



# Memo

Date: Monday, December 30, 2024  
To: Metro Council and Interested Parties  
From: Grace Cho, Principal Transportation Planner  
Noel Mickelberry, Senior Transportation Planner  
Subject: 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund – Step 1A.1 – Candidate Project Evaluation Results with Attachments

---

**Purpose:** Provide an overview of the performance evaluation & project delivery assessment results for the candidate projects in consideration.

## **Background & Current Place in Development:**

As part of the adoption of the 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund Program Direction, regional leadership agreed to move forward in the development of a new project bond proposal (also referred to as Step 1A.1) for consideration by the region. After a project nomination period was held a total of nine (9) bond nominations moved forward to undergo the candidate project evaluation, in which the results are being shared with Metro Council.

## **Candidate Project Evaluation Overview**

The candidate project consists of three separate evaluations which assesses 1) the consistency towards the bond purpose and principles; 2) the performance towards advancing Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) goals and outcomes; and 3) project delivery challenges outstanding. The purpose of the first two evaluations – comprising the performance evaluation – is not to rank projects, but to instead assess the relative performance by measure and to use the information as one input within the larger discussion of the candidate projects for the bond scenario phase.

Each project was evaluated based on the associated measures for each evaluation shown in Table 1. For the performance evaluation methodology, each measure was weighted equally and each received five (5) total points. Each measure had a quantitative or geospatial analysis element assessed using the specific project characteristics as well as a qualitative element assessed based on application and supplemental materials. The RTP goal advancement assessment applied the RTP goals and outcomes in relation to transit, given the program direction focus on transit. A map and summary of the candidate project applications can be found in Attachment 1.

Metro staff conducted the first two evaluations and utilized an external firm to conduct a project delivery assessment. The candidate project evaluation was conducted from late October through November 2024. Specifically in the bond purpose and principles consistency evaluation, the results are based on historic precedence of federal surface transportation programs. As new information emerges through the development process, the aim is to incorporate it into the bond development considerations.

*Table 1. Evaluation Measures for the Three Part Candidate Project Evaluation*

<b>Technical Evaluation Component</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Evaluation Results</b>
Bond Purpose & Principles	Regional/Corridor scale project	Rating + brief narrative
	Leverage significant discretionary funding	
	Advance ability to construct projects early	
	Consideration of funding strategy and request relative to other available funding sources	
RTP Goal Advancement	Improves transit service for residents in an Equity Focus Area	Rating + brief narrative
	Increases speed, frequency and reliability of high-capacity transit	
	Provides safer and more convenient access to transit	
	Improves access to jobs and essential services by transit	
	Identified by communities who face disparities in the transportation system as a priority	
Project Delivery Assessment	Planning	One qualitative rating for overall project delivery assessment
	Partnerships and Support	
	Environmental Considerations	
	Preliminary Engineering and Design	
	Construction	

**Candidate Project Evaluation Results and Draft Findings**

Table 2. is a summary of the evaluation results by the individual measures for performance evaluation and project delivery assessment organized by the category the project was nominated. Table 3. is a summary of all projects and their ratings on each measure for the three evaluations and by nomination categories. Included as an attachment are individual rating sheets for each project with qualitative comments on each evaluation component. Lastly, the analysis and details of the project delivery assessment of the bond nominations are included as an attachment.

The following are findings from the technical evaluation.

- Candidates which included elements from more than one transit project category (e.g. major transit capital infrastructure, pedestrian transit access, and signal priority) performed best in the performance evaluation. The comprehensive packaging and scale better advance regional goals.
- Inversely, singularly focused candidate projects (i.e. candidates with their scopes elements primarily in one transit project category) do not perform as well as in the performance evaluation. There is recognition these candidate projects address an identified regional need for the system and a part of the region’s transportation strategy, but being more tightly focused and/or smaller in scale even when compiled together programmatically is less impactful in advancing regional goals. For some candidates the consideration of other funding opportunities to advance those projects was also a factor in the performance evaluation ratings.
- Candidates which have a funding strategy that matches the program direction performed best in the bond purpose and principles consistency assessment.

- Articulation specifically on the role the bond proceeds play in leveraging other funding and targeting different discretionary opportunities and local commitment of funding effected the different ratings for the candidate projects.
- While each project is in different stages of development, the project delivery assessment identified at least one or more areas of project delivery challenges for each candidate, with mitigations needed for project delivery.
  - The nominating agencies demonstrated an awareness of the project delivery challenges the candidate project faces and seek to address those challenges through their development processes. This led to no one candidate project receiving a high mitigation effort rating.
  - For some candidates, the project delivery agency demonstrated through the proposed scope, schedule, and budget are adequate to address needed mitigations.
  - Project development only candidates tend to show ability to deliver the project development work as proposed with the bond proceeds, but additional project delivery mitigations will be needed in progressing the project into construction.
  - The major transit capital candidates were assessed under additional criteria specific to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Capital Investment Grant (CIG) process. The results highlight the additional rigor required of those candidate projects to meet project delivery milestones in efforts to meet the CIG program requirements.

Based on the draft fundings, some nominations tended to perform better than others, but also maintain project delivery matters in need of resolution. As expressed, the technical evaluation is not to rank projects, but to instead assess the relative performance and flag for implementation challenges. This information is to help shape the next stage of the bond development process, which will introduce additional technical information – in particular the financial analysis of the bond scenarios. These are expected to roll out in the following months to continue to inform the discussion.

*Table 2. Summary of Results by Individual Measures for the Performance Evaluation According to Bond Project Category*

2028-3030 Regional Flexible Fund Allocation: Step 1A.1 Candidate Project Performance Evaluation Results Summary												
Evaluation Section	Measure	Capital Investment Grant (CIG)/Large Transit Projects			First/Last Mile & Access to Transit Projects				Transit Vehicle Priority			
		Montgomery Park	82nd Ave	TV Highway	Sunrise	Burnside Bridge	OR99E	72nd Ave	185th Overcross	Better Bus	Burnside Bridge	
<b>Bond Purpose &amp; Principles Consistency</b>	Use regional revenues on regional or corridor scale projects											
	Candidate projects proposed with bond proceeds for construction activities are well advanced through project development activities and have an achievable funding strategy to complete the project.											
	The allocation of a new project bond proceeds to regional projects is made in consideration of other transportation spending in the region by other agencies and Metro											
	Leverage significant discretionary federal, state and/or local funding											
<b>RTP Goals &amp; Outcomes Advancement</b>	Improves transit service for residents in an Equity Focus Area											
	Increases speed, frequency and reliability of high capacity transit											
	Provides safer and more convenient access to transit											
	Improves access to jobs and essential services by transit											
	Identified by communities who face disparities in the transportation system as a priority											
<b>Project Delivery Assessment</b>	Number of mitigations	3	2	2	3	1	1	1	2	2	1	
	Level of mitigation effort	Med/Med/Low	Low/Low	Low/Med	Low/Low/Med	Low	Med	Low	Low/Low	Low/Low	Low	

Key: Darker shades of blue indicate higher scoring/rating, while lighter shades blue indicates lesser scoring/rating. For the Project Delivery Assessment, the number of mitigations reflect areas of identified project delivery challenges within the project delivery agency’s scope of control. The level of mitigation effort reflects by mitigation area the efforts needed to address the project delivery challenge.

*Table 3. Summary of Candidate Evaluation Ratings*

Evaluation Component/Category	Sunrise	185th	Better Bus	Burnside Bridge	OR99E	Montgomery Park	72nd Ave	82nd Ave	TV Highway
<b>Overall score</b>									
<b>Capital Investment Grant (CIG)/Large Transit</b>									
<b>First/Last &amp; Access to Transit</b>									
<b>Transit Vehicle Priority</b>									
<b>Bond Purpose &amp; Principles Consistency</b>									
<b>RTP Goals &amp; Outcomes Advancement</b>									
<b>Project Delivery Assessment (see attachment 3 for details)</b>	Number of Mitigations								
	3	2	2	1	1	3	1	2	2
	Level of Mitigation Effort								
	Low/Low/Med	Low/Low	Low/Low	Low	Med	Med/Med/Low	Low	Low/Low	Low/Med

Key: Darker shades of blue indicate higher scoring/rating, while lighter shades blue indicates lesser scoring/rating

## Attachment 2 – Individual Candidate Project Evaluations – Summary of Main Comments

**Project Name:** Sunrise Corridor

**Applicant:** Clackamas County

Evaluation Framework components & measures		Comments
Bond Purpose/ Principles	Use regional revenues on regional or corridor scale projects	This is a regional corridor, without high ridership transit lines. Requested RFFA Step 1A.1 is for project development funds only for the environmental reassessment of Sunrise Highway and complete streets retrofit with bike/pedestrian and transit hub elements on Highway 212. There are other sources of funds in the region that could support project development for the project. The project also necessitates agreement from ODOT to complete the parallel new Sunrise facility and the jurisdictional transfer and/or agreed upon design for Highway 212. At this point does not have a pipeline for construction funding at state or federal level. Project delivery agency intends to seek state legislative and federal discretionary grants.
	Candidate projects proposed with bond proceeds for construction activities are well advanced through project development activities and have an achievable funding strategy to complete the project.	
	The allocation of a new project bond proceeds to regional projects is made in consideration of other transportation spending in the region by other agencies and Metro	
	Leverages significant discretionary federal and state and/or local funding, including support for a pipeline of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Capital Investment Grant projects.	
RTP Goals	Improves transit service for residents in an Equity Focus Area	Primary focus is improved bike/pedestrian facilities to improve access to existing transit. This corridor does not currently have high capacity transit or frequent transit lines, through there are plans to add two local routes and more County operated shuttle service. Extensive outreach has been conducted with general need for better safety and pedestrian/bicycle facilities in the corridor. Feedback has also been received about the new roadway facility planned.
	Increases speed, frequency and reliability of high-capacity transit	
	Provides safer and more convenient access to transit	
	Improves access to jobs and essential services by transit	
	Identified by communities who face disparities in the transportation system as a priority	

## Attachment 2 – Individual Candidate Project Evaluations – Summary of Main Comments

**Project Name:** 185<sup>th</sup> Max Overcrossing

**Applicant:** City of Hillsboro

Evaluation Framework components & measures		Comments
Bond Purpose/ Principles	Use regional revenues on regional or corridor scale projects	Locally specific project on a high ridership line, funding request is for project development and not construction. While eligible for federal funding sources, unclear on competitiveness. Local sources could support project development funding request. While this project was submitted under CIG category, CIG not identified as a funding source for construction in application materials but rather potential Federal Rail Administration (FRA) grant funds.
	Candidate projects proposed with bond proceeds for construction activities are well advanced through project development activities and have an achievable funding strategy to complete the project.	
	The allocation of a new project bond proceeds to regional projects is made in consideration of other transportation spending in the region by other agencies and Metro	
	Leverages significant discretionary federal and state and/or local funding, including support for a pipeline of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Capital Investment Grant projects.	
RTP Goals	Improves transit service for residents in an Equity Focus Area	Directly serves an equity focus area, however there has not been extensive engagement on this specific project with impacted communities. Separation at one location has the ability to decrease conflicts (e.g. pedestrian-vehicle) and provide some speed and reliability to TriMet’s Line 52 frequent bus.
	Increases speed, frequency and reliability of high-capacity transit	
	Provides safer and more convenient access to transit	
	Improves access to jobs and essential services by transit	
	Identified by communities who face disparities in the transportation system as a priority	

## Attachment 2 – Individual Candidate Project Evaluations – Summary of Main Comments

**Project Name:** Better Bus Program

**Applicant:** Metro

Evaluation Framework components & measures		Comments
Bond Purpose/ Principles	Use regional revenues on regional or corridor scale projects	Regional impact via many smaller scale improvements for local transit lines. Program has a good history of delivering projects, but that may be impacted if it switches to federal aid process. Historically has leveraged significant local funds, but those funds are not yet committed.
	Candidate projects proposed with bond proceeds for construction activities are well advanced through project development activities and have an achievable funding strategy to complete the project.	
	The allocation of a new project bond proceeds to regional projects is made in consideration of other transportation spending in the region by other agencies and Metro	
	Leverages significant discretionary federal and state and/or local funding, including support for a pipeline of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Capital Investment Grant projects.	
RTP Goals	Improves transit service for residents in an Equity Focus Area	Location can vary across the region, using equity focus area or safety concerns as an eligibility criterion. Purpose of the program is to increase speed, frequency and reliability of transit. Community input can also be a relevant criterion for advancement of projects.
	Increases speed, frequency and reliability of high-capacity transit	
	Provides safer and more convenient access to transit	
	Improves access to jobs and essential services by transit	
	Identified by communities who face disparities in the transportation system as a priority	



## Attachment 2 – Individual Candidate Project Evaluations – Summary of Main Comments

**Project Name:** Transit and Access-to-Transit Components of the Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge (EQRB) Project  
**Applicant:** Multnomah County

Evaluation Framework components & measures		Comments
Bond Purpose/ Principles	Use regional revenues on regional or corridor scale projects	Regionally significant as the bridge serves many high ridership lines and is the surface lifeline route across the Willamette River. Eligible and reliant on many other sources of funding to construct and has raised significant local revenue.
	Candidate projects proposed with bond proceeds for construction activities are well advanced through project development activities and have an achievable funding strategy to complete the project.	
	The allocation of a new project bond proceeds to regional projects is made in consideration of other transportation spending in the region by other agencies and Metro	
	Leverages significant discretionary federal and state and/or local funding, including support for a pipeline of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Capital Investment Grant projects.	
RTP Goals	Improves transit service for residents in an Equity Focus Area	Application focused on the pedestrian and transit elements near the bridge as well as the transit prioritization on the bridge itself. Significant equity-focused efforts have shaped various components of the project and it serves an equity focus area directly with many social and human service providers. Transit reliability anticipated and resilience of transit lines through a highly utilized corridor.
	Increases speed, frequency and reliability of high-capacity transit	
	Provides safer and more convenient access to transit	
	Improves access to jobs and essential services by transit	
	Identified by communities who face disparities in the transportation system as a priority	

## Attachment 2 – Individual Candidate Project Evaluations – Summary of Main Comments

**Project Name:** McLoughlin Boulevard (OR99E) First and Last Mile and Safe Access to Transit Streetscape Enhancements

**Applicant:** City of Oregon City

Evaluation Framework components & measures		Comments
Bond Purpose/ Principles	Use regional revenues on regional or corridor scale projects	Regional impact on a corridor serving high ridership lines. Aggressive schedule with reliance on discretionary sources. Other regional sources available (e.g. Step 2) and necessitates future agreement from ODOT to implement agreed upon design.
	Candidate projects proposed with bond proceeds for construction activities are well advanced through project development activities and have an achievable funding strategy to complete the project.	
	The allocation of a new project bond proceeds to regional projects is made in consideration of other transportation spending in the region by other agencies and Metro	
	Leverages significant discretionary federal and state and/or local funding, including support for a pipeline of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Capital Investment Grant projects.	
RTP Goals	Improves transit service for residents in an Equity Focus Area	Supports equity focus area with extensive engagement. Focuses on improving pedestrian environment on a high crash corridor to enhance access to transit. Designed to be implemented with prior funded transit signal priority for a frequent service bus line and accessing the Oregon City transit center. No further transit reliability or frequency upgrades identified beyond those being coordinated with Line 33 transit signal priority project.
	Increases speed, frequency and reliability of high-capacity transit	
	Provides safer and more convenient access to transit	
	Improves access to jobs and essential services by transit	
	Identified by communities who face disparities in the transportation system as a priority	

## Attachment 2 – Individual Candidate Project Evaluations – Summary of Main Comments

**Project Name:** Montgomery Park Streetcar Extension

**Applicant:** City of Portland

Evaluation Framework components & measures		Comments
Bond Purpose/ Principles	Use regional revenues on regional or corridor scale projects	This is a Tier 1 High-Capacity Transit corridor in the 2023 RTP and is well suited for federal discretionary grants for a project type and entity that has had success previously (CIG). Some level of risk in funding strategy that is reliant on local development.
	Candidate projects proposed with bond proceeds for construction activities are well advanced through project development activities and have an achievable funding strategy to complete the project.	
	The allocation of a new project bond proceeds to regional projects is made in consideration of other transportation spending in the region by other agencies and Metro	
	Leverages significant discretionary federal and state and/or local funding, including support for a pipeline of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Capital Investment Grant projects.	
RTP Goals	Improves transit service for residents in an Equity Focus Area	Not located in an equity focus area. The project has conducted significant engagement and plans to include culturally specific art into project scope. This project will add new high capacity transit service where it does not currently exist and will upgrade the pedestrian and bike connections in the project area.
	Increases speed, frequency and reliability of high-capacity transit	
	Provides safer and more convenient access to transit	
	Improves access to jobs and essential services by transit	
	Identified by communities who face disparities in the transportation system as a priority	

## Attachment 2 – Individual Candidate Project Evaluations – Summary of Main Comments

**Project Name:** 72<sup>nd</sup> Ave. Phase 1 Tigard Triangle Corridor Improvements (Pacific Highway to Dartmouth St.)

**Applicant:** City of Tigard

Evaluation Framework components & measures		Comments
Bond Purpose/ Principles:	Use regional revenues on regional or corridor scale projects	This is a locally specific project. Well-articulated schedule and potential funding sources, but may not be taking into account the federal aid process for construction timeline. There are other potential sources of regional funds for this project (e.g. Step 2).
	Candidate projects proposed with bond proceeds for construction activities are well advanced through project development activities and have an achievable funding strategy to complete the project.	
	The allocation of a new project bond proceeds to regional projects is made in consideration of other transportation spending in the region by other agencies and Metro	
	Leverages significant discretionary federal and state and/or local funding, including support for a pipeline of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Capital Investment Grant projects.	
RTP Goals	Improves transit service for residents in an Equity Focus Area	Does not serve an equity focus area and while community engagement was noted the impact that input has had on the project was unclear. Application includes extensive pedestrian and bicycle upgraded facilities for accessing transit. This project is not on a high crash corridor and does not have a high capacity transit line but will serve a realigned frequent service Line 76 and is in the corridor area of the suspended Southwest Corridor project. Line 76 is a Tier 3 high capacity transit corridor, but not currently prioritized for short-term implementation, though it is one of several routes under consideration for FX service. The 72 <sup>nd</sup> Ave bridge itself does not include significant improvements for transit speed, frequency or reliability.
	Increases speed, frequency and reliability of high-capacity transit	
	Provides safer and more convenient access to transit	
	Improves access to jobs and essential services by transit	
	Identified by communities who face disparities in the transportation system as a priority	

## Attachment 2 – Individual Candidate Project Evaluations – Summary of Main Comments

**Project Name:** 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Transit Project

**Applicant:** TriMet

Evaluation Framework components & measures		Comments
Bond Purpose/ Principles	Use regional revenues on regional or corridor scale projects	This is a tier 1 high capacity transit project in the 2023 RTP and is well suited for federal discretionary grants for a project type and entity that has had success previously (CIG). Is consistent with prior use of RFFA bond funding to support transit capital projects that have limited sources of local funds to leverage significant federal discretionary funding.
	Candidate projects proposed with bond proceeds for construction activities are well advanced through project development activities and have an achievable funding strategy to complete the project.	
	The allocation of a new project bond proceeds to regional projects is made in consideration of other transportation spending in the region by other agencies and Metro	
	Leverages significant discretionary federal and state and/or local funding, including support for a pipeline of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Capital Investment Grant projects.	
RTP Goals	Improves transit service for residents in an Equity Focus Area	A majority (80%) of the project corridor runs through equity focus areas and project has conducted extensive community engagement that continues through 82 <sup>nd</sup> Ave. Coalition. Project is specifically designed to increase speed, frequency and reliability on the busiest transit line in TriMet’s network. Extensive improvements to pedestrian environment and access included in this project, located on a high crash corridor. Part of the project area necessitates future agreement from ODOT to implement agreed upon design.
	Increases speed, frequency and reliability of high-capacity transit	
	Provides safer and more convenient access to transit	
	Improves access to jobs and essential services by transit	
	Identified by communities who face disparities in the transportation system as a priority	

## Attachment 2 – Individual Candidate Project Evaluations – Summary of Main Comments

**Project Name:** Tualatin-Valley (TV) Highway Transit Project

**Applicant:** TriMet

Evaluation Framework components & measures		Comments
Bond Purpose/ Principles	Use regional revenues on regional or corridor scale projects	This is a tier 1 high capacity transit corridor in the 2023 RTP and is well suited for federal discretionary grants for a project type and entity that has had success previously (CIG). Is consistent with prior use of RFFA bond funding to support transit capital projects that have limited sources of local funds to leverage significant federal discretionary funding.
	Candidate projects proposed with bond proceeds for construction activities are well advanced through project development activities and have an achievable funding strategy to complete the project.	
	The allocation of a new project bond proceeds to regional projects is made in consideration of other transportation spending in the region by other agencies and Metro	
	Leverages significant discretionary federal and state and/or local funding, including support for a pipeline of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Capital Investment Grant projects.	
RTP Goals	Improves transit service for residents in an Equity Focus Area	Over 80% of the project corridor is in equity focus areas with extensive engagement through steering committee and equitable development strategy. Specific improvements are not as detailed, but this project focuses on transit reliability, frequency and speed. Pedestrian safety upgrades noted, the project is on a high crash corridor The project necessitates future agreement from ODOT to implement agreed upon design.
	Increases speed, frequency and reliability of high-capacity transit	
	Provides safer and more convenient access to transit	
	Improves access to jobs and essential services by transit	
	Identified by communities who face disparities in the transportation system as a priority	

# TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

---

December 2, 2024

Project# 29295.003

To: Metro Staff: Grace Cho, Monica Krueger, Noel Mickleberry, Dan Kaempff, and Ted Leybold  
From: Nicholas Meltzer, Lekshmy Hirandas, and Camilla Dartnell, PE  
RE: 2028-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 1A.1 Project Delivery Assessment

---

As part of the adoption of the 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund Program, Metro is developing a new project bond proposal for the region to consider, referred to as Step 1A.1. Step 1A.1 projects will be evaluated based on three components: 1) Bond purpose and principles consistency and advancement; 2) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) goals advancement; and 3) Project delivery assessment. Kittelson & Associates, Inc. (Kittelison) is supporting Metro by performing the project delivery assessments. This memorandum contains an overview of the methodology applied for the project delivery assessments.

## Background

Regional decision makers – through a Metro-led process – are considering a new commitment of future Regional Flexible Funds starting in 2028-2030 to support a bond and make funding available to advance regional projects. The estimated amount of funding generated through a new bond is between \$55 and \$105 million based on the eligible projects selected and other factors related to the bond financing mechanism.

Kittelison is evaluating project delivery aspects of the applications received by Metro including the scope, schedule, and budgets to determine if: 1) the scope of work sufficiently covers all work anticipated to be necessary for project success; 2) the budget and schedule are appropriate to the scope of work outlined in the application; and 3) the scope of work and expenditure of funds can be underway or completed in the federal fiscal year 2026 through 2029 timeframe.

## Project Delivery Assessment

Kittelison developed a scoring template focused on assessing the project delivery considerations for Step 1A.1 proposed projects. The project team based this scoring template on best practices related to common state and federal project delivery processes, including the Oregon Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration processes, best practices within project delivery, and experience assessing risk for Step 2 Regional Flexible Fund Allocation projects in the 2022-2024 and 2025-2027 cycles.

The intention for the project delivery assessment is to understand if the estimated budgets and schedules for each project will sufficiently address necessary scope items and rules and regulations of state and federal project delivery. If these are addressed, the risk to project delays, budget overages, and inability to deliver the intended scope is reduced.

## Attachment 3. 28-30 RFFA Step 1A.1 - Project Delivery Assessment

Each project is evaluated based on evaluation criteria grouped into six broad categories, including scope, schedule, and budget sufficiency related to:

- Planning
- Partnerships and Support
- Environmental Considerations
- Preliminary Engineering and Design
- Construction
- FTA Considerations\*

\*Only applicable to nominations in the CIG project category

The intent of utilizing the criteria under these six categories is not to rank projects against one another but to better understand whether there are additional scope, schedule, and/or budget considerations that may need to be added to lead to successful delivery of projects.

For each criterion, the assessment team identified whether the project 1) completed the step and/or sufficiently addressed the need in the scope, budget, and schedule, 2) insufficiently addressed the need in the scope, budget, and schedule, or 3) did not address the need. The assessment team performed the assessment based on materials provided by the applicant. If information was not provided or not provided in sufficient detail to indicate that a criterion is addressed, the project team assumed it is not addressed. At the request of Kittelson and Metro, applicants provided additional information to aid in assessing their projects.

Some projects are only requesting funds for planning, while others are requesting funding through construction. The project team primarily assessed the risk of each project to be completed through the project phase for which Step 1A.1 funding would be provided. Because of this, the project team is primarily applying criteria relevant to the level of project development for which the project is requesting funding. Therefore, projects not requesting construction funding will not be assessed against criteria relevant to construction; however, we have requested the applicant provide information on their plan for funding future construction of the project. This is provided alongside the results of the project delivery assessment, as it is relevant to understanding the likelihood of a project receiving future funding for construction.

### Assessment Summaries

Kittelson developed a summary of each project requesting funding through the RFFA process. The summary includes a project description, funding overview, project phases, and project applicant. The summary also includes Kittelson's assessment of the likely adequacy of the proposed project scope, schedule and budget. Recommended actions to address project delivery considerations are organized according to project delivery assessment categories: Planning (PL), Partnerships and Support (PS), Environmental Considerations (EC), Design (DE), Construction (CN), and FTA Considerations (FTA).

To aid in the review process, a short glossary of terms is provided below, followed by the nine project summaries.



## Attachment 3. 28-30 RFFA Step 1A.1 - Project Delivery Assessment

---

**Federal Transit Administration (FTA):** The government agency responsible for funding and regulating public transportation systems in the United States.

**Federal Highway Administration (FHWA):** The government agency responsible for funding and regulating ground transportation in the public right of way in the United States.

**Capital Improvement Grant (CIG):** A discretionary grant program within the Federal Transit Administration's Section 5309 that focuses on Fixed Guideway (i.e. rail or similar) systems. Large transit agencies commonly use it as a source of capital construction funding. The CIG program is divided into three subprograms: New Starts, Small Starts, and Core Capacity.

**New Starts:** CIG funding for design and construction of new fixed-guideways or extensions to fixed guideways (projects that operate on a separate right-of-way exclusively for public transport or include a rail or catenary system. For projects over \$400 million in total costs, seeking more than \$150 million in grants.

**Small Starts:** CIG funding for design and construction of corridor-based bus rapid transit projects operating in mixed traffic that represents a substantial investment in the corridor and emulate the features of rail. Total project cost less than \$400 million, seeking less than \$150 million in grants.

**Planning:** A term for the initial planning and scoping phase of a project, up to 30% conceptual design. The Oregon Department of Transportation refers to this phase as Program Development, while the Federal Transit Administration refers to it as Project Development.

**Design:** A term for the predominant design phase of a project, when Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E) are further developed from 30% to 100%. The Oregon Department of Transportation refers to this as Project Development, while the Federal Transit Administration refers to it as Engineering.

**Construction:** A term for the phase of a project after 100% Plans, Specifications and Estimates are complete and the project is put out to bid. Includes all work until the improvement is open and operational.

**Certified Agency:** An organization that has been qualified to deliver federally funded projects by the Oregon Department of Transportation. The Federal Highway Administration allows states to determine appropriate oversight methods for delivering federally funded projects and ODOT uses a certification process. Once approved, they are known as a Certified Agency and can deliver projects as opposed to working with ODOT to deliver the project.

## Attachment 3. 28-30 RFFA Step 1A.1 - Project Delivery Assessment

### Capital Investment Grant Projects

Project Name	Montgomery Park Streetcar Extension	
<b>Project Description:</b>	<p>The Portland Streetcar Montgomery Park Extension Project will extend the Portland Streetcar North-South (NS) Line 0.65 miles one-way (1.3 miles round trip) from its existing terminus at NW 23rd Avenue and NW Northrup Street to a new terminus at NW 26th Avenue and NW Wilson Street near Montgomery Park in Northwest Portland. The Project will support a new transit-oriented mixed use district west of Highway 30 between NW Nicolai and NW Vaughn streets, where underutilized industrial land is proposed to undergo land use changes to employment- and housing-supportive mixed uses</p>	
<b>Project Funding:</b>	<p><i>Requested from RFFA:</i> \$20 million for match to a larger grant</p>	<p><i>Total Project Cost:</i> \$119 million in design and construction anticipated from FTA Small Starts or \$178 million in design, construction and vehicle purchases anticipated from FTA Small Starts.</p>
<b>Project Phase(s):</b>	Design, Construction	
<b>Applicant and Project Delivery:</b>	Portland Bureau of Transportation, Certified Agency	
<b>Project Delivery Considerations for Scope, Schedule and Budget:</b>	<p>Permitting and right-of-way may not be sufficiently addressed in the budget and schedule. The project budget and ridership estimates, key pieces of FTA grants, are contingent on development of the Montgomery Park area.</p>	
<b>Recommended Action:</b>	<p>(DE) Project budget and schedule may require some extension to account for unknowns. (CN) Project schedule may require some extension to account for development timeline which affects ridership estimates and project match.</p> <p><b>FTA Considerations:</b> Project schedule may require some extension to account for development timeline which affects ridership estimates and project match.</p>	

## Attachment 3. 28-30 RFFA Step 1A.1 - Project Delivery Assessment

December 2, 2024

Page 5

2028-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 1A.1 Project Delivery Assessment

Project Name	82 <sup>nd</sup> Ave Transit Project	
<b>Project Description:</b>	<p>The purpose of the 82nd Avenue Transit Project is to improve transit speed, reliability, capacity, safety, comfort, and access for Line 72 through development of a corridor-based bus rapid transit (BRT) route that will include enhanced crossings or traffic signal at all stations; platforms with curbs and waiting areas, shelters, lighting, seating, real-time arrival info. The project seeks to address the needs of people who live, work, learn, shop, and travel within the corridor both today and in the future – in particular, BIPOC and low-income individuals – through context-sensitive transit improvements in a constrained corridor.</p>	
<b>Project Funding:</b>	<p><i>Requested from RFFA:</i> \$30 million to use as match for a larger grant</p>	<p><i>Total Project Cost:</i> \$300 million total anticipated from FTA CIG Small Starts</p>
<b>Project Phase(s):</b>	Design, Construction	
<b>Applicant and Project Delivery:</b>	TriMet, Certified Agency	
<b>Project Delivery Considerations for Scope, Schedule and Budget:</b>	<p>There are unknowns regarding the project scope and schedule due to the fact that the project terminus is currently undecided. The project team expects a terminus decision to be finalized in January. Additional time may be needed in the schedule to account for coordination with and design requirements for multiple jurisdictions, including both PBOT and ODOT. The lack of local match commitments presents a concern to the budget, however the schedule accommodates time to get agreements in place, and potential sources for funding have been identified. The decision for whether Portland Clean Energy Funds may be used as match funding is anticipated to be made in December 2024.</p>	
<b>Recommended Action:</b>	<p>(DE) Project schedule may require some extension to account for multi-jurisdictional coordination, as the project crosses multi-jurisdictional boundaries. (CN) The project team should also focus on securing local match to support project success.</p> <p><b>FTA Considerations:</b> No additional considerations.</p>	

### Attachment 3. 28-30 RFFA Step 1A.1 - Project Delivery Assessment

Project Name	TV Highway Transit Project	
<b>Project Description:</b>	<p>The purpose of the TV Highway Safety and Transit Project is to improve speed, reliability, accessibility and safety for transit riders on TV Highway, particularly for communities of color and low-income communities. The project replaces TriMet Rote 57 with a new Frequent Express (FX) Route and includes improved rider amenities, intersection improvements, and signal enhancements to improve bus speeds.</p>	
<b>Project Funding:</b>	<p><i>Requested from RFFA:</i> \$30 million</p>	<p><i>Total Project Cost:</i> \$300 million total anticipated from FTA CIG Small Starts</p>
<b>Project Phase(s):</b>	Design, Construction	
<b>Applicant and Project Delivery:</b>	TriMet, Certified Agency	
<b>Project Delivery Considerations for Scope, Schedule and Budget:</b>	<p>While the project team has begun coordination with the railroad, railroad right-of-way requirements and rail orders, if necessary, may significantly impact the project schedule. Only a small percentage of the required project match has been secured.</p>	
<b>Recommended Action:</b>	<p>(DE) Although the project team has already engaged the railroad, project schedule may require some extension to account for coordination with the adjacent railroad, including potential rail crossing orders or minor rail right of way acquisition. (CN) The project team should also focus on securing local match to support project success.</p> <p><b>FTA Considerations:</b> No additional considerations.</p>	

## Attachment 3. 28-30 RFFA Step 1A.1 - Project Delivery Assessment

### Transit Vehicle Priority Projects

Project Name	SW 185 <sup>th</sup> MAX Overcrossing	
<b>Project Description:</b>	The purpose of the SW 185th Avenue MAX Overcrossing project is to grade separate MAX light rail vehicles up and over SW 185th Avenue.	
<b>Project Funding:</b>	<i>Requested from RFFA:</i> \$20-\$30 million to be used as match	<i>Total Project Cost:</i> \$108 million total anticipated through Federal Rail Administration crossing elimination program
<b>Project Phase(s):</b>	Design	
<b>Applicant and Project Delivery:</b>	TriMet, Certified Agency	
<b>Project Delivery Considerations for Scope, Schedule and Budget:</b>	<p><b>Project Planning (as requested from RFFA):</b> The schedule may have little flexibility to accommodate any additional complexities that may arise, and the time anticipated for right-of-way acquisition in the schedule may be optimistic.</p> <p><b>Project Construction/Completion:</b> As construction funding is sought, there are limited examples of previous FRA grant funded projects in Oregon, which could result in some unknowns to the overall completion of the project.</p>	
<b>Recommended Action:</b>	<p>(PE) This project is anticipated to include all steps required to accomplish project development, as is the focus for the funding request. Consider extending the schedule to account for uncertainties.</p> <p>(CN) Construction is not part of the funding request, however consider exploring additional or secondary grant/funding sources.</p>	

### Attachment 3. 28-30 RFFA Step 1A.1 - Project Delivery Assessment

Project Name	Better Bus Program	
<b>Project Description:</b>	The program consists of initial planning work and program administration, project development, and design and delivery of a select number of Better Bus projects. Projects will be focused on those that help transit service operate more quickly and reliably. Projects that would advance through this grant could include those identified through the Better Bus program, FX planning, or other efforts depending on evaluation and analysis.	
<b>Project Funding:</b>	<i>Requested from RFFA:</i> \$11 million total project cost	<i>Local Match:</i> \$1,129,700 cash match from Metro local funds
<b>Project Phase(s):</b>	Design, Construction	
<b>Applicant and Project Delivery:</b>	Metro (applicant), TriMet (partner), local jurisdictions (project delivery agencies)	
<b>Project Delivery Considerations for Scope, Schedule and Budget:</b>	If federal funds are used, the scope of each project within the program is expected to grow to address federal requirements. This may impact local partnerships and the number of projects that can be delivered under the requested funding.	
<b>Recommended Action:</b>	(PS, CN). No cost risk mitigation anticipated, however keeping the project funding non-federal is expected to allow for more scope to be completed with requested funding. Project team should also have regular conversations with project partners to update partners on the anticipated scope.	

## Attachment 3. 28-30 RFFA Step 1A.1 - Project Delivery Assessment

December 2, 2024

Page 9

2028-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 1A.1 Project Delivery Assessment

Project Name	Transit and Access-to-Transit Components to Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge	
<b>Project Description:</b>	The Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge (EQRB) Project will replace the existing Burnside Bridge with one that is seismically resilient, and has improved transit, pedestrian, and bicycle access to serve our community for decades to come. Multnomah County will be adding permanent transit improvements to the new bridge and the surrounding area to improve safe access to transit and transit vehicle priority. In 2026, the County will construct permanent improvements along transit, pedestrian, and bicycle detour routes that will be utilized during the construction of the new bridge Improvements such as new bus stops, protected bike lanes, signing and striping, pedestrian refuge islands, traffic diverters and other traffic calming measures, sidewalk reconstruction, and modifications to traffic signals will provide safer access to transit.	
<b>Project Funding:</b>	<i>Requested from RFFA:</i> \$25 million for match to a larger grant	<i>Total Project Cost:</i> \$897 million total via a mix of local and federal funds
<b>Project Phase(s):</b>	Design, Construction	
<b>Applicant and Project Delivery:</b>	Multnomah County, Certified Agency	
<b>Project Delivery Considerations for Scope, Schedule and Budget:</b>	There is a possibility of minor schedule and budget impacts from the extent of planned right-of-way acquisition.	
<b>Recommended Action:</b>	(CN) No cost risk mitigation anticipated, however reserve project funding should be considered in the case that there are complexities with the right-of-way process.	

## Attachment 3. 28-30 RFFA Step 1A.1 - Project Delivery Assessment

### FIRST-LAST MILE AND SAFE ACCESS TO TRASIT PROJECTS

Project Name	Sunrise Gateway Corridor/Highway 212	
<b>Project Description:</b>	The project will focus on improving transit access and the first/last mile connections to and through the North Clackamas Industrial Area. The future improvements will provide key regional connections to support the implementation of the Clackamas to Columbia (C2C) corridor, design solutions to address the gaps in the pedestrian and bikeway facilities along Highway 212/224, first last mile transit access solutions including improved safety of bus stops and seamless transit transfers.	
<b>Project Funding:</b>	<i>Requested from RFFA:</i> \$15 million for design only	<i>Local Match:</i> \$1,540,500 cash match from the Road Fund
<b>Project Phase(s):</b>	Design	
<b>Applicant and Project Delivery:</b>	Clackamas County, Certified Agency	
<b>Project Delivery Considerations for Scope, Schedule and Budget:</b>	<p><b>Project Planning (as requested from RFFA):</b> The project schedule may be underdeveloped, and therefore may not currently anticipate all project complexities that may arise.</p> <p><b>Project Construction/Completion:</b> Project construction is contingent upon securing the extensive required right-of-way, for which funding may not have been considered for relocations; developing a funding plan; and securing grants.</p>	
<b>Recommended Action:</b>	<p>(EC, DE) This project is anticipated to include all steps required to accomplish project development, as is the focus for the funding request. Project schedule may require some extension if complexities arise in environmental permitting or preliminary engineering.</p> <p>(CN) Construction is not part of the funding request, however for project construction, relocation fees should be added to right-of-way costs.</p> <p>After the FEIS is complete, it is only valid for a 3-year period, so it will be important for the project team to secure final design and construction funding though the project development period to keep from needing to perform an additional FEIS update in the future.</p>	



### Attachment 3. 28-30 RFFA Step 1A.1 - Project Delivery Assessment

December 2, 2024

Page 11

2028-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 1A.1 Project Delivery Assessment

<b>Project Name</b>	<b>McLoughlin Boulevard (OR-99E) First and Last Mile and Safe Access to Transit Streetscape Enhancements</b>	
<b>Project Description:</b>	The project includes first/last mile bicycle and pedestrian connection will work in tandem with recently-funded TriMet improvements to Line 33, including transit signal priority on McLoughlin Boulevard for Line 33 (east of 10th Street), to activate McLoughlin Boulevard as a transit corridor with safe and comfortable active transportation connections.	
<b>Project Funding:</b>	<i>Requested from RFFA:</i> \$9 million for design and construction	<i>Local Match:</i> \$924,300 in cash match from Transportation System Development Charges
<b>Project Phase(s):</b>	Design, Construction	
<b>Applicant and Project Delivery:</b>	City of Oregon City. Delivery by ODOT	
<b>Project Delivery Considerations for Scope, Schedule and Budget:</b>	The project schedule may not appropriately account for the ODOT project delivery process or collaboration required with ODOT staff due to the project location within ODOT's right-of-way.	
<b>Recommended Action:</b>	(DE) Project schedule may require some extension to account for multi-jurisdictional coordination, and to account for the ODOT federal aid delivery process.	

### Attachment 3. 28-30 RFFA Step 1A.1 - Project Delivery Assessment

Project Name	72 <sup>nd</sup> Ave Phase I Tigard Triangle Corridor Improvements	
<b>Project Description:</b>	This project will transform 72nd Avenue into a complete street featuring separated cycle tracks, sidewalks, enhanced pedestrian crossings, and improved transit stops, providing safer and more sustainable transit options.	
<b>Project Funding:</b>	<i>Requested from RFFA:</i> \$15,904,000 total project cost	<i>Local Match:</i> \$3,976,000 in cash match from tax increment financing
<b>Project Phase(s):</b>	Planning, Design, Construction	
<b>Applicant and Project Delivery:</b>	City of Tigard. Delivered by ODOT	
<b>Project Delivery Considerations for Scope, Schedule and Budget:</b>	The project has a well defined scope and identifies mitigations for possible complexities. A funding gap exists between the updated cost estimate and the proposed funding sources in the initial application.	
<b>Recommended Action:</b>	(PL) Project's funding strategy may need to be expanded to account for full project cost estimates.	

### Assessment Summary Table

A table summarizing the assessment information follows on the next page and contains the following headings:

- **Project Applicant**
- **Project Name and Description**
- **Overview of Project Delivery Considerations**  
This information matches the project summaries in this memorandum and allows for consolidated project review
- **Cost Risk Mitigation Needs**  
Mitigation needs are identified according to the project delivery assessment categories Kittelson reviewed and include Planning, Partnerships and Support, Environmental Considerations, Design, Construction and FTA Considerations. Recommended actions are matched with mitigation needs.
- **Recommended Action**  
Actions that can be taken to address anticipated cost risk mitigation needs.

For each project, if cost risk mitigation is suggested the appropriate project delivery assessment category is identified along with a level of mitigation effort. The level of mitigation effort is sorted into low, medium and high, which corresponds to the impact an unaddressed consideration could have on the project.

# PROJECT DELIVERY ASSESSMENT - SUMMARY

The table below provides an overview of project delivery considerations, mitigation needs to reduce cost risk, and the recommended actions.

### Project Delivery Assessment Categories






- PL Planning
- PS Partnerships & Support
- EC Environmental Considerations
- DE Design
- CN Construction
- FTA FTA Considerations

### Mitigation Effort

- Low
- Medium
- High

Project Applicant	Project Name & Description	Overview of Project Delivery Considerations	Cost Mitigation Risk	Recommended Action
<b>CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANT PROJECTS</b>				
PBOT	<p><b>Montgomery Park Streetcar Extension</b> This project is part of the Montgomery Park Area Plan, and this extension will bring streetcar service to Montgomery Park, enhancing transit access and supporting planned development in the area.</p>	Permitting and right-of-way may not be sufficiently addressed in the budget and schedule. The project budget and ridership estimates, key pieces of FTA grants, are contingent on development of the Montgomery Park area.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><span style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 2px;">DE</span> Project budget and schedule may require some extension to account for unknowns.</li> <li><span style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 2px;">CN</span> <span style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 2px;">FTA</span> Project schedule may require some extension to account for development timeline, which affects ridership estimates and project match.</li> </ul>
TriMet	<p><b>82<sup>nd</sup> Ave Transit Project</b> The purpose of the project is to improve transit speed, reliability, capacity, safety, comfort, and access for Line 72 through the development of a Frequent Express (FX) route that will include enhanced crossings or traffic signals at all stations; platforms with curbs and waiting areas, shelters, lighting, seating, real-time arrival info</p>	There are unknowns regarding the project scope and schedule due to the fact that the project terminus is currently undecided. The project team expects a terminus decision to be finalized in January. Additional time may be needed in the schedule to account for coordination with and design requirements for multiple jurisdictions, including both PBOT and ODOT. The lack of local match commitments presents a concern to the budget, however the schedule accommodates time to get agreements in place, and potential sources for funding have been identified. The decision for whether Portland Clean Energy Funds may be used as match funding is anticipated to be made in December 2024.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><span style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 2px;">DE</span> Project schedule may require some extension to account for multi-jurisdictional coordination, as the project crosses multi-jurisdictional boundaries.</li> <li><span style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 2px;">CN</span> The project team should also focus on securing local match to support project success.</li> </ul>
TriMet	<p><b>TV Highway Transit Project</b> The project replaces TriMet Route 57 with a new Frequent Express (FX) Route and includes improved rider amenities, intersection improvements, and signal enhancements to improve bus speeds.</p>	While the project team has begun coordination with the railroad, railroad right-of-way requirements and rail orders, if necessary, may significantly impact the project schedule. Only a small percentage of the required project match has been secured.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><span style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 2px;">DE</span> Although the project team has already engaged the railroad, project schedule may require some extension to account for coordination with the adjacent railroad, including potential rail crossing orders or minor rail right of way acquisition.</li> <li><span style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 2px;">CN</span> The project team should also focus on securing local match to support project success.</li> </ul>
<b>TRANSIT VEHICLE PRIORITY PROJECTS</b>				
Hillsboro	<p><b>185<sup>th</sup> Max Overcrossing</b> The project intends to grade separate MAX light rail vehicles up and over SW 185th Avenue.</p>	The schedule may have little flexibility to accommodate any additional complexities that may arise, and the time anticipated for right-of-way acquisition in the schedule may be optimistic. As construction funding is sought, there are limited examples of previous FRA grant funded projects in Oregon, which could result in some unknowns to the overall completion of the project.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><span style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 2px;">DE</span> This project is anticipated to include all steps required to accomplish project development, as is the focus for the funding request. Consider extending the schedule to account for uncertainties.</li> <li><span style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 2px;">CN</span> Construction is not part of the funding request, however for project construction, the project team should consider exploring additional or secondary grant/funding sources.</li> </ul>

\*Not included in project funding request

Project Applicant	Project Name & Description	Overview of Project Delivery Considerations	Cost Mitigation Risk	Recommended Action
Metro	<p><b>Better Bus</b> Projects will be focused on those that help transit service operate more quickly and reliably. Projects that would advance through this grant could include those identified through the Better Bus program, FX planning, or other efforts depending on evaluation and analysis.</p>	<p>If federal funds are used, the scope of each project within the program is expected to grow to address federal requirements. This may impact local partnerships and the number of projects that can be delivered under the requested funding.</p>		<p><b>PS</b> <b>CN</b> No cost risk mitigation anticipated, however keeping the project funding non-federal is expected to allow for more scope to be completed with requested funding. Project team should also have regular conversations with project partners to update partners on the anticipated scope.</p>
Multnomah County	<p><b>Burnside Bridge</b> This project will replace the existing Burnside Bridge with a new structure designed to withstand seismic activity. The new bridge will improve transit, pedestrian, and bicycle access, offering a more resilient and accessible crossing point.</p>	<p>There is a possibility of minor schedule and budget impacts from the extent of planned right-of-way acquisition.</p>		<p><b>CN</b> No cost risk mitigation anticipated, however reserve project funding should be considered in the case that there are complexities with the right-of-way process.</p>
<b>FIRST-LAST MILE AND SAFE ACCESS TO TRANSIT PROJECTS</b>				
Clackamas County	<p><b>Sunrise Corridor</b> The project will focus on improving transit access and the first/last mile connections to and through the North Clackamas Industrial Area. The future improvements will provide key regional connections to support the implementation of the Clackamas to Columbia (C2C) corridor, design solutions to address the gaps in the pedestrian and bikeway facilities along Highway 212/224, first last mile transit access solutions including improved safety of bus stops and seamless transit transfers.</p>	<p>The project schedule may be underdeveloped, and therefore may not currently anticipate all project complexities that may arise. Project construction is contingent upon securing the extensive required right-of-way, for which funding may not have been considered for relocations; developing a funding plan; and securing grants.</p>		<p><b>EC</b> <b>DE</b> (EC, DE) This project is anticipated to include all steps required to accomplish project development, as is the focus for the funding request. Project schedule may require some extension if complexities arise in environmental permitting or preliminary engineering.</p> <p><b>CN</b> Construction is not part of the funding request, however for project construction, relocation fees should be added to right-of-way costs.</p> <p>After the FEIS is complete, it is only valid for a 3-year period, so it will be important for the project team to secure final design and construction funding though the project development period to keep from needing to perform an additional FEIS update in the future.</p>
Oregon City	<p><b>McLoughlin Blvd OR-99E</b> The project includes first/last mile bicycle and pedestrian connection that will work in tandem with recently-funded TriMet improvements to Line 33, including transit signal priority on McLoughlin Boulevard for Line 33 (east of 10th Street), to activate McLoughlin Boulevard as a transit corridor with safe and comfortable active transportation connections.</p>	<p>The project schedule may not appropriately account for the ODOT project delivery process or collaboration required with ODOT staff due to the project location within ODOT's right-of-way.</p>		<p><b>DE</b> Project schedule may require some extension to account for multi-jurisdictional coordination, including the ODOT federal aid delivery process.</p>
Tigard	<p><b>72<sup>nd</sup> Ave - Phase 1 Tigard Triangle Corridor Improvements</b> This project will transform 72nd Avenue from Pacific Highway to Dartmouth St into a complete street featuring separated cycle tracks, sidewalks, enhanced pedestrian crossings, and improved transit stops, providing safer and more sustainable transit options.</p>	<p>The project has a well defined scope and identifies mitigations for possible complexities. A funding gap exists between the updated cost estimate and the proposed funding sources in the initial application.</p>		<p><b>PL</b> Project's funding strategy may need to be expanded to account for full project cost estimates.</p>

\*Not included in project funding request