

W. N. C.

# SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

**DATE:** May 3, 2006

**TO:** Lane County Board of Commissioners

**DEPARTMENT:** Public Works Department

**PRESENTED BY:** Tom Stinchfield, Transportation Planning Engineer

**TITLE:** PUBLIC HEARING AND ORDER/In the Matter of Adopting a Priority List for *ConnectOregon* Projects in Lane County

These are supplemental materials for the May 3, 2006 public hearing on the *ConnectOregon* priorities in Lane County. Included in this packet are:

- Order with Exhibit A to the Order with priority lists for Region and Statewide Priorities
- Lane County Project Rankings (Using the suggested MWACT method)
- March 27, 2006 letter from ODOT Director with guidelines and suggestions for rankings
- Bucket Screening Matrix for Lane County projects
- Draft Region 2 Evaluation Matrix for all Region 2 projects providing information from the applications
- 

## Discussion

The attached materials evaluate and rank the seven applications in Lane County for the *ConnectOregon*. As stated in the agenda cover memo, these rankings are difficult and the projects remain closely bunched. This discussion is intended to assist the Board in making a decision on rankings in preparation for the All-Area meeting on May 16, 2006 in Salem where a consensus Region 2 proposal is desired. The first step in the process was to screen the projects into "Buckets". As stated in the agenda cover memo, all of the Lane County projects have been placed in "Bucket 1". Thus, only one list based on the buckets is required.

The process guidance allows each reviewing group to select a method for evaluating projects against the criteria established in the *ConnectOregon* legislation (SB 71). Early in the process, ODOT Region staff sent out a method developed by the MWACT as a suggestion for possible use. We have elected to use this method, rather than invent another one. It is clear that both this method and the one used by LCOG to rank metro area projects are mathematical, but not really precise. Judgment has to be applied to any of these methods. In addition, the process requests comments on both region and statewide lists. The raw rankings are:

- |  |           |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Eugene Air Cargo Project                            | 28 points |
| 2. Port of Siuslaw Maple St Landing and Transient Dock | 28 points |
| 3. Central Oregon and Pacific Railroad                 | 27 points |
| 4. LTD Pioneer Parkway EmX                             | 24 points |
| 5. Union Pacific Railroad                              | 24 points |
| 6. Creswell Airport                                    | 23 points |
| 7. Eugene Depot  | 23 points |

## Phasing

Region 2 staff has requested ideas on phasing of projects due to the limited amount of funds available in relation to the requests. Lane County staff has requested comments from applicants on the phasing issue. The following responses have been received to date. We expect that some of the applicants may address this issue at the public hearing.

**Port of Siuslaw:** The Port Manager has indicated that the project was split into two phases prior to the application. In addition, the Port has overmatched the grant portion of the project and made part of the request a loan. No further phasing or reduction in scope is possible.

**Union Pacific Railroad:** A representative of the UP indicated that their proposal had also been scaled back from approximately \$12 million to the current proposal of \$7,080,000 and cannot be further reduced in scope.

**Central Oregon and Pacific Railroad:** A CORP representative indicated that their track improvements could be phased if necessary. However, the benefits of the higher weight capacity track (increasing from the 267,000 lb standard to the 286,000 lb standard) will not be realized until an entire network of track is upgraded to the heavier standard.

## Region versus Statewide List

In county staff's opinion, the following projects may be competitive for statewide funding. It is important to note that the statewide competition will be intense, but Region 2 has requested the assemblage of a Region 2 statewide list in order to assert the importance of our Region 2 projects.

- **Union Pacific Railroad.** The importance of these improvements to the UP Mainline for both freight movement and Amtrak movement statewide and beyond argues for statewide consideration.
- **Eugene Air Cargo Project.** As the second largest airport in the state, and an air cargo hub at the southern end of the Willamette Valley, this project may be able to compete for statewide funds.
- **Central Oregon and Pacific Railroad.** The improvements on this short line railroad in both Region 2 and Region 3 are primarily focused on regional rail access. However, they connect to the UP system in Eugene and have benefits in delivering products, particularly forest products, to California and beyond.

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

ORDER NO.                                    ) In the Matter of Adopting a Priority List for  
  ) *ConnectOregon* Projects in Lane County

**WHEREAS**, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) has created an application process for the *ConnectOregon* program, a \$100 million program to invest in air, rail, marine, and transit infrastructure to ensure Oregon's transportation system is strong, diverse, and efficient; and

**WHEREAS**, the Lane County Board of Commissioners held a work session on October 19, 2005 to discuss *ConnectOregon*; and

**WHEREAS**, ODOT has requested the Board submit a priority list for projects in Lane County and participate in a Region 2 All-Area priority setting process; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board held a public hearing on May 3, 2006 to gather public testimony on the project applications in Lane County; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board wishes to adopt a list of priority projects as shown on Exhibit A attached to this order; now, therefore, it is hereby

**ORDERED** that the list of project priorities shown on Exhibit A be forwarded to the Region 2 Planning and Development Manager.

Dated this \_\_\_\_\_ day of May, 2006

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bill Dwyer, Chair

Lane County Board of Commissioners

APPROVED AS TO FORM

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
OFFICE OF LEGAL COUNSEL

## Exhibit A

### ConnectOregon Applications In Lane County

#### Priority List for Region 2 Allocation

(in priority order)

App #	Project Name	Request	Comment
1. 044-06	Eugene Air Cargo	\$4,103,461	grant
2. 048-06	Port of Siuslaw Dock	\$258,000 \$86,000	grant loan
3. 014-06	CORP Mainline	\$1,477,492	Reg 2 grant, phasable
4. 045-06	LTD EmX	\$5,400,000	grant
5. 065-06	Union Pacific Eugene	\$5,664,000	grant
6. 034-06	Creswell Airport	\$612,800	grant
7. 031-06	Eugene Depot	\$400,000	grant

#### Priority List for Statewide Allocation

(in priority order)

App #	Project Name	Request	Comment
1. 065-06	Union Pacific Eugene	\$5,664,000	grant
2. 044-06	Eugene Air Cargo	\$4,103,461	grant
3. 014-06	CORP Mainline	\$1,477,492	Reg 2 grant, phasable

### Lane County Project Rankings - All Projects and "Bucket" #1

**Connect Oregon  
Area 5 Project Rating**

	CONSIDERATIONS (from OAR 731-035-0060)	Central Oregon and Pacific Railroad	Creswell Airport	Eugene Air Cargo Project	Eugene Depot	LTD Pioneer Parkway EmX	Port of Siuslaw	Union Pacific Railroad
1	Proposed transportation project reduces transportation costs for Oregon businesses	4	2	4	2	2	2	4
2	Proposed transportation project benefits or connects two or more modes of transportation	2	4	4	4	2	4	2
3	Proposed transportation project is a critical link in a statewide or regional transportation system that will measurably improve utilization and efficiency of the system	4	4	5	4	5	5	4
4	How much of the cost of a proposed transportation project can be borne by the applicant for the grant or loan	4	4	4	4	4	4	2
5	Proposed transportation project creates construction and permanent jobs in this state	4	2	4	2	2	4	3
6	Proposed transportation project is ready for construction, or if the project does not involve construction it is at a comparable stage	5	3	3	1	3	3	5
7	Project leverages other investment and public benefits from the state, other government units, or private business	3	3	3	5	5	5	3
8	Applicant for grant or loan can meet the requirement to contribute 20 percent of the eligible project costs	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
<b>SCORE</b>		<b>27</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>24</b>

1	General = 2 Specific = 4
2	Benefits = 2 Connects = 4
3	Utilization = 4 Efficiency = 2 Identified in "Public Agency Plan" or "Meet Standards" = 5
4	Regional 20 % match = 2 Over 20 % = 4
5	Creates Construction Jobs = 1 <b>Plus one:</b> Strong link to permanent jobs = 3 Weak or not substantiated link to permanent jobs = 2 "Trolling" for jobs = 1
6	Less than 6 months = 5 Less than 1 year = 3 More than a year = 1
7	Completes Federal Earmark = 5 Builds on/makes use of Previous Investments = 3
8	20 % = 1

March 27, 2006

Lylla Gaebel, Clatsop County Commissioner  
Northwest Oregon ACT  
PO Box 1058  
Warrenton, Oregon 97146

Richard Bjelland, Woodburn City Council  
Mid-Willamette Valley ACT  
OHCS  
725 Summer Street NE, Suite B  
Salem, Oregon 97301-4246

Roger Nyquist, Linn County Commissioner  
Cascades West ACT  
300 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW  
Albany, Oregon 97321

Commissioner Bill Dwyer, Chair  
Bobby Green, Commissioner  
Anna Morrison, Commissioner  
Lane County Board of Commissioners  
Lane County Public Service Building  
125 East 8th Avenue  
Eugene, Oregon 97401

Dear ACT Chairs and Lane County Board of Commissioners:

On behalf of the Oregon Transportation Commission, I would like to request that the Region 2 "SuperACT" committee review and prioritize *ConnectOregon* Region 2 project applications. Your leadership and expertise will make an invaluable contribution to the success of the program and the future of multimodal transportation funding in the state. Thank you in advance for all of your work.

ODOT Region 2 staff (Jane Lee) has been sent electronically all the Region 2 12-page applications, plus completeness and technical evaluation reports for *ConnectOregon* review and ranking. A hard copy of all Region 2 applications is also in the hands of the region staff. These hard copies contain additional materials beyond the 12-page electronic version, including maps, letters of support and other details. Region 2 staff will coordinate with each of you to ensure that your respective committees have the documents you want for review.

ACT Chairs  
March 27, 2006  
Page 2 of 2

In addition, Freight Mobility Section staff will soon be sending you several other documents via e-mail to assist in your committee's review and evaluation process. These documents include:

- #1 General Guidelines*
- #2 Project Evaluation Matrices (Excel Spreadsheets)*
- #3 Post-Technical Review Applications Log (PDF)*
- #4 Timeline Chart*

We look forward to working with you in this exciting process.

Sincerely,

Matthew L. Garrett  
Director

cc: Jane Lee, ODOT Lane County Area Manager  
Julie F. Rodwell, ODOT Freight Mobility Section Manager

# **Guidelines and Suggestions for Review of *ConnectOregon* Projects**

This document has several sections, as follows:

1. Timeline for Review
2. Conflict of Interest Disclosure
3. Project Evaluation
  - 3.1. Requirements of SB 71
  - 3.2. Obtaining Additional Data
  - 3.3. Dividing a Project into Several Parts
  - 3.4. Qualitative Evaluation and Groupings
  - 3.5. Evaluation Matrix and Ranking
    - 3.5.1. Criteria for each Consideration
      - 3.5.1.1 First Consideration -- Reduce Transportation Costs
      - 3.5.1.2 Second Consideration -- Benefit/Connect Two or More Modes
      - 3.5.1.3 Third Consideration -- Improve Utilization & Efficiency of Transportation System
      - 3.5.1.4 Fourth Consideration -- Applicant Match Percentage
      - 3.5.1.5 Fifth Consideration -- Jobs Creation (Construction & Permanent)
      - 3.5.1.6 Sixth Consideration -- Construction Readiness
      - 3.5.1.7 Possible Additional Considerations
    - 3.5.2. Weighting and Ranking Example
  - 3.6. Other Evaluation Issues
4. *ConnectOregon* Website and List Serve Messages
5. Consensus Committee
6. Questions.

## **1. *Timeline for Review***

In order for the process to stay on schedule, Review Committees must complete their work and submit it back to the *ConnectOregon* staff (ODOT's Freight Mobility Section) no later than ***Friday, May 19 at noon***. Reviews are preferred electronically, but fax and mail are acceptable. Contact information is at the end of this document.

## **2. *Conflict of Interest Disclosure***

In response to questions from several members regarding potential conflicts of interest, we issued the following guidance from ODOT's Assistant Attorney General.

It is essential that the *ConnectOregon* program and process maintain credibility and trust with the Legislature, stakeholders, and public, so we want to avoid even the appearance of a conflict with those who participate in the project selection process. At the same time, the future of multi-modal transportation in Oregon needs expert advice that can only be found in specific industries and stakeholders, and Senate Bill 71 (SB 71) specified business advisory groups to make recommendations to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC). The challenge is to avoid conflict while engaging essential expertise and experience.

To accomplish this goal, we believe that potential conflict and the appearance of conflict



can be resolved through full and repeated disclosure by persons involved in the project selection process who are associated with project applications.

All members of the Region Review Committees and Modal Advisory Committees will be asked to announce at each meeting whether they or their organization is an applicant or associated with an application. Those representatives will be asked to refrain from voting on or recommending their own projects, but they will be able to otherwise participate in the evaluation and recommendation process. In order to keep our process open and transparent, this disclosure requirement will apply to both public and private sector members. Such disclosure should also be identified and included in any written recommendations of Committees. It is also important to keep in mind that the ultimate decision maker on selecting projects will be the Oregon Transportation Commission.

### **3. Project Evaluation**

#### **3.1. Requirements of SB 71**

*ConnectOregon* applicants were instructed that, when recommending and selecting projects, the following will be considered as specified in SB 71:

- Whether the project reduces transportation costs for Oregon businesses;
- Whether it benefits or connects two or more modes;
- Whether it is a critical link in a statewide or regional transportation system;
- How much of the cost can be borne by applicants;
- Whether the project creates construction and permanent jobs in the state; and
- Whether the project is ready for construction.

The first three of these considerations are strategic considerations; the applicant's description of how the project responds to each is critically important in making the case that this is a strategic project which truly "Connects Oregon." The first three considerations are thus of primary importance.

The application seeks information on each of these considerations. Applicants were instructed to provide as much quantitative, technical information about their projects as possible to assist you, the reviewer, in forming your recommendations. For example, findings of market studies, activity forecasts, cost-benefit studies, feasibility studies and other supporting work were to be summarized and included with appropriate citation.

Because the projects are potentially diverse, no single set of data sources could be specified. It was up to each applicant to be as precise and well-documented as possible in showing how the application responds to any of the six *ConnectOregon* considerations. Not all considerations may be applicable to each project; evaluate those that apply. The application also provided an opportunity for applicants to describe other merits of their project that go beyond these six considerations.

#### **3.1. Obtaining Additional Data**

Should any Review Committee determine that additional written data is necessary concerning any application or project, they may request *ConnectOregon* staff to solicit

this from applicants, and such solicitations may ONLY be made by *ConnectOregon* staff. Requests from Review Committees for such information must be submitted as soon as possible, but no later than noontime, **Friday March 31**. Staff will forward such requests to applicants, and applicants must respond within one business day i.e. close of business **Monday April 3**. Applicants will also have the opportunity to directly submit any clarifications to the posted consultant feasibility reviews, also by April 3. Staff will publish an Addendum containing any new information by **Friday April 7** and notify the Review Committees. Review Committees may, at their discretion, invite presentations from applicants on an equitable basis, i.e. inviting every applicant under that committee's purview, as long as these presentations are not more than 15 minutes in duration including questions and answers.

### **3.2. Dividing a Project into Several Parts**

Although applicants were encouraged to separate their various projects into separate applications, not all approached it this way. As review work proceeds, if an application lends itself to being divided (with the component sub-projects still successfully addressing the *ConnectOregon* considerations), your Review Committee may decide to split certain applications into two or more separate parts with separate merits. In doing this, please number them with the same tracking number (001-06 etc) and a suffix a, b, c, etc. so that they can be tracked (for example: 001a-06).

### **3.3. Qualitative Evaluation and Groupings**

As you review the applications, the OTC asks that you evaluate project applications by assigning them to one of four groups:

- 1) Projects that have demonstrated that they meet all six considerations;
- 2) Projects that have demonstrated that they meet all three strategic considerations;
- 3) Projects that achieve one or more of the strategic considerations, but not all of them or
- 4) Projects that cannot demonstrate any of the strategic or region-wide considerations.

The Commission encourages the Modal and Regional Review Committees to prioritize projects within those four categories based on their modal and regional expertise.

Assignment of each project to one of the above four groups may be accomplished in several ways. Your Committee is at liberty to develop its own method. What follows are suggestions only.

Rating of projects may be achieved through qualitative evaluation, discussion and consensus, perhaps rating projects High, Medium or Low performers under each consideration without use of mathematical weighting of evaluation criteria, and without formal scoring of each application.

### **3.4. Evaluation Matrix and Ranking**

Some Review Committees, however, have expressed a desire to score and rank the projects under their purview, i.e., using a more mathematical approach. For those wishing to take this approach, it is requested that they rank all projects in order of preference, by Region or Statewide fund. The Regional funds are \$15m per region and the statewide funds are \$25m.

#### **3.4.1. Criteria for each Consideration**

The six considerations in SB 71 lend themselves to the following types of measures or criteria. (The material that follows is taken from the application instructions.)

##### **3.4.1.1. First Consideration -- Reduce Transportation Costs**

How does the project reduce transportation costs for Oregon business (es)? Note the specific industry or actual Oregon businesses that will receive benefit. How are those savings achieved? For example, how many businesses are affected and in what ways? Will the reduced costs result in time savings to one or more businesses -- in lower costs to customers, in added service levels, in greater profits or income to businesses? Will the investment improve business competitiveness against other Oregon firms, or against businesses in other states? Are the beneficiaries located in Oregon or beyond? Does the project remove a critical bottleneck or constraint that affects the transportation costs to Oregon businesses? Who will benefit, and why? Are the costs direct, affecting the applicant, or indirect, affecting the public at large? How does the applicant quantify the improvements -- time savings, business expansion, better service to customers, safety improvements, other? Cost reduction does not necessarily mean rate reduction to the end consumer; it could mean lower costs that help a company or organization in other ways.

##### **3.4.1.2. Second Consideration -- Benefit/Connect Two or More Modes**

Does the project connect two or more transportation modes? What modes are connected by the project and what are the benefits of the added connectivity? Does the project include a connection to a non-funded mode (e.g. highway)? If so, this ineligible portion of the project must be distinguished from the eligible portion, i.e. connections to modes qualified for *ConnectOregon* funding (air, marine, rail, and public transit).

How does the applicant propose to quantify the improved connectivity -- reducing congestion (where? how much?), handling increased tonnage by alternative modes (how many tons? what commodities?), time savings (how much and to whom?), business expansion (how much and to whom?), better service to customers (measured by what considerations?), better transit services (resulting in what new ridership?), safety improvements and accident reductions (by what amount?); other?

##### **3.4.1.3. Third Consideration -- Improve Utilization & Efficiency of Transportation System**

Does the project provide a critical link in a statewide or regional transportation system? Are key elements in the system and their connectivity with the project involved? Will the project measurably improve use and efficiency of the system? This consideration

differentiates from the modal connectivity consideration above because it addresses the larger significance of the proposed connection, seeking to determine if it has regional, multi-regional or even statewide significance. Does the applicant demonstrate this? What critical bottleneck or constraint will the project remove? Who will be benefited, how and why?

How does the applicant quantify the improvements – reducing congestion (where? how much?), handling increased tonnage by alternative modes (how many tons? what commodities?), time savings (how much and to whom?), business expansion (how much and to whom?), better service to customers (measured by what considerations?), better transit services (resulting in what new ridership?), safety improvements and accident reductions (by what amount?); other?

#### **3.4.1.4. Fourth Consideration -- Applicant Match Percentage**

Did the applicant exceed the program's minimum requirements of 20% match for grants and 0% down payment for loans? If so, by what amount or percentage? The example evaluation matrix offered in this mailing gives a maximum of ten (10) points to this consideration. Using this matrix, the eight loan applicants could be awarded the full 10 points (rather than penalized) since there is no match requirement for loans. A possible method of awarding the points is to give one (1) point for projects with 20% match, and 10 points for the project with the highest % "overmatch" which happens to be 370% [when a 20% match is rated as 0% overmatch, a 40% match is rated at 100% overmatch, and so on] and then award points to the other applications by interpolation.

#### **3.4.1.5. Fifth Consideration --Jobs Creation (Construction & Permanent)**

What is the job creation impact of the *ConnectOregon* investment? Evaluate the description and supporting data, which should include the number and nature of the jobs created in Oregon in each category below that is applicable to this project:

1. *Construction jobs*: Are the construction jobs covered by BOLI or Davis Bacon? How will the anticipated wages compare to the average 2004 County wage? What is the duration of the construction jobs? Which jobs, if any, will be filled by Oregon residents or will the contractor bring in out-of-state crews?
2. *Other Direct jobs* not including construction (new hiring or layoffs that do not occur as a specific result of the *ConnectOregon* project): The number and type of jobs to be created or retained. Is a new job being created or is it a retained job? Jobs that are being relocated from one part of the state to the other are not considered in the ranking process, only jobs that are a net gain for the state.
3. *Indirect jobs*: Does the project create *indirect* jobs in supplier companies due to increased activity from the project?
4. *Induced jobs*: Does the project create *induced* jobs in the general economy resulting from increased spending both by the grant recipient and by its suppliers? If the project is expected to create *indirect* and *induced* jobs, the application must carefully and accurately distinguish these benefits within the overall job creation retention impact of the project.

#### **3.4.1.6. Sixth Consideration-- Construction Readiness**

The project construction start date is the date on which the applicant expects to break ground. If the project does not involve construction, evaluate the date when the first major outlay of funds will occur.

Evaluate whether preliminary or final design of the project is yet to begin, underway, or completed. Are any land use actions – such as zoning changes, comprehensive plan goal exceptions or amendments, or land use permits – needed? If yes, have the necessary approvals been obtained, or is work to obtain the approvals underway? Are any land use actions needed? Are environmental approvals or other related work needed? If yes, have the approvals been obtained, or is work to obtain approvals underway? Examples of environmental work or approvals that may be needed include: Environmental Assessments, Environmental Impact Statements, Air Quality Determinations or environmental permits. Has the applicant checked with the relevant state or federal agency to identify any environmental approvals that may be needed?

In view of the above considerations and any other relevant considerations, did the applicant provide a credible estimated project timeline and description of where the project is on this timeline?

#### **3.4.1.7. Possible Additional Considerations**

Did the applicant describe any other considerations or information they would like the evaluators to know? Did they provide qualitative or quantitative documentation of other factors or considerations? Among such considerations are those benefits that uniquely relate to public transit projects, for example, projects that:

- Increase mobility;
- Mitigate congestion (freeing up highway capacity for trucks);
- Improve air quality;
- Increase economic vitality;
- Increase property values;
- Conserve energy; and
- Improve sustainability.

#### **3.4.2. Weighting and Ranking Example**

Included is a project-by-project evaluation matrix using the six considerations of SB 71 and the four groups described above that will be used by the Oregon Freight Advisory Committee. This approach is similar to what committees have done in the past when helping ODOT with OTIA and other highway project prioritization.

Therefore, if your Committee finds these useful in evaluating the project applications, please use them. You might use the evaluation matrix to put qualitative comments in each cell, or you might choose to put numerical scores, based on your own weightings, in the cells. These materials are attached (Attachment #2). This example ranks the projects by region and start date, so that the “Construction Ready” consideration is easily addressed.

Review Committees may want to also include other considerations, for example Oregon Economic and Community Development Department's "shovel ready" site certification. We also can provide a GIS map of the *ConnectOregon* application sites that has been overlaid with the certified sites.

### **3.6 Other Evaluation Issues**

Each Regional Committee should report back regarding what composes their project list recommendation for the \$15m per region. In addition, Regional Committees may want to prioritize how they would allocate the \$25m in statewide funds also. There may be some projects with multi-regional or statewide benefit that should receive high priority, and this should be indicated.

Each Modal Committee should report back regarding what composes their project list recommendation for the \$100m statewide. It will be helpful if the Committees build this ranking by region, since the ultimate OTC decision will be made by region. As with the regional reviews, there may be some projects with multi-regional or statewide benefit that should receive high priority, and this should be indicated.

## **4. ConnectOregon Website and List Serve Messages**

All applications will be posted to the ODOT *ConnectOregon* web site, so that in your review process, if you decide you'd like to see additional applications, they can be downloaded from the web. Contact ODOT Freight Mobility Section manager Julie Rodwell at 503-986-3525 for additional materials that accompany each application.

To stay abreast of general information about the program, please ask to add your e-mail address to the *ConnectOregon* list serve by contacting [ConnectOregon@odot.state.or.us](mailto:ConnectOregon@odot.state.or.us)

## **5. Consensus Committee**

A facilitator has been hired to staff the Consensus Committee. A list of its members will be posted on the web shortly. In general, two individuals from each of the nine Review Committees will be asked to serve on the Consensus Committee along with additional industry and economic development reps.

## **6. Questions**

*Please address all non-aviation questions to the ODOT Freight Mobility Section:*

Julie F. Rodwell  
Manager, Freight Mobility Section  
503-986-3525  
Cell 503-385-6080  
Fax 503-986-4173  
[Julie.F.Rodwell@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Julie.F.Rodwell@odot.state.or.us)

Amy Hollingsworth  
Key Contact, Freight Mobility Section  
503-986-3520  
Fax 503-986-4173  
[Amy.Hollingsworth@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Amy.Hollingsworth@odot.state.or.us)

*And address aviation questions to:*

Robert Hidley  
Director, Oregon Dept. of Aviation  
503-378-4880  
Fax 503-373-1688  
Robert.Hidley@state.or.us

BUCKET SCREENING MATRIX

CONSIDERATIONS (from SB 71)	Central Oregon and Pacific Railroad	Creswell Airport	Eugene Air Cargo Project	Eugene Depot	LTD Pioneer Parkway EmX	Port of Siuslaw	Union Pacific Railroad
<p><b>Proposed transportation project reduces transportation costs for Oregon businesses</b></p>	<p>This project will reduce transportation costs for Oregon forest products industries by providing and maintaining a less expensive transportation alternative. Lower rail rates vs. truck will result in a savings of up to \$17,000,000 per year. This investment will make these Oregon industries more competitive against other forest products businesses throughout the United States.</p>	<p>The Creswell Airport is both a time and money saver for local businesses, entrepreneurs, and larger multi-state companies. FedEx and UPS rely on Hobby Field during times of inclement weather at the Eugene Airport when landing bottlenecks or the inability to land occur. This benefits customers who rely on a timely delivery and FedEx/UPS whose bottom lines and business reputations are based on their delivery guarantees. With the removal of the moratorium on development, the Creswell Airport can be considered as a site for the placement of a smaller hub by both companies.</p>	<p>Improvements will remove current constraints for efficient movement of air cargo at Eugene. Less time is then needed for movement of time-sensitive shipments to the air cargo network. Project reduces direct and indirect costs associated with cargo movement and handling. According to the draft 2005 Oregon Transportation Plan, investments that expand regional air services, especially air freight, are needed and should be supported because highway congestion will become a financial constraint.</p>	<p>Improve efficiency of transit, taxi, private vehicle and pedestrian circulation on site, improve safety by reducing congestion and traffic conflicts, and reduce wait times. This will be accomplished through a combination of improvements to the parking and site circulation areas, improvements to the rail passenger holding/boarding area and improved integration of the rail passenger and passenger drop off/pick up areas.</p>	<p>Business transportation cost savings include: travel time savings resulting from dedicated bus lanes, fewer motor vehicle accidents, improved freight mobility/accessibility due to reduced congestion on I-5 and city streets, improved mobility on the state highway system, particularly near I-5 and Beltline Road, and increased access and mobility for employees/customers with and without cars. For every \$10 million invested in transit, over \$15 million is saved in transportation costs to both highway and transit users. The Pioneer Parkway BRT project could save approximately \$57 million in transportation costs for both Oregon businesses.</p>	<p>This project will reduce fuel costs and transit time for both the commercial fishing vessels and seafood dealer trucking operations. The project will also reduce transportation facility maintenance costs for the Port and reduce the safety liability risk associated with deficient wharf and floating dock facilities. The project site is the closest seafood transfer facility to the exceptional Heceta Bank fishing grounds and the I-5 corridor markets, reducing both marine and highway transportation costs and improving seafood product quality and value.</p>	<p>Increased demand for rail freight service and passenger service is continuing to add stress to the rail network and to increase the need for modern and efficient rail facilities. The lack of mainline capacity and yard facilities has been identified as key improvements needed to address business opportunities in the area. Improvements in yard capacity and efficiency will allow for more growth in rail freight movements for UP, and the short line carriers in the region, to and from (a) local customers, (b) other freight origins and destinations through the state including the Port of Portland, and (c) additional freight that traverses through the area to other destinations</p>
<p><b>Proposed transportation project benefits or connects two or more modes of transportation (strategic consideration)</b></p>	<p>This project will provide an alternative to truck transportation for Oregon businesses by making the CORP more efficient and capable of handling more carloads of traffic. The avoided truck trips will result in reduced highway congestion from truck in the Roseburg area (Note: both a Region 2 and Region 3 application). The avoidance of up to 63,000 annual truck trips will result in avoiding an increase in the truck Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) of up to 4%.</p>	<p>Note: See above for connection between air transportation and the highway system related to air freight delivery companies. Another significant air/highway link on a northwest regional basis is that of the emergency medical transportation services (EMT). Four EMT providers (Air Life, out of Bend, CAL OR out of Brookings, Mercy Flights out of Medford, and Life Flight, out of Portland) currently use Hobby Field on a part-time and growing basis for a wide range of reasons.</p>	<p>The increased demand for the movement of time-sensitive freight requires frequent trucking. The capacity enhancement at the airport improves the connection between ground and the national air transportation system. Supports OTP POLICY 3.1 – An Integrated and Efficient Freight System, STRATEGY 3.1.4: Work with shippers, transportation providers and other groups to improve traffic flows and interactions between modes. It is estimated that the potential value to the community would be an increase of \$42M in goods shipped/received.</p>	<p>Major improvement in interconnection of rail passengers arriving and departing by transit, taxi and private vehicles. Improving the efficiency and convenience for rail passengers will enhance the attractiveness of rail service to the public. Supports OTP DRAFT POLICY 1.1 – Development of an Integrated Multimodal System; Policy 1.2 - Equity, Efficiency and Travel Choices, Strategy 1.2.1: Develop and promote inter and intra-city public transportation</p>	<p>The project will connect three modes of transportation: pedestrians/bicycles, auto and transit. The project benefits several modes, including freight mobility, auto, transit and pedestrians.</p>	<p>For decades the Maple Street Landing and Transient Dock has linked commercial fishing vessels to seafood dealers, and the dealers to their local markets, using the federal waterway and highway system. Commercial vessels...to off-load seafood and load fishing gear. Public hoists on the Port's adjoining Old Town Wharf are used by vessel crews and commercial seafood dealers from the vessels to containers and transport vehicles on the wharf. The fresh seafood cargo is then quickly moved by truck from the wharf to local seafood markets, and using Hwy 126 to regional markets in the Willamette Valley and beyond to distant markets on the I-5 corridor like Seattle and San Francisco.</p>	<p>Intercity rail passenger service is becoming a critical part of the region's transportation system. This rail line is part of a state supported rail passenger corridor, as well as a portion of Amtrak's long distance network connecting Oregon to California and Washington. It provides an alternative to air and highway transportation in the congested I-5 corridor. Since more fluid operations in the Eugene terminals will also permit better service to local freight customers, it will also be possible to provide a better product to those freight customers utilizing the truck-rail transloads in the area. Note: ODOT reviewer estimates 80% benefit to freight and 20% to Amtrak.</p>
<p><b>Proposed transportation project is a critical link in a statewide or regional transportation system that will measurably improve utilization and efficiency of the system (strategic consideration)</b></p>	<p>The project will connect Oregon businesses to the national rail system, making them more competitive. Using rail reduces congestion on the highway system while lowering costs by the businesses. The reduced congestion will be statewide by avoiding up to 63,000 additional annual truck trips on I-5 by increasing car loads up to 9,000 per year. Applicant estimates \$8,600,000 in avoided social costs (congestion, air pollution, noise, and accidents). Also, estimates decreased fuel consumption up to 1 million gallons per year by 2015 and reduced costs to shippers of \$17,000,000 per year.</p>	<p>Creswell Hobby Field is categorized as a Community Aviation Airport (Category 4) in the 2000 Oregon Aviation Plan, based on its functional role, and it is included in Oregon's "Core System of Airports" for having a "significant role in the statewide aviation system." Hobby Field supports 3 maintenance shops, 3 flight schools, and 2 skydiving operations. As noted earlier, Hobby Field is a backup for both FedEx and UPS and is used by 4 EMT providers in emergency/critical care patients.</p>	<p>Eugene Airport will be used as a regional hub for cargo operations. The project allows larger aircraft to connect with smaller feeder aircraft from the surrounding region. This air-to-air hub, coupled with enhanced ground-to-air activity, makes this project a strategic link in the state and national air cargo system, and a project that will create a measurable increase in the efficiency of the intermodal system.</p>	<p>The Eugene Depot serves as the multi-modal transportation hub for the lower Willamette valley and the southern terminus of Amtrak's high-speed rail system serving the Willamette Valley north to Vancouver, B.C. The Depot is the terminal for Amtrak's interstate passenger rail and bus service, serving the Lane County and surrounding areas to the east, south and west. Supports OTP draft POLICY 3.1 – An Integrated and Efficient Freight System, Strategy 3.1.7 Support rail transportation to achieve greater efficiency of goods movements through public/private partnerships and to reduce traffic on area roadways.</p>	<p>The project is an essential link in the Statewide and Regional transportation system. The project supports many of the strategies and policies in the draft Oregon Transportation Plan, particularly Goal 2, Management of the System, and Goal 3, Economic Vitality. This project is identified in TransPlan, and also in the RTP. The project will measurably improve the efficiency of the regional and state transportation system. The peak hour transit mode share on congested corridors, a key plan performance measure that is affected by BRT, would increase from 7.9 percent to 10.1 percent. The percentage of drive-alone trips will decrease from 44.21 percent in 2002 to 40.21 percent in 2025.</p>	<p>The Siuslaw River Harbor is approximately 35 miles from Heceta Bank, whereas Umpqua is 44 miles, Newport is 53 miles, and Coos Bay is 58 miles, providing a shorter sailing time and reducing vessel fuel and operating costs. The Siuslaw Fisherman's Association reported that local fishing boats delivering to other ports are "burning extra fuel and losing a day of fishing in the process." Maple Street Landing and Transient Dock is a minor but locally important component of the south coast maritime-rail-truck Major Freight Corridor described in the 1999 Oregon Highway Plan. Less than 1/2 mile of local streets connects the dock to US Hwy 101 and State Hwy 126 (National Highway System), and ultimately to I-5.</p>	<p>The main line through Eugene is a part of the principal north-south rail route along the west coast of the U.S. Upgrading the physical plant at Eugene is a key initiative to improving the fluidity of this route for all trains operating in the I-5 corridor and in the Eugene area.</p>



BUCKET SCREENING MATRIX

CONSIDERATIONS (from SB 71)	Central Oregon and Pacific Railroad	Creswell Airport	Eugene Air Cargo Project	Eugene Depot	LTD Pioneer Parkway EmX	Port of Siuslaw	Union Pacific Railroad
<b>How much of the cost of a proposed transportation project can be borne by the applicant for the grant or loan</b>	Total cost is \$12,379,574. This is total for Region 2 and Region 3. ODOT reviewers required split between regions. Region 2 total cost is \$2,487,260 and Region 2 grant request is \$1,477,492. Local match is \$1,009,768. (40.6%).	Total cost is shown as \$1,121,978. Grant request is \$612,800. Local match is \$224,395. This fulfills minimum 20% match requirement for grant.	The total project cost is proposed at \$5,471,281. The grant request of \$4,103,461 will be matched by local and federal leveraged funds of \$1,367,820, which is 25% of the total, and 5% above the minimum required.	The City of Eugene, with federal funds under the SAFETEA program, will bear 70% of the total \$1.4 million project cost. The ConnectOregon grant request of \$400,000 will be matched by \$1 million in federal funds earmarked for the Eugene Depot project.	Lane Transit District will provide the \$1.08 million required match to the \$5.4 million ConnectOregon Pioneer Parkway Project request. \$31,520,000 million in funds will be provided from a combination of local funds, land grants, and federal funds. Sufficient Federal funds are authorized in the 2005 federal transportation bill, SAFETEA-LU, Sec. 3043 (d)(17) and LTD has programmed local match in its long range financial plan.	Total cost of this phase for ConnectOregon is \$769,000. Grant request is \$258,000 (33%) and loan request is \$86,000 (11%). Local match is \$425,000 (55%). The Oregon State Marine Board and the Oregon Economic Development Department will be assisting the Port with the \$715,950 financing package for Phase II.	Total project cost is \$7,080,000. Grant request is \$5,664,000 and local match is \$1,416,000 (20%).
<b>Proposed transportation project creates construction and permanent jobs in this state (strategic consideration)</b>	26 track construction jobs for about a year. Application estimates that increased capacity could support up to 571 railroad and forest products jobs in southwest Oregon. This appears to be a combined amount for Winchester Rail Yard and track improvements in both Region 2 and 3.	Estimates construction crew of 7. Also reports lost opportunities because of lack of fire suppression capability. A recent inquiry from a company looking for a site for 100 direct jobs for an air transportation facility. Company liked I-5 access and small town atmosphere. Water supply issues and denial by the fire marshal led to the location of the company elsewhere.	The project will create 20 (estimated) local full time construction jobs. The top air cargo users represented 8,945 Lane County jobs. The annual growth rate for air cargo in Lane County over the past three years is 10.4%. With an economic multiplier of 2.0 for construction projects, the project is expected to generate a benefit to the State's economy of approximately \$9.0 million.	Design and construction will be by Oregon firms. With an economic multiplier of 1.9 to 2.0 for construction expenditures, the project is expected to have a \$2.7 to \$2.8 million benefit to the regional and state economy.	LTD's \$38 million Pioneer Parkway Bus Rapid Transit Project would create an estimated 214 construction jobs * Increased demand for goods and services from local suppliers will create an additional 401 indirect jobs *The Pioneer Parkway BRT project is expected to have an annual operating and maintenance cost of approximately \$1,250,000. Over 20 years this would be approximately \$25,000,000 for operations, creating an estimated 1,425 jobs	Applicant has used standard cost multipliers to estimate 6 direct construction jobs and 4 indirect jobs. Conversely, loss of project threatens existing fishing industry, already challenged by regulation and fuel costs. Applicant estimates 80 local fishing jobs and 11 tourism jobs are dependent on the dock. 555 retail jobs in Old Town could be impacted by the loss of use.	No construction jobs would be created since existing UP crews would be used. Applicant asserts future job creation through long term benefits of more efficient operations. Oregon operations included 265,000 carloads originating and 300,000 carloads terminated in Oregon.
<b>Proposed transportation project is ready for construction</b>	Track replacement requires no environmental permits. Completion date given is December 2007.	Final design underway by consultant, to be completed in April, 2006. Can contract in 2007.	Land acquisition, environmental review, initial civil design and construction cost estimates have already been completed. Construction could start by the spring of 2007, as that would coincide with the timing for receipt of the federal grant and completion of the architectural plans for the building.	Conceptual design for this project was completed as part of the Master Plan for the Depot. Final design will begin as soon as funding is secured. Due to the complexity of the intermodal project and requirement for multiple agency review, the design, approval process and bidding is expected to take up to 18 months, with a construction start date of January, 2008.	Construction of the transit station at the Gateway Mall along the Pioneer Parkway EmX corridor can begin in 2007. The other transit stations along the corridor will be built between 2007 and 2009.	PE complete. Permits underway. Projected start Oct 1, 2006. Replacement of existing facilities should expedite permits.	Design work and field checking needed. Work to be performed by UP crews. No government approvals are necessary. Completion projected for 2007.
<b>BUCKET*</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

\* - Buckets are defined as follows:  
1. Project demonstrates it meets all six considerations  
2. Project demonstrates that it represents strategic investments and connections - two or more modes of transportation, system improvements, and jobs/economic development; but may not be fully ready to construct, able to demonstrate lower transportation costs for Oregon business, or leverage other benefits.  
3. Project achieves one or more of the strategic considerations, but not all of them.  
4. Project cannot demonstrate any of the strategic or regionwide considerations

**Connect Oregon Region 2 Evaluation Matrix  
DRAFT**

Region	Application Number	Applicant Name	Project Name / Description	Mode	CO GRANT Funds Requested	CO LOAN Funds Requested	Total Connect Oregon Funds Requested (\$)	GRANT Match Funds Pledged	Total Project Funds (\$)	% Match	% OverMatch (see note at end)	Given Construction Start Date	Adjusted Construction Start Date (see note at end)	Consultant Comments re Start Date Adjustment																				
2	034-06	City of Creswell	Creswell Airport Fire Suppression Project	Aviation	\$ 612,800	\$ -	\$ 612,800	\$ 509,178	\$ 1,121,978	45%	125%	2007, 2Q	2007, 2Q	Applicant's timeline is reasonable.																				
2	035-06	City of Salem	Salem Municipal Airport - Enlarge/improve terminal bldg. for future air carrier service. Upgrade security requirements to meet FAA requirements post 911.	Aviation	\$ 2,510,000	\$ -	\$ 2,510,000	\$ 628,000	\$ 3,138,000	20%	0%	2007, 1Q	2007, 1Q	Consultant questioned use of FAA AIP funds after 9/07. Apart from that, timeline is reasonable.																				
2	041-06	City of Newport	Newport Municipal Airport Hangar Development	Aviation	\$ 520,000	\$ -	\$ 520,000	\$ 130,000	\$ 650,000	20%	0%	2006, 4Q	2006, 4Q	Applicant's timeline is reasonable.																				
2	044-06	City of Eugene-Eugene Airport *	Air Cargo Facilities Improvements	Aviation	\$ 4,103,461	\$ -	\$ 4,103,461	\$ 1,563,957	\$ 5,667,418	28%	40%	2007, 2Q	2007, 2Q	Apart from question about whether the project will be using FAA AIP funds after the program expires, the construction start date is reasonable, and could even be moved up a few months.																				
2	047-06	City of Astoria City of Newport	Scheduled Airline Service - Astoria and Newport	Aviation	\$ 3,369,600	\$ -	\$ 3,369,600	\$ 842,400	\$ 4,212,000	20%	0%	2006, 4Q	2006, 4Q	Applicant's timeline is reasonable.																				
2	092-06	Port of Tillamook Bay	Tillamook Airport Multimodal Freight Infrastructure	Aviation	\$ 600,000	\$ -	\$ 600,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 800,000	25%	25%	2006, 4Q	2007, 1Q	Design timeline is too ambitious, question about whether permits will be needed.																				
2	020-06	Port of Newport	Newport International Terminal Access Improvement	Marine	\$ 2,775,200	\$ -	\$ 2,775,200	\$ 693,800	\$ 3,469,000	20%	0%	2007, 4Q	2007, 4Q	Applicant's timeline is reasonable.																				
2	048-06	Port of Siuslaw	Transient Dock Project (Maple St. Landing) Florence	Marine	\$ 258,000	\$ 86,000	\$ 344,000	\$ 425,000	\$ 769,000	62%	210%	2006, 4Q	2006, 4Q	Applicant's timeline is reasonable.																				
2	094-06	Port of Toledo	Toledo Intermodal and Industrial Center	Marine / Rail Freight	\$ 4,385,600	\$ -	\$ 4,385,600	\$ 1,096,400	\$ 5,482,000	20%	0%	2007, 1Q	2007, 2Q	Consultant raised question about need for dredging, which could lead to need for permits. Apart from this, timeline is reasonable.																				
2	017-06	City of Lebanon/ Co-Applicant - Albany & Eastern RR	Lebanon Reload Facility	Rail Freight	\$ 1,918,558	\$ -	\$ 1,918,558	\$ 479,640	\$ 2,398,198	20%	0%	2008, 2Q	2008, 2Q	The timeline is reasonable and is based on a CO award to 1) acquire property; 2) prepare design; and 3) bid project.																				
2	053-06	Willamette Valley Railroad Company	Upgrade Track between Stayton and Woodburn to Class 1	Rail Freight	\$ 2,342,880	\$ -	\$ 2,342,880	\$ 585,720	\$ 2,928,600	20%	0%	2006, 3Q	2007, 1Q	The project is dependent on a CO award, and could begin within 6 mos; however, they may have under-estimated costs, and may need to further document their source for match.																				
2	060-06	Albany & Eastern Railroad	Mill City Railroad Bridge Project	Rail Freight	\$ 800,000	\$ -	\$ 800,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 1,000,000	20%	0%	2006, 3Q	2007, 1Q	Questions were raised about cost estimates in application. Assuming they are resolved, const. could begin within 4 months.																				
2	061-06	Albany & Eastern Railroad	RR Tie Project - Mill City	Rail Freight	\$ 640,000	\$ -	\$ 640,000	\$ 160,000	\$ 800,000	20%	0%	2006, 3Q	2007, 1Q	Questions were raised about cost estimates in application. Assuming they are resolved, const. could begin within 4 months.																				
2	066-06	Union Pacific Railroad	Install Centralized Traffic Control (Albany-Salem)	Rail Freight	\$ 4,604,000	\$ -	\$ 4,604,000	\$ 1,151,000	\$ 5,755,000	20%	0%	2007	2007, 3Q	Applicant provides construction start date of "2007." Project should not require more than 5 months to start construction.																				
2	070-06	Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians (CTSI)	CTSI Toledo Mill Site Rail Siding Restoration	Rail Freight	\$ 231,840	\$ -	\$ 231,840	\$ 57,960	\$ 289,800	20%	0%	2006, 4Q	2006, 4Q	Applicant provided a timeline which is reasonable.																				
2	077-06	Willamette & Pacific Railroad	Willamina Branch 286K pound Rail Upgrade Project	Rail Freight	\$ 2,208,492	\$ -	\$ 2,208,492	\$ 885,000	\$ 3,093,492	29%	45%	2006, 3Q	2006, 3Q	While applicant needs approval from Union Pacific RR, owner of the track, all design and permits are complete, and mobilization on hand. Applicant lists 3rd quarter '06 as the date they would begin the design process - i.e., not the construction start date. Their timeline shows a construction start date of 4th quarter '06, which is reasonable.																				
2	099-06	Port of Tillamook Bay	RR Track Replacement Work - Region 2 Portion of Line	Rail Freight	\$ 931,198	\$ -	\$ 931,198	\$ 564,700	\$ 1,495,898	38%	90%	2006, 3Q	2006, 4Q	Applicant provides construction start date of "2007." Project should not require more than 5 months to start construction.																				
2	065-06	Union Pacific Railroad	Eugene New Thru Running Track/Passenger Layover Track	Rail Freight / Rail Passenger	\$ 5,664,000	\$ -	\$ 5,664,000	\$ 1,416,000	\$ 7,080,000	20%	0%	2007	2007, 3Q	Applicant lists 4th quarter '06 as the date they would begin the design process - i.e., not the construction start date. The timeline in the application indicates January 2008 construction start date, which is reasonable.																				
2	031-06	City of Eugene *	Eugene Depot Passenger/Transit Access Improvements	Rail Passenger / Transit	\$400,000	\$ -	\$ 400,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,400,000	83%	315%	2006, 4Q	2008, 1Q	Applicant provided a timeline from design to permits to construction bids to construction completion - all of which is reasonable.																				
2	009-06	Tillamook County Transportation Dist.	Tillamook Transit & Visitors Center	Transit	\$ 550,000	\$ -	\$ 550,000	\$ 184,000	\$ 734,000	25%	25%	2007, 1Q	2007, 1Q	Applicant states that P.E. is complete and env. processes will conclude in Aug '06. Plus, contractor is already under contract. Added 2-mo. Contingency to account for potential design/permit delays.																				
2	045-06	Lane Transit District City of Springfield	Pioneer Parkway Bus Rapid Transit Project (BRT)	Transit	\$ 5,400,000	\$ -	\$ 5,400,000	\$ 32,600,000	\$ 38,000,000	86%	330%	2006, 3Q	2006, 4Q	Project is truly construction ready. Added 4 months to applicant exp. July '06 start date to account for any CO award potentially occurring in Aug '06.																				
2	052-06	City of Albany	Bus Parking Garage to house transit vehicles-Linn County Fuel Station	Transit	\$ 115,200	\$ -	\$ 115,200	\$ 28,800	\$ 144,000	20%	0%	2006, 3Q	2006, 4Q	Applicant provided a timeline which is reasonable																				
2	072-06	Salem-Keizer Transit - App 1	Keizer Transit Station	Transit	\$ 2,500,000	\$ -	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 720,000	\$ 3,220,000	22%	10%	2008, 3Q	2008, 3Q	Applicant provided a timeline which is reasonable																				
2	073-06	Salem-Keizer Transit - App 2	Construct South Salem Transit Station (Madronna/Commercial)	Transit	\$ 2,500,000	\$ -	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 3,250,000	23%	15%	2008, 3Q	2008, 3Q	Assuming agreements are as certain as stated in the application, the timeline is reasonable.																				
1,2,4,5	079-06	Regional Maritime Security Coalition	Integrated Intermodal Safety, Security & Efficiency Enhancement Project, Columbia River	Marine	\$ 1,226,667	\$ -	\$ 1,226,667	\$ 1,226,667	\$ 2,453,334	50%	150%	2006, 3Q	2006, 3Q	Applicant's timeline is reasonable.																				
1,2,3,4,5	054-06	Cogent Corporation International	Enhance G.A. Aviation	Aviation	\$ 7,340,000	\$ -	\$ 7,340,000	\$ 2,203,000	\$ 9,543,000	23%	15%	2006, 4Q	2006, 4Q	Assuming project begins with CO award and considering mobilization time, added 4 months.																				
2, 3	014-06	Central Oregon & Pacific Railroad, Inc.	Improvements - Main Lines	Rail Freight	\$ 7,353,762	\$ -	\$ 7,353,762	\$ 5,025,812	\$ 12,379,574	41%	105%	2006, 1Q	2006, 4Q																					
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>																																		
					<b>27 Applications</b>																													
					<b>\$ 65,861,258</b>					<b>\$ 86,000</b>					<b>\$ 65,947,258</b>					<b>\$ 56,327,034</b>					<b>\$ 122,274,292</b>					<b>46%</b>				

Note: % Overmatch is calculated by subtracting 20 percent from the % Match, then dividing by 20%. For example, a 40% match is equivalent to a 100% Overmatch ((40 - 20) / 20).

Note: Construction Start Date (Adjusted) is the date stated by the applicant, but possibly adjusted by the feasibility consultant.

\* Project adjusted to add land cost to match.