MEETING: WCCC Transportation Advisory Committee
DATE: Thursday March 26, 2015
TIME: 1:30 – 3:00 p.m.
PLACE: Beaverton Library Cathy Stanton Conference Room
12375 SW 5th St., Beaverton

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Regional System of Mutual Funding Interest
   Purpose: Get input on how define a system of transportation projects of regional importance for the potential of creating a regional transportation funding source
   Presenter: Dan Kaempff, Metro

3. MSTIP System of Countywide Importance
   Purpose: Review the map and criteria used to develop the map
   Presenter: Dyami Valentine, Washington County

4. Other Business and Agency Updates
   - TPAC Agenda
   - WCCC Agenda
   - Transportation Futures Study

* Material included in packet.
# Material will be distributed at the meeting.
^ Material available electronically and/or distributed in advance of the meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, April 23</td>
<td>Beaverton Library / Cathy Stanton Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, May 28</td>
<td>Beaverton Library / Cathy Stanton Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, June 25</td>
<td>Beaverton Library / Cathy Stanton Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, July 30</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, August 27</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, September 24</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, October 29</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, November 19</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, December 17</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For agenda and schedule information, call Dyami Valentine at 503.846.3821
email: dyami_valentine@co.washington.or.us
Date: January 2015  
To: Interested Parties  
From: Ted Leybold, Andy Cotugno  
Subject: Framework for discussion of Transportation System of Regional Funding Interest

**Introduction**  
Discussions about potential for creating a regional transportation funding source is prompting efforts to define a system of transportation projects that are of sufficient regional importance that creates a shared interest by leaders and stakeholders in seeing those projects funded.

The regional transportation plan (RTP) has defined a regional transportation system needed to implement regional policy interests, define where intra-jurisdictional coordination is necessary and to establish federal funding eligibility (see attached). These purposes represent a broader set of interests and regional project definition than what is likely to be of a mutually agreeable set of interests to develop a shared revenue package. However, it does provide a framework from which a shared revenue transportation package can be developed.

**RTP Framework**  
The regional transportation plan defines the regional system through a list of projects that are consistent with modal system maps (road system, freight system, bicycle system, etc.) and topical plans (system and demand management). Interested staff from across the region could work from these defined networks to develop a narrowed definition of a regional transportation system for the purposes of mutual funding interest. The purpose would be to define a system that regional leaders from any part of the region could clearly understand and articulate to their constituents why investments from a new regional funding source benefits or is important to everyone in the region.

**Straw proposal**  
To demonstrate an example and begin discussions on this approach, one possible definition of such a system could include the following.

I. Any project that addresses a deficiency and brings a facility up to design guidelines that is located on the highest level orders of the regional system facilities:  
   - Arterial and Throughways (Principle and Major arterials)  
   - Freight (Main railroad and roadway routes)  
   - Transit (Light Rail/HCT, Frequent Bus Route, or inter-city high speed rail)  
   - Bike (Bicycle parkway)  
   - Pedestrian (Pedestrian parkway)  
   - System Management (Major arterial corridor management, Operations Centers)  
   - Demand Management (TBD from review of RTO Strategic Plan)

II. Projects that address a deficiency located on the next tier of RTP system classifications only when specific criteria (TBD) that elevate those projects to a level of mutual funding interest are met. Criteria could be developed around many issues such as addressing multiple modal benefits,
removing a recognized transportation barrier to development of a regional significant land use area, leveraging a safety funded project, etc.

- Arterial and Throughways (Minor and Rural arterials)
- Freight (Road connectors and Branch railroads)
- Transit (Regional bus and terminal/P&R facilities)
- Bike (Regional Bikeway and Bicycle Districts)
- Pedestrian (Regional Pedestrian Corridor and Pedestrian Districts)
- System Management (Minor arterial corridor management projects)
- Demand Management (TBD from review of RTO Strategic Plan)

**Next Steps**

Continue to meet to refine the proposal, considering feedback and direction provided at the TMAC retreat, and propose next iteration at upcoming TMAC and JPACT Finance Subcommittee meetings. Should a definition of a system emerge that is of interest to stakeholders, consider embarking on a process to define a regional transportation funding proposal for consideration.

Consider “local share” portion of a regional funding package. This would ensure a distribution of some funding across sub-regions and with more local influence of decision making for projects closer to the local-regional portion of the geographic interest spectrum, but still needing to address “programmatic” regional interests (e.g. street connectivity, safety, demand or system management capacity, etc.).
At the January 15, 2015 meeting, the JPACT Finance Committee requested staff develop a proposed process for defining a regional transportation system of mutual funding interest. This system definition could then be used as a tool in gauging whether there is interest in pursuing new funding for the region.

Metro staff intend to hold a series of workshops with local staff and interested parties from across the region to develop a draft proposal for consideration at JPACT. Two or three workshops are anticipated, but more can be held if needed.

The attached matrix represents a draft concept of how to begin the discussion in the workshops. It is an initial proposal for narrowing down the RTP system definition to help regional leaders identify projects to be included in potential new sources of transportation funding. Based on Regional Transportation Plan system and network definitions, each of the networks is divided into tiers defining funding eligibility. The tiers are derived from network hierarchies and other identifying characteristics. Staff will provide examples to help illustrate the types of projects for each of the system tiers.

The base assumption in identifying these four tiers is the presence of new revenue, divided into regional and local share portions. (The revenue source(s) and manner in which funding is divided is to be determined and not in the scope of this exercise.) All projects funded from either the regional or local share portions would need to demonstrate connectivity or benefit to the system of mutual funding interest.

Staff is requesting your feedback and input on this approach.
## PROPOSED - Regional Transportation System Of Mutual Funding Interest

### Definition & Funding Eligibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Networks</th>
<th>Regional Investments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arterial &amp; Throughway</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freight</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Desired outcome(s):  

**Regional Network/Investment definition:**  
All roads and streets classified as "Regional street" or higher in RTP hierarchy, unless otherwise included or excluded as noted below.  
All service that provides transit access in regionally designated Mobility Corridors, unless otherwise included or excluded as noted below.  
All roadways, trails and districts classified as regional in the RTP, unless otherwise included or excluded as noted below.  
All railroad lines, main roadway routes, and road connectors as shown in the Regional Freight Network.  

### System Tiers  

#### Eligibility  

**System of Statewide Interest**  
Eligible: Only on a shared-cost agreement basis  
Projects included in Regional system, but designated as being of "State Significance"  
Unimproved "orphan highways"  
Freeway expansion/modernization  
Service that connects the region to other cities:  
Intercity bus  
Adjoining city services (SAM, CAT, Cherriots, etc.)  
Amtrak/passenger rail  
*Existing/planned bike/ped elements in State facility ROW  
Bike/ped elements of unimproved "orphan highways"  
Ped/bike elements of freeway expansion/modernization (parallel path)  
Projects on the State owned highway system that are included on the Regional Freight Network  
Freeway expansion/ modernization  

**System of Regional Interest (Funded via Regional Share)**  
Eligible: Based on mutual regional interest in multi-modal project outcomes.  
"Geographic Equity" is not applicable.  
Projects not included in the State System and classified in the RTP as:  
Throughway  
Arterial street  
Projects that build or expand existing:  
High-capacity transit  
Frequent Service bus  
Operational costs of above capital investments  
Roadways/trails not included in the State System and classified in the RTP as:  
Bicycle Parkway  
Pedestrian Parkway  
Regional Bikeway  
Regional Pedestrian Corridor  
Projects on the Regional Freight Network, but not included in the State System.  

**System of Local Interest (Funded via Local Share)**  
Eligible: Local "Geographic Equity" applies to distribution of these funds to these projects, but projects are expected to address some aspects of regional outcomes (TBD by project type)  
Projects that meet RTP guidance for connectivity to Regional System and classified as:  
Collector street  
Local street  
Projects that improve access to the regional transit system:  
Local or feeder bus  
Bicycle or pedestrian access  
Operational costs of above service  
Projects that improve access to the regional bicycle, pedestrian and transit system:  
Regional roadways  
Regional trails  
Projects not included on the Regional Freight Network, but maintain/improve grade separation, provide local access for industrial businesses, or improve traffic flow on parallel facilities to main roadway routes.  

**System of Local Interest**  
Ineligible: No clear and significant regional outcomes expected  
Projects that do not connect to Regional System and classified as:  
Collector street  
Local street  
Projects that address primarily local transit service.  
Projects that do not connect to/provide access to the regional bicycle, pedestrian and regional transit system.  
Not applicable.