

W8c

AGENDA COVER MEMO

DATE: September 29, 2004
TO: Lane County Board of Commissioners
DEPT.: Public Works
PRESENTED BY: Sonny Chickering, County Engineer

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: DISCUSSION OF IMPROVEMENTS TO THE PUBLIC
WORKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (CIP) PROCESS.

I. MOTION

DISCUSSION ONLY.

II. ISSUE OR PROBLEM

During the recent adoption (May 12, 2004) of the Public Works five-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for FY 05-09, staff and the Board worked through a list of project additions and cuts from the program to ensure that the dollar value of project cuts met or exceeded the value of project additions. This was due to the fact that Federal legislation guaranteeing annual payments to the County Road Fund is due to expire in FY 06-07. A projection of the Road Fund Balance in the 05-09 CIP indicates exhaustion of the fund reserve in FY 06-07 without reauthorization or other changes to the CIP. Given this, prioritization of CIP projects for upcoming annual adoptions will become even more critical.

III. DISCUSSION

A. Background

The Board of County Commissioners has adopted a process as outlined in Lane Manual 15.575 for annual review and development of a five-year Capital Improvement Program. Two primary purposes are identified in Lane Manual for an established Public Works CIP:

1. To allocate limited financial resources to projects which will provide the greatest return in moving people and goods safely and efficiently; and
2. To provide for the most efficient scheduling and allocation of staff and other resources.

The CIP process begins each fall with a staff evaluation of the previously adopted CIP program. Adjustments are made to existing projects to reflect such things as schedule or cost changes. Public notice is sent out by staff to interested parties and

agencies to solicit public comment. After release of the draft CIP, the adoption process involves a public hearing in front of the Roads Advisory Committee (RAC) along with a recommendation by the RAC and a subsequent public hearing in front of the Board.

At this year's CIP discussion by the Board, Commissioners commented on aspects of the adoption process that could be improved, and requested that staff look at changes that would provide better information to the Board and the public regarding allocation of funds to competing projects.

B. Analysis

Staff suggests the following improvements to the project comparison process. If the Board is in general agreement with the approach described below, staff can implement these changes in the next CIP cycle this winter:

- More complete project descriptions and justifications;
- Explicit criteria for the Board, the public, and nominating agencies to consider, including policies recently adopted in the County Transportation System Plan (TSP) or other relevant transportation plans;
- An evaluation of project funding requests against the criteria;
- Recommendations from staff and the supporting reasons why the recommendations are being made.

History of Project Ranking Systems (County)

In the 1970's and 1980's, staff used a Fortran-based computer ranking system that considered traffic volumes, roadway characteristics, and roadway design standards to identify candidate projects for the CIP program. Many of the County's urban arterials (such as River Road) and rural major collectors (Marcola Road, Clear Lake Road, and Row River Road) were identified, funded, and constructed in this manner. Eventually, the program became technically outdated and its use was discontinued.

Staff began working in 1996 on another formula for prioritizing CIP projects (see Exhibit A). This process assigned points to a project for major roadway characteristics, such as Functional Classification, Road Usage (ADT and Truck Volume), Road Condition (Alignment, Capacity and Pavement), Safety (Crash Rate and Roadway Hazards), and Cost (Cost per Vehicle Mile Driven).

Staff used this priority ranking when presenting projects to the RAC and public, but the method still did not allow for flexibility during approval of the annual CIP plan. In some instances, a project would score very high on the technical priority scale, but would not have constituency support among the public, the RAC, or the Board. Alternately, a project would have a strong constituency, but would not score well in the technical analysis. The conclusion of staff was that the point system was not

“intelligent” enough to evaluate and compare the range and variety of project requests in the CIP process. See Attachment A for a sample ranking sheet.

A more recent example of comparing diverse project requests is the Capital Project Partnership Program (CaPP) matrix (see Attachment B). This program was established by the Board in the amount of \$10 million after the last federal timber receipt reauthorization. The Board created the program to make regionally important improvements on the ODOT system and within cities to demonstrate the benefits of the timber receipts program to Lane County and to make an impact regionally. Criteria for the CaPP include both Required Criteria and Evaluative Criteria. This method of project priority and selection is relatively straightforward and understandable.

All of this history has resulted in the current method of prioritization that we use today. Projects can be nominated by members of the public or other agencies based on their own perception of need. Projects are sometimes generated by previous work, such as Transportation System Plans, refinement plans, or other documents. Staff nominations for projects typically come from the Projects List of the Transportation System Plan or other analysis. Public requests often come from individual experiences with congestion, crashes, or other personal experience. In general, staff feels that the current process provides a good blend of technical information, community partnership, and flexibility. However, it is not always apparent where the priorities have come from or why decisions are made.

Issues of concern with the current CIP project comparison and selection process include:

- How to balance the program between Rural and Urban/Metro projects;
- How to balance Road Fund investments between the County Road system, State Highways, City streets, or other programs, such as County City Road Partnership;
- How to set funding targets for each program, such as Pedestrian/Bicycle, CaPP, and Community Development Fund;
- How to utilize unencumbered balances in individual programs;
- Whether to combine programs like assisted housing and community development, (as suggested by the City of Creswell in May);
- How to react if Federal Reauthorization payments are not continued, or are continued at substantially lower levels.

Additional Information and Comparisons

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) has developed many different approaches to priority setting. The most applicable ones appear to be processes, which match policies in planning documents, such as the Oregon Highway Plan, with project requests. As an example, the Metropolitan Planning Commission (MPC) used a policy-based priority process for the biennial State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). In short, the process relied on Oregon Highway

Plan (OHP) policies and the local Regional Transportation Plan -Transportation System Improvement (RTP-TSI) policies (See Attachment C). Eligibility was either a “yes or no”, and the policies were either supported (+) or strongly supported (++). The summation of “plusses” for OHP and RTP-TSI policies indicated relative support and prioritization for each project.

County Transportation System Plan (TSP) as a Project Comparison Tool

The newly adopted Lane County Transportation System Plan provides the overall planning framework for management of the County Road system, including capital improvements. It promotes the coordination of all transportation facilities within the County, including those managed by other jurisdictions and agencies. County road improvement projects are placed on the TSP 20-year project list based upon the needs assessment criteria established in the TSP, and this list has become the planning backbone or foundation for annual updates to the CIP, along with TSPs from cities in Lane County.

Another important part of the TSP is the specific Goals and Policies established by the Board for roads, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, public transportation, transportation and land use, and financing. As a starting point, staff has created a proposed matrix similar to the one for the State STIP, but using Goals and Policies approved in the County TSP (See Attachment D). The matrix is first formed by listing the specific goals and objectives that typically relate to project categories found in the CIP. Similar to the system employed in the State STIP, all parties involved in the CIP process could compare and contrast goal and policy level appropriateness for each individual project.

Another recommendation of staff is to create a one-page summary for each project in or nominated for the CIP. Existing databases and Geographical Information System (GIS) layers/platforms could be utilized to better show project specifics to the public, agencies and the Board. One of the challenges would be to provide this information for new project requests, especially those that come directly from the public, or are nominated late in the project comparison process.

Impacts of Federal Payments

As the Board is well aware, reauthorization of the timber receipt legislation will have a major impact on the County’s CIP program, as well as other aspects of the Road Fund budget. If reauthorization occurs at current funding levels, the County will likely be able to continue to improve its own system, both urban and rural, and to respond to requests from cities or ODOT for off-system investment. Making these inter-jurisdictional choices is difficult, and will certainly become more difficult if funding levels decline. In either case, Lane County will have to balance County Road needs with the needs on city and ODOT systems and the resulting community and economic benefits. Improved project information and ranking criteria would be helpful in explaining how these choices have been made.

C. Alternatives/Options

1. Direct staff to proceed with development of improved project information and ranking criteria for CIP projects and project requests. This development will rely on project summary sheets and policy level analysis of candidate projects, supplemented by basic technical data where it exists.
2. Direct staff to proceed with development of a quantitative point based system to prioritize requests.
3. Direct staff to continue the process without the changes outlined in 1 or 2. In essence, continue the existing CIP project ranking and selection process.
4. Other direction to staff.

D. Recommendations

Option 1 above.

IV. IMPLEMENTATION/FOLLOW-UP

By December 1, 2004, return for Board review and adoption of new summary sheets and policy level analysis templates.

V. ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A – 1996 Prioritization Formula
Attachment B – CaPP Criteria and Evaluation Matrix
Attachment C – Metro Area Matrix for STIP Project Evaluation
Attachment D - 2004 TSP Policy Matrix (draft)

Formula for Prioritizing CIP Projects



	pts	score
• Road Connection		
1. Functional Class (10 pts possible)		<input type="text"/>
Arterial or Rural Major Collector	10	
Urban Collector	7	
Rural Minor Collector	5	
Local	0	
• Road Usage		
2. ADT (10 pts possible)		<input type="text"/>
ADT > 5000	10	
2000 ≤ ADT ≤ 5000	5	
ADT < 2000	0	
3. Truck Volume (10 pts possible)		<input type="text"/>
> 10%	10	
5-10%	5	
< 5%	0	
• Road Condition		
4. Alignment Conditions (10 pts possible)		<input type="text"/>
some curves rated > 20 mph below design speed	6-10	
some curves rated 10 to 20 mph below design speed	3-5	
all curves within 10 mph below design speed	0-2	
5. Capacity Problems (10 pts possible)		<input type="text"/>
LOS ≤ D	10	
LOS = C	5	
LOS A or B	0	
6. Pavement Condition Rating (10 pts possible)		<input type="text"/>
≤ 20	10	
21-50	8	
51-70	5	
71-90	3	
91-100	0	
• Safety		
7. Accident Rate (15 pts possible)		<input type="text"/>
AR > 2 or Fatality	15	
1 ≤ AR ≤ 2	7.5	
AR < 1	0	
8. Roadway or Roadside Hazards (15 pts possible)		<input type="text"/>
Many	15	
Few	7.5	
None	0	
• Fiscal Impact		
9. Project Cost (10 pts possible)		<input type="text"/>
cost per vehicle mile < \$250	10	
\$250 ≤ cost per vehicle mile ≤ \$750	5	
cost per vehicle mile > \$750	0	
TOTAL (100 pts possible)		<input type="text"/>

How to use the CIP Prioritization Formula

1. The functional classification of a roadway is defined in the Lane County Master Road Plan.
2. The average daily traffic (ADT) is the most recent traffic volume counts available.
3. The truck volume identifies the percentage of truck traffic compared with the ADT. If no specific truck counts are available then LCPW staff will estimate the percentage of truck traffic.
4. Alignment problems are identified by examining the inventory of posted curve advisory speeds or known vertical curve sight distance limitations and comparing them with the identified design speed for the road segment.
5. The capacity analysis is done by calculating a future volume to capacity (v/c) ratio. A 20-year traffic volume (20-year ADT) is projected assuming a 2 percent increase in traffic per year with compounding. The 20-year ADT is assumed to be equal to 1.5 x current ADT. The peak hour volume is assumed to be 10 percent of the ADT. Using the peak hour volume of the 20-year ADT and dividing it by 2,800 passenger cars per hour (pcph) yields the v/c. The v/c is then compared with the level of service (LOS) criteria defined in Table 8-1 (LEVEL-OF-SERVICE CRITERIA FOR GENERAL TWO-LANE HIGHWAY SEGMENTS) of the Highway Capacity Manual as shown below.

LOS	PERCENT TIME DELAY	v/c RATIO ^a																				
		LEVEL TERRAIN						ROLLING TERRAIN						MOUNTAINOUS TERRAIN								
		AVG ^b SPEED	PERCENT NO PASSING ZONES						AVG ^b SPEED	PERCENT NO PASSING ZONES						AVG ^b SPEED	PERCENT NO PASSING ZONES					
			0	20	40	60	80	100		0	20	40	60	80	100		0	20	40	60	80	100
A	≤ 30	≥ 58	0.15	0.12	0.09	0.07	0.05	0.04	≥ 57	0.15	0.10	0.07	0.05	0.04	0.03	≥ 56	0.14	0.09	0.07	0.04	0.02	0.01
B	≤ 45	≥ 55	0.27	0.24	0.21	0.19	0.17	0.16	≥ 54	0.26	0.23	0.19	0.17	0.15	0.13	≥ 54	0.25	0.20	0.16	0.13	0.12	0.10
C	≤ 60	≥ 52	0.43	0.39	0.36	0.34	0.33	0.32	≥ 51	0.42	0.39	0.35	0.32	0.30	0.28	≥ 49	0.39	0.33	0.28	0.23	0.20	0.16
D	≤ 75	≥ 50	0.64	0.62	0.60	0.59	0.58	0.57	≥ 49	0.62	0.57	0.52	0.48	0.46	0.43	≥ 45	0.58	0.50	0.45	0.40	0.37	0.33
E	≤ 75	≥ 45	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	≥ 40	0.97	0.94	0.92	0.91	0.90	0.90	≥ 35	0.91	0.87	0.84	0.82	0.80	0.78
F	100	< 45	—	—	—	—	—	—	< 40	—	—	—	—	—	—	< 35	—	—	—	—	—	—

^a Ratio of flow rate to an ideal capacity of 2,800 pcph in both directions.

^b Average travel speed of all vehicles (in mph) for highways with design speed ≥ 60 mph; for highways with lower design speeds, reduce speed by 4 mph for each 10-mph reduction in design speed below 60 mph; assumes that speed is not restricted to lower values by regulation.

6. Pavement condition rating is a State standardized system to visually inspect the existing conditions of a pavement surface which then is compared with a developed index. This system does not rate gravel or dirt roads and is performed by LCPW Engineering staff on a biannual basis.
7. The accident rate per million vehicle miles (AR) is an average of the number of accidents that has occurred for each million vehicle miles traveled along the segment of roadway defined during the specified interval of time. The formula is as follows:

$$AR = \frac{(\text{\# of reported accidents within specified time period}) \times (10^6)}{(\text{current ADT}) \times (\text{roadway segment length}) \times (365) \times (\text{specified time period})}$$

NOTE: A 5-year accident history is assumed as an adequate account of the possible problems associated with the conditions of a roadway and its effect on users.

8. A roadside inventory of existing or potential hazards as defined in the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) 1994 Metric Highway Design Manual is the model used in this component. It is at the discretion of LCPW staff to determine the magnitude of existing or potential hazards in the roadside inventory for the segment of roadway studied.
9. The project cost per vehicle mile =
$$\frac{(\text{total project cost})}{(\text{current ADT}) \times (\text{project length})}$$

Criteria for Capital Project Partnership Program (CaPP)

I. REQUIRED CRITERIA: Projects must meet all of the following criteria to be considered for CaPP funding.

1. Proposed facility must be a public road as defined by ORS and Lane Code.
2. City, County and ODOT facilities are eligible.
3. Applicable road authorities give consent to proposal.
4. Projects proposed under this program should be under contract within program life. Jurisdiction proposing improvement must demonstrate a readiness to proceed.
5. Funding strategy should not displace ODOT or local funding.
6. Proposal provides means for acceptable level of accountability. Examples include:
 - a) County control of work, b) County contract, c) County payment based on contractor invoice or made directly to contractor.
7. County reserves the right of first refusal to perform engineering, contract administration and inspection.

II. EVALUATIVE CRITERIA: The following criteria will be used to evaluate and rank projects for CaPP funding.

1. Program funding priority will be given to Safety and Modernization projects.
2. Program funds available for projects on the Arterial/Collector system within the County. Preference given to urban arterial streets and rural major collector or arterial projects.
3. Improvement of connectivity and key transportation links in Lane County will be given preference.
4. Leveraging of other funding sources is an important consideration to show jurisdictional partnership.
- 14, m, L 5. Provides positive economic benefit to community.
- NR 6. Consideration given to culvert replacements for fish passage and drainage management.
- H, M, L 7. Visibility:
 - a) Project is high-profile in the community, and b) Project enhances positive County image in the community.
- H, M, L 8. Supports alternative modes of transportation.

SORTED BY AGENCY

Applicant	Project Name	Requested Amount	Traffic (Year)	Required Criteria		Priority for Safety/Mod	Functional Classification	Evaluative Criteria			Support
				Public Road (Y/N)	Jurisdiction/ Rd Authority	Readiness (Y/N)	Displace other funding? (Y/N)	Connectivity	Leverage other funds	Positive econ benefit	High Profile alt modes
Cottage Grove	Hwy 99 at Harrison	\$ 195,000	8,000(2003)	Y	ODOT/CG	Y 2003	N	H,M,L	(%CaPP)H,M,L	H,M,L	H,M,L
Eugene	Oak St, 5th to Willamette	\$ 325,000	2,000(2002)	Y	Eugene	Y 2002	N	M	(53%)H	L	M
Eugene	Broadway	\$ 1,600,000	4,500(2002)	Y	Eugene	Y 2002	N	H	(10%)H	M	H
Eugene	Chad Drive (Old Coburg Road)	\$ 419,000	1,000 (2004)	Y	Lane County	Y 2004	N?	M	(61%)H	H?	M
Florence	2nd St Extension	\$ 275,000	?	Y?	Florence	Y 2003	N	H	(59%)H	M or H??	M
Florence	Laurel Street	\$ 132,000	?	N?	Florence	Y 2003	N	H or M	(67%)M	M	M
Junction City	Hwy 99, 3rd St to Flat Creek	\$ 1,000,000	16,000 (1997)	Y	ODOT	Y 2003	N	L	(72%)M	M	L
Lane County	Jasper Rd Extension (Overpass)	\$ 6,670,000	8,200(2005) 2015	Y	LC/ODOT	?	N	H	(22%)H	M	M
Lane County	Hwy 99 at Lingo Lane	\$ 405,000	9,500 (2000)	Y	ODOT/LC	Y	N	H	(100%)L	M	L
Oakridge	Hwy 58 @ Industrial Pkway	\$ 240,000	2,906(2000)	Y	ODOT/Oak	?	N	L	(93%)L	L	L
ODOT	Spfd/Creswell Hwy @ I-5	\$ 300,000	9,158 (2002)	Y	ODOT	Y Ex r/w	?	L	(74%)M	H?	L
ODOT	Hwy 58 @ Mill Road	\$ 352,780	7,100 (?)	Y	ODOT/LC	?	N	H	(36%)H	L	H
ODOT	Hwy 126 East @ Thurston Rd	\$ 200,000	10,000	Y	ODOT/LC	Y 2003	N	L	(88%)L	L	L
Springfield	42nd Street	\$ 3,300,000	15,000 (2000)	Y	Spfd/ODOT	Y 2002	N	L	(80%)L	L	L
Springfield	Pioneer Parkway Extension	\$ 3,300,000	32,000 (2020)	Y	Spfd	Y 2003?	N	M	(83%)L	M or H??	M
Veneta	Hwy 126 West Frontage Road	\$ 558,400	2,000 (2020)	Y	Veneta	Y 2002?	N	H	(36,56,75%?)	H	L or M?
								M	(94, 100%) L	M	M

C-STIP PRIORITIZATION FACTOR ANALYSIS DETAIL FOR OHP RTP-TSI POLICIES

Project		Limits	Description	OHP Policies																RTP TSI Policies												
				1A	1B	1C	1D	1F	1G	2A	2B	2C	2E	2F	2G	3A	3B	3C	4A	4B	4C	4D	4E	5A	OHP #	TSI- SW	TSI- R	TSI- T	TSI- B	TSI- P	TSI- GM	TSI- OM
I-5/Beltline		I-5 to Gateway/Beltline	Environmental Assessment Phase 1 Reconstruction and Right-of-Way Purchase for EA Phases 1 & 2	+	+	+		++	+							+	+	+	+	+				13	++	++	+	+	+			8
WEP Unit 1-B		Garfield to Seneca	New 4-lane arterial	+	+	+		++	+							+	+	+	+					12	++	++	+	+	+	+		8
WEP Units 2-A & 2-B		W. 11th to Beltline	New 4-lane arterial	+	+	+		++	+							+	+	+	+					11	++	++	+	++	+	+		9
Beltline Highway, Stage 3		Roosevelt to W. 11th	Widen to 4 lanes, etc.	+	+			++	+							+		+	+					9	+	++	+	+	+	+		7
Beltline-Coburg Interchange		Beltline Highway at Coburg Road	Improve interchange to provide adequate storage	+	+			++	+							+		+	+					10	++	++	+			+		6
Franklin Blvd.		Jenkins Dr. to Mill Street	Urban standards improvements	+	+			+	+							+	+	+	+					9	+	+	+	++	+	+		7
6th-7th Avenues		Garfield to Washington	Intersection improvements for traffic capacity and operations	+	+	+		++	+							+		+						9	++	++	+			+		6
N. 42nd Street		Marcola Road to Weyerhaeuser RR tracks	Upgrade to urban standards		+					+						+		+	+					7	++	+	+	++	+			7
Highway 99 North		Garfield to Roosevelt	Urban standards improvements	+	+				+							+	+	+	+					8	+	+	+	+	+	+		6
Interstate 105		Washington Jefferson Bridge	Add SB lane from 1st to 6th	+	+	+		++	+									+						8	+	++	+			+		5
Interstate 105		Washington Jefferson Bridge	Add NB lane from 6th to Delta Hwy.	+	+	+		++	+									+						8	+	++	+			+		5
Jasper Road		42nd to JR Extension	Upgrade to urban standards		+					+									+					5	+	+	+	+	+			5
McVay Highway		I-5 to Franklin	Upgrade to urban standards		+					+						+								5	+	+	+	++	+			6
W. 11th Ave. (126)		Green Hill Rd. to Terry St.	Widen to 4 lanes	+	+	+		++	+							+	+	+	+					11	+	++	+	+	+	+		7

This sheet shows in detail which OHP Policies and RTP-TSI Policies each project supports.

A + sign indicates support for the policy. A ++ sign indicates strong support for that policy.

Projects with 9 to 12 plus marks for OHP policies receive a ++ mark on the overall ranking sheet.

Projects with 5 to 8 plus marks for OHP policies receive a + mark on the overall ranking sheet.

Projects with 7 to 9 plus marks for RTP-TSI policies receive a ++ mark on the overall ranking sheet.

Projects with 5 or 6 plus marks for RTP-TSI policies receive a + mark on the overall ranking sheet.

POTENTIAL C-STIP PROJECTS

COST RANGE	PROJECT	LIMITS	DESCRIPTION	MAP KEY #	C-STIP PRIORITIZATION FACTORS				ADDITIONAL CENTRAL LANE MPO PRIORITIZATION FACTORS					DRAFT CENTRAL LANE MPO STAFF PRIORITY FOR FY08-09 C-STIP HIGHWAY MODERNIZATION FUNDING
					Readiness: Project is achievable by FY08-09	Supports OHP Policies	Leverages other funds and projects	Environmental Milestones Already Complete	Supports Central Lane MPO RTP Land Use Policies	Supports Central Lane MPO RTP Transportation Demand Management Policies	Supports Central Lane MPO RTP Transportation System Improvement Policies	Supports Central Lane MPO RTP Finance Policies.	Total Number of Plus Marks	
OVER \$20 MILLION	I-5/Beltline	I-5 to Gateway/Beltline	Environmental Assessment Phase 1 Reconstruction and Right-of-Way Purchase for EA Phases 1 & 2	C13	++	++	+	+			++	+	9	(Large project—consider for OTIA funding)
	WEP Unit 1-B	Garfield to Seneca	New 4-lane arterial	C3	++	++		+			++	+	8	(Large project—consider for OTIA funding)
	WEP Units 2-A & 2-B	W. 11th to Beltline	New 4-lane arterial	C4	++	++	+	+			++	+	9	(Large project—consider for OTIA funding)
\$10 MILLION to \$20 MILLION	Beltline Highway, Stage 3	Roosevelt to W. 11th	Widen to 4 lanes.	C5	+	++	+	++			++	+	9	(Large project—consider for OTIA funding)
	Franklin Blvd.	Jenkins Dr. to Mill Street	Urban standards improvements and intersection improvements.	C7	+	++	+		+		++	+	8	(Large project—consider for OTIA funding)
UNDER \$10 MILLION	8th & 7th Avenue Intersections	Garfield to Washington	Intersection improvements for traffic capacity and operations	C1	++	++			+		+	+	7	HIGH
	W. 11th Ave. (128)	Green Hill Rd. to Terry St.	Widen to 4 lanes	C12	+	++	+		+		++	+	8	HIGH
	Beltline-Coburg Interchange	Beltline Highway at Coburg Road	Improve interchange to provide adequate storage	C14	++	++			+		+	+	7	HIGH
	N. 42nd Street	Marcola Road to Weyerhaeuser RR tracks (City Street)	Upgrade to urban standards	C6	++	+	+		+		++		7	HIGH (Consider for OTIA funding)
	Highway 99 North	Garfield to Roosevelt	Urban standards improvements	C8	+	+	+		+		+		5	LOW
	Interstate 105	Washington Jefferson Bridge, southbound	Add lane to 8th Avenue off-ramp	C9	+	+			+		+	+	5	LOW
	Interstate 105	Washington Jefferson Bridge	Add NB lane from 8th to Delta Hwy.	C10	+	+			+		+	+	5	LOW
	Jasper Road	42nd to JR Extension	Upgrade to urban standards	C11	+	+	+		+		+		5	LOW
	McVay Highway	I-5 to Franklin	Upgrade to urban standards	C2	+	+	+		+		+		5	LOW

POTENTIAL D-STIP PROJECTS

PROJECT NAME	LIMITS	CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DESCRIPTION	DEVELOPMENT PROJECT DESCRIPTION	ESTIMATED DEVELOPMENT PROJECT COST	COMMENTS	MAP KEY #	D-STIP ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA			D-STIP PRIORITIZATION FACTORS						DRAFT CENTRAL LANE MPO STAFF PRIORITY FOR FY06-09 D-STIP FUNDING
							Supports OTC definition of D-STIP	Addressee need in TSP or statewide or federal project	Funding adequate to complete the identified milestone	Level of work is appropriate to achieve developmental milestone	Supports OHP Policies	One or more development milestones already completed	Funding identified for construction	Leverages other funds and public benefits	Total Number of Plus Marks	
Bellevue Highway	River Road to Coburg Road	Widen to 6 lanes	Facility Plan Study	\$2,000,000			Y	Y	Y	++	+			+	4	HIGH
Interstate 5 Interchange Study	Willamette River to 30th Avenue	Facility Plan Study to determine needed improvements	Refinement Plan Completion	\$750,000			Y	Y	Y	++	+			+	4	HIGH
Interstate 5	At Coburg Interchange	Reconstruct Interchange	Environmental Assessment	\$300,000			Y	Y	Y	+	+	++			4	HIGH
Eugene-Springfield Highway (126)	at Q Street/Pioneer Parkway	Interchange Improvements	Environmental Assessment	\$500,000			Y	Y	Y	+	+			+	3	MEDIUM
Eugene-Springfield Highway (126)	at Main Street	New Interchange to replace at-grade signalized intersection	Environmental Assessment	\$500,000			Y	Y	Y	+	+			+	3	MEDIUM
Franklin Blvd.	Jenkins Dr. to Mill Street	Urban standards improvements	Environmental Assessment	\$200,000			Y	Y	Y	+	+			+	3	MEDIUM
Interstate 5	at Franklin Blvd. and Glenwood Interchange	Construct new interchange	Environmental Impact Statement	\$2,250,000			Y	Y	Y	+	+			+	3	MEDIUM
Eugene-Springfield Highway (126)	at 52nd Street	New Interchange to replace at-grade signalized intersection	Environmental Assessment	\$500,000			Y	Y	Y	+	+			+	3	MEDIUM
Eugene-Springfield Highway (126)	I-5 to Mohawk	Widen to 6 lanes	Environmental Assessment	TBD			Y	Y	TBD		+				1	LOW
Interstate 5	at 30th/McVay Highway	Reconstruct Interchange	Development Work Reflected by I-5 Interchange Study Shown Above	NA			NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		
Bellevue Highway	River Road to Delta	Widen to 6 lanes	Development Work Reflected by Beltline Study Shown Above	NA			NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		
Interstate 5	I-105 to Highway 58	Widen to 6 lanes	Further Development Work Not Needed at this Time	NA			NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		
Interstate 105	Delta Highway to Coburg Road	Widen to 6 lanes	Further Development Work Not Needed at this Time	NA			NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		
Interstate 105	Coburg Road to Interstate 5	Widen to 6 lanes	Further Development Work Not Needed at this Time	NA			NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		

