility for funding projects.

*Use of Earmarks for Local Contribution to State Highway Projects*

Earmarks for projects on the state highway system are generally intended to supplement rather than supplant state and local resources already committed to the project, and the Commission's earmark requests shall be focused on filling gaps in projects that have not been fully funded. Earmarks for state highway projects shall first be applied to any unfunded balance; once a project is fully funded, earmarks secured by local agencies may be counted toward the local agency's expected contribution.



## **Guidance for Preparing Earmark Recommendation Lists**

### **BACKGROUND**

In the next surface transportation authorization legislation, the Oregon Transportation Commission (Commission) intends to present Oregon's congressional delegation a limited number of earmark requests for transportation projects that are strategic investments in Oregon's transportation system, address important transportation problems, and have broad support. In advancing these projects, ODOT commits to delivering each project if a sufficient earmark is secured by the congressional delegation. ODOT will provide or help provide matching funds and make up any shortfalls for projects on the official Commission Earmark Requests List to ensure these projects are delivered.

The Commission intends to have Area Commissions on Transportation (ACTs) and other advisory bodies recommend the most appropriate and highest priority projects for which to request earmarks in the reauthorization bill. This guidance explains the process and the steps ACTs and similar bodies will follow to create Earmark Recommendation Lists for consideration by the Commission as required by the Commission Policy on Federal Reauthorization Highway Program Earmark Requests, available at [www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/federal\\_affairs.shtml](http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/federal_affairs.shtml).

Each ACT and ACT-like body will be asked to prepare an Earmark Recommendation List containing a small number of priority projects. The Earmark Recommendation Lists will serve two primary purposes. The lists will be used by the Commission in its selection of projects for the Commission Earmarks Request List. The Earmark Recommendation Lists will also be provided to members of the Oregon congressional delegation to show which projects in each district have been determined to be regional priorities. ACTs and similar advisory bodies will develop these Earmark Request Lists during the summer and provide them to ODOT by the end of September so the Commission can approve its Earmark Request List in December.

### **BACKGROUND ON EARMARKS**

Projects that receive congressional earmarks are considered federal-aid highway projects and are subject to all federal-aid highway requirements. Under the federal transportation program, ODOT administers all federal-aid highway earmarks and works with local agencies to help them deliver projects. For a partial explanation of earmark and federal-aid highway requirements, see *Federal-Aid Funding for High Priority Project Sponsors*, available online at [www.oregon.gov/ODOT/docs/LocalProjectSponsorsGuide.pdf](http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/docs/LocalProjectSponsorsGuide.pdf).

Earmarks in the most recent surface transportation authorization act, SAFETEA-LU, required a non-federal match of at least 11.45% of the earmark amount, and it is anticipated that earmarks in the next surface transportation authorization act will have a similar requirement. Earmarks in the next authorization bill will not be available until the legislation is signed into law, which will likely be in 2010 or 2011. Funding from earmarks comes available in a fractional amount each year, and all funding is on a reimbursement basis; no cash is provided up front to pay for projects.

## **EARMARK SPONSOR ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

Under Commission policy, any local agency<sup>1</sup>, organization, business, or other entity that requests and secures earmark funding for a project not on the official Commission Earmark Requests List takes on the role of the project's sponsor. The earmark requestor will be expected to provide the required non-federal matching funds. When a project not on the Commission Earmark Requests List receives an earmark, the Department may provide additional funds for the project only in accordance with the Department's funding priorities and only to the extent funds are available after Commission approved earmark requests are fully funded and after other funding priorities have been met. This policy will apply when the local agency's earmark is for a project on the state system in addition to when the earmark is for a project on the local agency's system. A local agency that secures an earmark for a local agency project also is responsible for developing and delivering the project according to all applicable federal and state requirements, with oversight and technical assistance from ODOT, as required under federal law.

Earmarks for projects on the state highway system are generally intended to supplement rather than supplant state and local resources already committed to the project, and the Commission's earmark requests will be focused on filling gaps in projects that have not been fully funded. Earmarks for state highway projects will first be applied to any unfunded balance; once a project is fully funded, earmarks secured by local agencies may be counted toward the local agency's expected contribution.

## **COMMISSION EARMARK REQUEST CRITERIA**

Earmark projects are often modernization or bridge projects, and the Commission has established requirements for such projects in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) criteria. Therefore, projects recommended for earmark funding requests should meet the approved STIP criteria as set forth in the *STIP Project Eligibility Criteria and Prioritization Factors*. Earmark projects often have further requirements or special considerations due to their earmarked status; therefore, the Commission established the following additional criteria for ODOT earmark requests. The Commission will only make requests for projects that meet these minimum Earmark Request Criteria:

- *Strategic Investment:* The project is a strategic investment that address problems on Oregon's transportation system, is included in or consistent with an existing transportation plan document or needs list, and has been identified as a regional or state priority. Projects should provide significant benefits to Oregon and its transportation system in areas such as economic development, freight mobility, environmental quality, congestion relief and mobility improvement, safety, and other priority areas.
- *Meets STIP Criteria:* Projects recommended for earmark requests must meet the approved Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) criteria as set forth in the *STIP Project Eligibility Criteria and Prioritization Factors*.
- *Support:* The project has strong support, including support from local government agencies, area and/or statewide advisory bodies, the public, and the business community.

---

<sup>1</sup> For purposes of the Commission's policy on earmarks, the definition of "local agency" includes, but is not necessarily limited to, cities, counties, metropolitan planning organizations, ports, special districts, federally recognized Native American tribes, and other units of government.

- *Readiness:* The project has been developed enough to identify potential concerns and demonstrate that it has no known fatal flaws. The work will begin during the timeframe of the transportation authorization legislation (2010-2015).
- *Funding:* Earmark funding, when combined with funding already committed to the project and additional available resources, will be used to complete the project or a project phase, which may include planning, environmental work and project development, preliminary engineering, right of way acquisition, or construction. Construction of the project may be structured in phases so that the earmark funds received will complete construction of a segment of the project.

### **ADDITIONAL GUIDELINES FOR PROJECT RECOMMENDATIONS**

ACTs should also consider these general guidelines when selecting projects:

- *Project Type:* Most earmark funding for Oregon highway projects in SAFETEA-LU went to modernization projects. Bridges and Transportation Enhancement projects also received substantial funding, but other types of projects, including safety and operations, are also eligible for earmark funding.
- *Project Timeline:* The next reauthorization bill will likely be signed into law in 2010 or 2011 and will continue through the end of federal Fiscal Year 2015. Earmark funding will come available after the bill becomes law and will be available in annual increments through 2015. Funding should only be requested for projects or project phases that will begin during this period. Project selection should take into account that not all funding will be available immediately upon enactment of the legislation, though tools such as Advance Construct can be used to address issues related to availability of funds.
- *Earmark Request Size:* Oregon's highway project earmarks in SAFETEA-LU, the last surface transportation authorization act, ranged from \$90,000 to \$23.5 million, with a mean of about \$4 million and a median size of \$2 million. ACTs should limit earmark requests to no more than \$25 million, as no project in Oregon received more than this amount in SAFETEA-LU. ACTs should generally not recommend earmarks of less than \$1 million.

ODOT has limited ability to fill any funding gap remaining after securing an earmark, so ACTs should recommend projects that could reasonably cover funding gaps with an earmark. ACTs should also consider that the amount of funding secured is usually significantly lower than the amount requested. For example, in SAFETEA-LU ODOT received only 41% of the amount of funding requested for projects on the Commission earmark request list. ACTs should ensure that there is a commitment to bridging any remaining funding gap and a contingency plan that will allow projects to move forward even if full funding is not secured.

### **STEPS TO PREPARE AN EARMARK RECOMMENDATION LIST AND SUBMIT IT TO THE COMMISSION FOR CONSIDERATION**

#### **STEP 1: Agency/MPO/ACT Coordination**

ODOT region staff, local government agencies, and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) should work together through the ACT or a similar body to identify and recommend appropriate projects that are high priorities for the area and have broad support. The ACTs or similar advisory committees should participate in selecting and recommending projects for earmark requests as they do for modernization projects. ODOT staff will provide information and assistance for the ACTs to:

- Consider any existing project needs list.
- Evaluate potential earmark projects against the current *STIP Project Eligibility Criteria and Prioritization Factors*.
- Evaluate potential earmark projects against the Commission Earmark Request Criteria.
- Communicate with any affected local government agencies not participating in the ACT and appropriate statewide advisory committees.
- Recommend appropriate high-priority projects with broad support to the Commission for inclusion in the Commission Earmark Requests List.

Local agencies and ODOT regions will be asked to submit their potential earmark requests, particularly for projects on the state highway system, to the ACTs for consideration and potential inclusion in Earmark Recommendation Lists and the Commission Earmark Requests List. ODOT staff and local agencies who wish to propose projects for ACT consideration should fill out a Reauthorization Earmark Proposal Form and submit it to ACT staff and the ODOT Area Manager. The Reauthorization Earmark Proposal Form is available online at [www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/federal\\_affairs.shtml](http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/federal_affairs.shtml).

The ACTs should do this work during their regular meetings that are advertised and open to the public. A full description of ACT responsibilities, duties, and expectations is presented in the *Policy on Formation and Operation of the ACTs*, available on the ACT website at [www.oregon.gov/ODOT/COMM/act\\_main.shtml](http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/COMM/act_main.shtml).

#### *Coordination with Metropolitan Planning Organizations*

Because of the important role MPOs play in determining transportation priorities within urban areas, the Commission expects ACTs to coordinate with MPOs and seek their input for projects within MPO boundaries. Each MPO should submit a list of priority projects to their respective ACT prior to the ACT's selection of projects, and ACTs should take this input into consideration as they recommend projects. These MPO lists of priority projects may contain any of the types of project that can be included on an Earmark Recommendation List, including state highway projects, projects on the local road system, and transit projects (see below). ACTs should also seek input from any other important transportation advisory bodies within their boundaries.

#### **STEP 2: Prepare the Earmark Recommendation List**

Each ACT should prepare a list of one to five priority projects. The Earmark Recommendation List need not be put in priority order.

#### *Size and Number of Projects*

While ACTs will not be provided funding targets, they should attempt to balance the number and size of requests. For example, ACTs that recommend large earmarks should advance fewer projects, while those that recommend smaller earmarks can advance more projects. ACTs are urged to present earmark request lists that are in line with their population; smaller ACTs should generally put forward a smaller total dollar amount, while larger ACTs may request a larger total dollar amount.

#### *Project Types*

Because the Earmark Recommendation Lists will be provided to the congressional delegation as well as to the Commission, ODOT will not restrict ACT recommendations to the state highway system. ACT lists may include the following types of transportation projects:

- state highway projects,
- local projects that benefit the state highway system,

- local projects that do not benefit the state highway system,
- transit projects.

#### *Local Projects*

The Commission Earmark Request List will include state highway projects that meet the earmark criteria listed on page 2 of the Commission Policy on Federal Reauthorization Highway Program Earmark Requests and may include local projects that benefit the state highway system. Local agency projects may be considered for inclusion on the Commission Earmark Request List if they meet the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) Policy 2B: Off-System Improvements. The OHP is available online at [www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/orhwyplan.shtml](http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/orhwyplan.shtml). The Commission Earmark Request List will not include local projects that do not demonstrably benefit the state highway system. However, ACTs may consider local projects and include those that are deemed regional priorities on their Earmark Recommendation List to demonstrate support for these projects to the congressional delegation.

#### *Transit Projects*

Because of the important role public transit plays in Oregon's transportation system, ACTs may include a separate section of their list for transit projects to show support for projects that will be requested by local transit agencies. These projects will not be included in the Commission Earmark Requests List, but they will be included in the list of identified regional priorities that will be provided to the congressional delegation. The list of transit projects will not count against the limit on highway projects ACTs can include on their list.

#### *Timeline*

Local agencies and ODOT staff are asked to submit their project proposal forms to ACT staff and the ODOT Area Manager by **July 7<sup>th</sup>** to allow ample time for ACTs and similar advisory bodies to consider and recommend projects. Any agency that cannot meet this deadline should coordinate with their ODOT Area Manager and ACT staff to seek an extension. Proposals submitted after this deadline should be considered by ACTs as practical and appropriate.

MPOs should submit their priority lists to the ODOT Area Manager and ACT staff by **July 7<sup>th</sup>** to ensure that ACTs can consider these priorities in their selection process. MPOs should coordinate with their ODOT Area Manager and ACT staff if they will have difficulty meeting this deadline.

ACTs should develop a process for selection of projects to recommend in June and July. This may include creation of a special subcommittee to recommend a list of priority projects.

ACTs should develop and approve their lists of recommended projects in August and September. ACTs are encouraged to utilize existing project recommendation lists, such as their SB 566 project lists and 2010-2013 STIP recommendations, to simplify this process.

ACTs must complete their Earmark Recommendation Lists and provide them to the ODOT Director's Office, by way of the ODOT Area Manager, by **September 30, 2008**. Any ACT lists received after this date will be considered as practical and appropriate by the Commission.

When ACTs have completed their Earmark Recommendation Lists, ODOT will request supplemental information on each non-transit project included on those lists in order to select projects for the Commission's Earmark Request List. This supplemental information will be due in October.

**STEP 3: Commission Review of Earmark Recommendation Lists**

ODOT will draw on the Earmark Recommendation Lists for the creation of the official Commission Earmark Requests List. Projects on the Commission list may also be drawn from other sources, including recommendations from statewide advisory bodies such as the Oregon Freight Advisory Committee (OFAC) and MPO priority lists provided to ACTs. As ACTs and similar bodies are primarily involved in selecting modernization projects, it is anticipated that most projects on Earmark Recommendation Lists will be highway modernization projects, and the Commission may draw on other sources for other types of projects, such as bridges and operations/ITS projects.

The Commission will also consider recommendations from ODOT Regions and Areas, statewide priorities, and available budget for providing required match and fully funding the project to develop the list of transportation earmark requests that will be sent to the congressional delegation. The Commission may give preference to earmark requests that will complete the funding necessary to fully construct a project over requests that will fund only earlier phases, such as project development activities or right-of-way acquisition, or that only contribute to but do not fully fund construction of a new project. Projects that have the support of multiple parties including local governments, business and community groups, area and statewide transportation advisory committees, and the ODOT region will be preferred over ones that have less support.

**For Further Information**

Please direct any questions on the Commission Policy on Federal Reauthorization Highway Program Earmark Requests or the process for regional project selection to Travis Brouwer, ODOT Federal Affairs Advisor, at (503) 986-3448 or by e-mail to [travis.brouwer@odot.state.or.us](mailto:travis.brouwer@odot.state.or.us).

<b>Commission Earmark Requests List Process Schedule 2008-09</b>												
<b>Tasks</b>	<b>Feb 08</b>	<b>Mar</b>	<b>Apr</b>	<b>May</b>	<b>June</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>Aug</b>	<b>Sept</b>	<b>Oct</b>	<b>Nov</b>	<b>Dec</b>	<b>Jan 09</b>
Draft Earmark Policy to Commission for approval to start outreach	X											
Outreach on the Draft Earmark Policy	X	X	X									
Earmark Policy to Commission for approval				X								
Local Agencies and ODOT prepare proposals and submit to ACTs					X	X						
ODOT Regions, Local Agencies, ACTs and MPOs collaborate to prepare lists					X	X	X	X				
ACTs send lists to ODOT Director's Office								X				
ODOT staff compiles ACT lists and prepares draft Earmark Requests List for Commission									X	X		
Commission reviews Earmark Recommendation Lists and draft Earmark Requests List										X		
Commission approves Earmark Requests List											X	
ODOT presents congressional delegation Commission Earmark Request List												X



# REAUTHORIZATION EARMARK PROPOSAL FORM

Please fill out this form to propose that a project be considered by an ACT or similar body for inclusion on an Earmark Recommendation List that will be sent to the Oregon Transportation Commission and Oregon's congressional delegation. Supplemental information will be requested for each project included on an Earmark Recommendation List to determine whether the meets the Commission Earmark Request Criteria. Filling out this form does not constitute an application for funding.

**Instructions**

- Please carefully read the Oregon Transportation Commission's Policy on Federal Reauthorization Highway Program Earmark Requests as well as the associated Guidance for Preparing Earmark Recommendation Lists before filling out this form. The policy and guidance are available at [www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/federal\\_affairs.shtml](http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/federal_affairs.shtml).
- To ensure consistency, please fill out form using 10 point Arial font.
- Letters of support may be attached.
- E-mail completed form to ACT and ODOT staff listed in the table below by **July 7**.
- Please direct any questions to the ODOT Area Manager or to Travis Brouwer, ODOT Federal Affairs Advisor, at (503) 986-3448 or by e-mail to [travis.brouwer@odot.state.or.us](mailto:travis.brouwer@odot.state.or.us).

Area of State	ODOT Staff	ACT Staff
Central Oregon ACT: Deschutes, Crook, Jefferson counties	Gary Farnsworth, <a href="mailto:gary.c.farnsworth@odot.state.or.us">gary.c.farnsworth@odot.state.or.us</a>	Andrew Spreadborough, <a href="mailto:aspreadborough@coic.org">aspreadborough@coic.org</a>
Cascades West ACT: Linn, Benton, Lincoln counties	Vivian Payne, <a href="mailto:vivian.b.payne@odot.state.or.us">vivian.b.payne@odot.state.or.us</a>	Scott Wilson, <a href="mailto:swilson@ocwcoq.org">swilson@ocwcoq.org</a>
Hood River County	Rich Watanabe, <a href="mailto:richard.f.watanabe@odot.state.or.us">richard.f.watanabe@odot.state.or.us</a>	--
Lane County	Sonny Chickering, <a href="mailto:sonny.p.chickering@odot.state.or.us">sonny.p.chickering@odot.state.or.us</a>	--
Lower John Day ACT: Wasco, Sherman, Gilliam, Wheeler counties	Sam Wilkins, <a href="mailto:sam.l.wilkins@odot.state.or.us">sam.l.wilkins@odot.state.or.us</a>	Michelle Colby, <a href="mailto:michelle.colby@co.gilliam.or.us">michelle.colby@co.gilliam.or.us</a>
Portland Metropolitan Region: Multnomah, Washington, Clackamas counties	Travis Brouwer, <a href="mailto:travis.brouwer@odot.state.or.us">travis.brouwer@odot.state.or.us</a>	--
Mid Willamette Valley ACT: Marion, Polk, Yamhill counties	Tim Potter, <a href="mailto:james.t.potter@odot.state.or.us">james.t.potter@odot.state.or.us</a>	Richard Schmid, <a href="mailto:rschmid@mwvcoq.org">rschmid@mwvcoq.org</a>
Northeast ACT: Morrow, Umatilla, Union, Wallowa, Baker counties	Frank Reading, <a href="mailto:frank.h.reading@odot.state.or.us">frank.h.reading@odot.state.or.us</a>	Glenis Harrison, <a href="mailto:glenis.harrison@odot.state.or.us">glenis.harrison@odot.state.or.us</a> and Nancy Martin, <a href="mailto:nancy.e.martin@odot.state.or.us">nancy.e.martin@odot.state.or.us</a>
Northwest ACT: Columbia county	David Kim, <a href="mailto:david.kim@odot.state.or.us">david.kim@odot.state.or.us</a>	Mary McArthur, <a href="mailto:mhmcarthur@att.net">mhmcarthur@att.net</a>
Northwest ACT: Clatsop and Tillamook counties	Larry McKinley, <a href="mailto:larry.mckinley@odot.state.or.us">larry.mckinley@odot.state.or.us</a>	Mary McArthur, <a href="mailto:mhmcarthur@att.net">mhmcarthur@att.net</a>
Rogue Valley ACT: Josephine and Jackson counties	Art Anderson, <a href="mailto:arthur.h.anderson@odot.state.or.us">arthur.h.anderson@odot.state.or.us</a>	Pat Foley, <a href="mailto:pfoley@rvcoq.org">pfoley@rvcoq.org</a>
South Central ACT: Klamath and Lake counties	Butch Hansen, <a href="mailto:norman.c.hansen@odot.state.or.us">norman.c.hansen@odot.state.or.us</a>	Christina Ingram, <a href="mailto:christina@scoedd.org">christina@scoedd.org</a>
South East ACT: Harney, Malheur, Grant counties	Rena Cusma, <a href="mailto:rena.m.cusma@odot.state.or.us">rena.m.cusma@odot.state.or.us</a>	Sondra Lino <a href="mailto:slino@orednet.org">slino@orednet.org</a>
South West ACT: Douglas, Coos, Curry counties	Mark Usselman, <a href="mailto:mark.usselman@odot.state.or.us">mark.usselman@odot.state.or.us</a>	Yvonne Lind, <a href="mailto:Yvonne.Lind@odot.state.or.us">Yvonne.Lind@odot.state.or.us</a>

<b>Project name (route and segment):</b>
<b>Jurisdiction owning facility:</b>
<b>Entity proposing project:</b>
<b>Contact information for proposer (name, phone number, e-mail):</b>
<b>Is this project inside an MPO boundary? If so, please list the MPO and note whether the project is included in the Regional Transportation Plan.<sup>1</sup></b>
<b>Estimated total project cost for phases that have not been completed:</b>
<b>Has this estimate been determined through a valid and detailed cost estimate?<sup>2</sup></b>
<b>At what stage in the project development process was this estimate completed?</b>
<b>Total funding currently dedicated to the project:</b>
<b>Amount of earmark funds requested:</b>
<b>Phase(s) for which earmark is requested:</b>
<b>Expected start date(s) for phase(s) for which funding is requested:</b>
<b>Describe the problem this project is designed to solve.<sup>3</sup> Please limit this description to 350 words or less.</b>
<b>Describe the project and how it will solve the problem described above. Please limit this description to 350 words or less.</b>
<b>List agencies, organizations, businesses, and others who support this project.</b>

<sup>1</sup> ACTs and similar advisory bodies should consult with MPOs on any project within an MPO boundary.

<sup>2</sup> To be valid, a cost estimate should, at minimum, be expressed in year of expenditure dollars, using accepted rates of project cost inflation.

<sup>3</sup> This should be consistent with problem statements from planning or NEPA documents.

# Draft Commission Policy on Federal Reauthorization Highway Program Earmark Requests

## Summary of Major Changes

Based on comments from stakeholders and internal review, ODOT has made the following major changes to the draft ODOT Policy on Federal Reauthorization Highway Program Earmark Requests and the guidance document that will go to ACTs, MPOs, and other stakeholders.

*Purpose:* The purpose of the policy has been rewritten to better reflect the intent behind it. The purpose statement now emphasizes the desire to seek input from local stakeholders, advance broadly supported projects, clearly explain expectations for earmarks on the state highway system, strengthen regional prioritization processes, and secure funding to help deliver projects.

*Role of Metropolitan Planning Organizations:* MPOs are given an explicit role in the project recommendation process. MPOs are asked to provide input on project priorities to ACTs, and the ACTs are directed to consider this input. The OTC will also consider MPO input provided to ACTs when it selects projects.

*Strategic Investment:* To better define the types of projects ODOT will put forward, the “Strategic Investment” criterion now notes that projects should provide significant benefits to Oregon and the state transportation system in terms of economic development, freight mobility, environmental quality, congestion relief, and safety, and other areas.

*Funding:* The “Funding” criterion has been modified to state that earmarks, when combined with funding already committed to the project and additional available resources, will be used to complete the project or a project phase. The phases are now defined, including environmental work, preliminary engineering, right of way acquisition, and construction. Due to concerns that the “last dollar” requirement could disqualify many projects, the “last dollar” language has been moved to another section of the policy to serve as guidance rather than a firm requirement, and the intent of this language has been clarified.

*Local Agency Roles and Responsibilities:* ODOT has modified the language in this section of the policy to more clearly explain its intent. The revised language emphasizes that ODOT will not make any advance commitment to allocate additional funds for projects not on the OTC request list while noting that these projects will still be able to compete for funding within the normal STIP process. In addition, the language on requiring local agencies to make up funding shortfalls has been dropped, as the OTC cannot compel any agency to fully fund a project. However, the intent of this statement has been retained: given the agency’s limited resources, ODOT will not be able to fund every project for which a local agency or other organization secures an earmark, and ODOT will only commit to funding and delivering projects that the OTC has requested. The revised language also notes that the policy applies to any entity that requests and secures an earmark.

*Preclusion of Local Requests:* Based on concerns expressed by some local agencies, ODOT has added a paragraph noting that this policy would not preclude a local agency from seeking an earmark from the congressional delegation. Local agencies will be able to request any project—including state highway projects—from the congressional delegation, but the policy explains that they will not be able to expect that ODOT will dedicate its scarce resources to funding projects the State has not requested.

*Local Contribution:* ODOT has eliminated the original language that would generally prohibit local agencies from using an earmark to cover the local contribution to a state highway project. ODOT has substituted a policy that would allow local agencies to count federal earmarks toward their local contribution when a project is fully funded. When an earmark is not fully funded, the earmark will first be applied to closing any funding gap, and any remaining funds could be applied to the local contribution.

*Project Selection Guidelines:* ODOT has provided additional guidelines on project selection to ACTs, MPOs, local agencies, and other advisory bodies in the guidance document. These include guidelines related to project type, timeline, and size of earmark request. The guidelines also direct ACTs to ensure that a contingency plan is in place to ensure a project can move forward if full funding is not secured.

*Transit Projects:* The guidance document has been modified to allow ACTs to include a separate list of priority transit projects in order to show regional support for requests made by local transit agencies.