

EXHIBIT A
OREGON FREIGHT ADVISORY COMMITTEE – CONNECTOREGON FEEDBACK SEPTEMBER 13, 2006

GOOD POINTS	NEED IMPROVEMENT	NEXT STEPS
Private sector involvement in decisions.	Transit projects didn't rank well due to the considerations in the bill; hard coming up with transit projects; would have been even harder if there had been more freight projects.	Allocate money based on top needs not on an equal basis by regions.
Region 1 committee ranking process worked very well. The Region 1 ACT put together a criteria list and stuck to it.	Less \$4-6m projects and more smaller ones; funds not spread around as much as hoped given so many big projects.	Overcoming multiple calls to applicants by ODOT staff could be alleviated by a pre-application conference.
Freight Mobility staff did huge amount of work.	Smaller applicants didn't have resources to prepare applications.	Criteria to review projects needs work. Focus on economic return to state favors larger projects. What was really meant by this?
Region 3 staff work.	Guidance in SB; however, not enough detail and many more questions than answers; had to make up rules as went along. Imprecise understanding of how to rank led to thumbs up-thumbs down at ACT level; at the SuperACT meeting, the leadership of Region 3 Alternatives to Surface Transportation Director provided guidance to get the dollars 'on the road' where they would make the most difference statewide. Region 3 had numerous good, small projects and if there was funding available, would have recommended all of them, but the projects that were ultimately selected were the ones that made a difference statewide.	Application document needs to be more definitive.
Work completed under <i>ConnectOregon</i> is an excellent foundation.	More review time needed for applications.	<i>ConnectOregon II</i> : Standard criteria and prioritization factors need to be applied Application review process done on a region specific basis and have firms within region review applications because they will have more information on projects
ODOT and staff commended for first try at <i>ConnectOregon</i> . It was a success.		If additional documentation requirements are added to application, entities with a staff of 2 to 3 won't be able to compete. Challenge – how to get more information but not knock out the small applicants.

GOOD POINTS	NEED IMPROVEMENT	NEXT STEPS
OFAC Projects Subcommittee process was open to all who showed up; had the opportunity that no other committee did, to examine all 103 projects – statewide freight viewpoint, selected most important projects to the statewide transportation system.	Lots of good, small projects in Region 2 SuperACT, just not enough funding to include all the small port projects. Some ports came up with good arguments; however, it was difficult for them to compete with larger projects with greater impact on the state transportation system.	Set of criteria and prioritization factors similar to STIP.
Consensus Committee process.	Name membership sooner. Provide materials much sooner. Provide clearer guidelines about the level of effort and preparation needed. Provide colored spreadsheets much sooner and clearly indicate which committees were involved in each “green”, “red”, and “purple” designation. Green = approval by all committees that reviewed project. Red = not recommended by any committee. Purple = recommended by at least one committee.	
Good process at Consensus Committee, easy to participate, opinions mattered.	ACT should have done the work that the Region 3 staff did; how to get inputs from ACTs to go to SuperACTs.	Application review process regionally because regional knowledge.
Railroad (UP) very pleased with Consensus Committee process.	Railroads would like to see funding allocated for the top projects in the state – not regionally.	More time for all major steps.
Outstanding how list got finalized.	Small ports reluctant to support if <i>ConnectOregon II</i> uses same process as <i>ConnectOregon I</i> .	UP would like to take advantage of good weather and get the Winchester Yard graded before inclement weather. They are finding the money isn't available yet.
Apples and elephants.	Lot of debate about how to score, how to approach decisions in OFAC subcommittee.	Feeling that about freight (99%) and small port projects had difficulty competing vs. larger ports although good projects.
No feedback from ACTs to subcommittee.	Committee (rail) in a strange position re judging merits of ethanol plants.	Ports set-aside? Small projects set-aside? Transit set-aside?
The questions were not definitive in the applications, lot of room for variation in applicant responses. Difficult to compare and evaluate.	Small applicants can't support a large complex process even if a really good project.	Modal committees should review projects first and report their findings and rationale for each project to SuperACTs.
ODOT and staff commended for outstanding	Three jobs in Rainier matter more than 20 jobs in	Required representation from all regions on

GOOD POINTS	NEED IMPROVEMENT	NEXT STEPS
job in short time with reasonable result.	Portland but the process did not specifically allow for this issue to be evaluated.	OFAC project review committee.
Facilitator had a large part in bringing Consensus Committee to close.	State Board of Aviation does not want to support private sector projects such as hangars that, if marketable, can be built without public assistance.	Designate steps to better include a broad spectrum of applicants.
	Legislative intent needs to be clarified: is the focus freight, economic stimulus, operations support, etc.?	Transit in for political reasons; if stays in, must be treated differently, carve-out and / or separate criteria.
	Some of the SuperACTs wanted “peanut butter” approach without regard for the considerations of the program; some regions completed the evaluation and prioritization according to guidelines provided	Persist in emphasizing strategic statewide view.
	Is the transportation system a statewide system or a compilation of regional systems? We are divided / schizophrenic about this.	Clarify economic return language.
	Consensus Committee starting point was regional lists not modal; gave a regional focus to the process.	If there is a <i>ConnectOregon II</i> , the State Board of Aviation Chair intends to talk with Oregon airport managers well ahead of time about what kinds of projects will succeed (and what won't).
	Hard to make the criteria work so began making it up on the fly, especially true for Transit which would not have rated well vs. strict approach; some seat of pants decisions.	Don't make the review process too tight but consider Transit and small project set-asides.
	Provide ODOT regions with some level of resource to help small applicant, and /or pre-application process / conference.	Regions that followed the rules provide a template for future action.
	Technical and policy sides of process mixed together. Overlaying regional lists with rigid technical analysis of modal lists helped to show up the best projects in the Consensus Committee process.	
	Get systemic list of projects together; how does this small project make a contribution to the system? Small applicants did not expect this.	