*Connect*Oregon IV

Final Recommendation Report

*Connect*Oregon IV Final Review Committee

June 13, 2012

1 Introduction 1
2 *Connect*Oregon IV Program Development 1
2.1 Policy Team Guidance 1
2.2 Administrative Rule Development 1
2.3 Application Procedures Development 1
3 *Connect*Oregon IV Review Prior to the Final Review Committee 2
3.1 Completeness, Eligibility and Feasibility Review 2
3.1.1 Economic Benefit Review 2
3.1.2 Statutory Consideration Review 2
3.1.3 Tiers 3
3.2 Instructions to Reviewers 3
3.3 Committee Review 4
3.3.1 Conflict of Interest 4
3.3.2 Modal Committees Review 4
3.3.3 Regional Committees Review ("SuperACTs") 4
3.4 Staff Coordination for Final Review Committee 4
4 *Connect*Oregon IV Final Review Committee 5
4.1 Committee Membership 5
4.2 Meeting Facilitator 6
4.3 Memorandum of Collaboration 6
4.4 Conflict of Interest 6
4.5 Final Review Process 6
4.6 Committee Member Comments 6
4.7 Final Review Committee Prioritization 7
Appendix 1 Committee Member Comments 13
Appendix 2 Modal Committee Report Matrices 17
Appendix 3 Regional Committee Matrices 26
Appendix 4 Memorandum of Collaboration 33
Appendix 5 Staff Presentation of Projects for Review (06/13/12) 44

1 Introduction

This report summarizes the *Connect*Oregon IV (CO IV) Program development and project selection process from August 2011 through June 13, 2012. Section 1 describes the development of the *Connect*Oregon IV program, Section 2 explains and documents the application review by the modal and regional committees, and Section 3 documents the actions of the Final Review Committee.

2 *Connect*Oregon IV Program Development

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) developed the following organizational structure, administrative rules, application process, and review processes to implement the *Connect*Oregon IV program.

2.1 Policy Team Guidance

In August 2011, ODOT formed a *Connect*Oregon IV Policy Team to provide executive level direction during the CO IV program development and project selection. The CO IV Policy Team was chaired by Jerri Bohard, Administrator, Transportation Development Division, and included the ODOT Chief of Staff, Government Relations Manager, Rail Administrator, Public Transit Administrator, Director of Communications, and Freight Mobility Manager.

2.2 Administrative Rule Development

The *Connect*Oregon program administrative rules (OR 731, Division 35) were updated to reflect statutory changes made by the Legislature during the 2011 Oregon Legislative session. The rule amendment eliminates the allocation to rural airports of at least five percent of the net proceeds of lottery bonds used for the *Connect*Oregon program as directed by Section 22 of House Bill 5036 (2011). The proposed amendments further allows the Oregon Transportation Commission to award funds available in the Multimodal Transportation Fund due to earnings, loan repayment or grant awards refunded as a result of projects completed below cost or project termination. Finally, the rule amendment deletes the requirement that Multimodal Transportation Fund earnings be used only for grants or loans for passenger rail projects.

The aforementioned amended Administrative Rule was adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission on December 21, 2012.

2.3 Application Procedures Development

Based on stakeholder feedback, ODOT staff streamlined CO IV applications and application instructions. Furthermore, staff redesigned certain questions to better emphasize project readiness, job creation, and measurable outcomes as review considerations. Application material and instructions were posted on ODOT's website on October 3, 2012.

As part of the application materials, a sample Grant Agreement was included to allow all applicants to be aware of the grant terms and conditions. The Grant Agreement requires *Connect*Oregon IV fund recipients to provide ODOT with a written report specifying jobs created and measures of project success resulting from the project within 18 months of project

completion. The sample Grant Agreement may be viewed at http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/ConnectOR.shtml under Application Process.

3 *Connect*Oregon IV Review Prior to the Final Review Committee

This section summarizes the project review process prior to the final review committee; Project applications were due on November 21, 2011. By the application Due Date, ODOT had received 70 CO IV project applications.

3.1 Completeness, Eligibility and Feasibility Review

Staff from three state agencies (ODOT, Oregon Business Development Department and Department of Aviation) reviewed all applications for completeness, administrative eligibility, and technical feasibility. During this period, staff communicated with applicants to clarify specific information contained in the applications. The completeness, eligibility, and feasibility reviews ended on February 18, 2012. Based on these assessments, the Policy Team examined the project applications deemed to be ineligible or that contained elements that did not qualify for program funding. Four (4) applications were deemed ineligible and removed from consideration. None of the 4 ineligible applicants appealed the decision. A total of 64 projects moved on to modal and regional review. (Note: One (1) eligible application was withdrawn by the applicant at a later date due to factors internal to the applicant. Also, one of the initial applications was deemed an emergency by the legislature and was funded with non-*Connect*Oregon IV Multimodal Transportation funds – leaving 64 projects for consideration.)

3.1.1 Economic Benefit Review

*Connect*Oregon staff worked with ODOT economists to update economic benefit scoring methodology for review staff to capture the degree of economic benefit a proposed project may have to the State. The revised scoring template identified specific CO IV application questions related to each economic benefit consideration and provided a consistent method of assessing the economic benefit of each project. The scoring and subsequent tiering information was contained in the Instructions to Applicants to inform applicants how the economic benefit consideration would be assessed. Each application received two (2) economic benefit evaluations: one from an ODOT economist and one from an OBDD Business Development Officer. Staff Statutory Consideration reviews were completed on January 6, 2012. The economic benefit assessment and scores were included in the review materials provided to each review committee.

3.1.2 Statutory Consideration Review

OAR 731-035-0060 requires review committees and the Oregon Transportation Commission to consider a set of five (5) Statutory Considerations when prioritizing projects. The 5 considerations are as follow:

a. Whether a proposed transportation project reduces transportation costs for Oregon businesses or improves access to jobs and sources of labor;
b. Whether a proposed transportation project results in an economic benefit to this state. (See Section 3.1.1 above);

c. Whether a proposed transportation project is a critical link connecting elements of Oregon's transportation system that will measurably improve utilization and efficiency of the system;
d. How much of the cost of a proposed transportation project can be borne by the applicant for the grant or loan from any source other than the Multimodal Transportation Funds; and
e. Whether a proposed transportation project is ready for construction.

ODOT staff developed and utilized a set of scoring criteria to determine to what extent each proposed project met the five Statutory Considerations. *Connect*Oregon staff used the aforementioned scoring criteria to award points to each project based on the projects ability to meet each consideration. Each application was reviewed by relevant modal staff including: Department of Aviation staff, ODOT Transit staff, ODOT Rail staff, and OBDD Marine Port staff. Scores were awarded from 0 to 10 based on how thoroughly a project met each consideration. To thoroughly meet a consideration, a project must have demonstrated through application responses and independent verification, that the project will accomplish the intent of the consideration. Staff Statutory Consideration reviews were completed on January 6, 2012. The Statutory Consideration assessment and scores were included in the review materials provided to each review committee.

3.1.3 Tiers

To support review committees' prioritization processes ODOT staff sorted projects into tiers. Tiers were assigned based on scores achieved from a combination of the Statutory Consideration review and the Economic Benefit review and were intended to represent the degree to which each of the Statutory Considerations were met. The tiers include:

Tier 1	41 – 50 Points	The application demonstrates the project meets **all five** considerations **thoroughly.**
Tier 2	31 – 40 Points	The application demonstrates the project meets **most** considerations **thoroughly.**
Tier 3	21 – 30 Points	The application demonstrates the project meets **some** considerations **thoroughly.**
Tier 4	1 - 20 Points	The application **fails** to demonstrate the project meets **any of** the considerations **thoroughly.**

Projects were assigned tiers based on information contained in each project's application. Due to the review scheduled, tiers were not revised when new information came to light. New information was made available to the committees and is reflected in each committee's prioritization (See Section 3.3)

3.2 Instructions to Reviewers

A detailed set of "Instructions to Reviewers" was published on October 3, 2011 for review committee members and the staff supporting review committees. The Instructions provided for a single phase review process where each committee prioritized projects based on tiering scores and their knowledge and expertise.

3.3 Committee Review

Ten review committees provided a comprehensive technical and regional review of project applications. The review committees were divided into two groups – Modal Committees that have a defined transportation mode or technical expertise and Regional Committees that correspond to the *ConnectOregon* regions defined in OAR 731-035-0070.

3.3.1 Conflict of Interest

At the start of each review committee meeting the Committee Chair required members to disclose all conflicts of interest regarding any projects discussed. A conflict of interest means the member is an applicant, or a consultant to the applicant, or is a committee or board member who has assisted the applicant, or has a financial benefit in the project. All conflicts of interest are recorded in the meeting notes.

3.3.2 Modal Committees Review

Five Modal Review Committees reviewed the projects between February 21, 2012 and March 27, 2012. Modal Review Committees included the State Aviation Board (SAB), Oregon Freight Advisory Committee (OFAC), Marine Projects and Planning Advisory Committee (OBDD), Public Transit Advisory Committee (PTAC), and Rail Advisory Committee (RAC). Committees were asked to prioritize projects in order of each project's ability meet the five (5) Statutory Considerations. Where project priority did not correspond with tier scores (i.e. a top priority project received a tier 3 score), review committees were asked to document the reasons for the difference. Modal Review Committees provided ODOT staff with project reports and a prioritization matrix. Each project report and modal prioritization matrix was provided to the Regional Review Committees and the Final Review Committee.

3.3.3 Regional Committees Review ("SuperACTs")

Five Regional Review Committees were formed corresponding to each *Connect*Oregon region identified in OAR 731-035-0070. Regional Review Committees were primarily comprised of members of the ODOT Area Commissions on Transportation. Regional Review Committee reviews occurred between April 2, 2012 and May 8, 2012. Committees were asked to prioritize projects in order of each project's ability meet the five (5) Statutory Considerations. Where project priority did not correspond with tier scores (i.e. a top priority project received a tier 3 score), review committees were asked to document the reasons for the difference. Regional Review Committees provided ODOT staff with project reports and a prioritization matrix. Each project report and modal prioritization matrix was provided to regional review committees and the Final Review Committee.

3.4 Staff Coordination for Final Review Committee

ODOT staff consolidated all project materials, along with modal and regional review project reports and prioritizations, onto a Compact Disk (CD). The CD was sent to each Final Review Committee member two weeks prior to the meeting date. Several hard copy sets of all materials were available in binders during the meeting for members' easy reference. Further, based on modal and regional project reports and prioritizations, staff created a working draft matrix of blended project priorities as a starting point for project discussions. (See Section 4.5 Project

Matrix) Prior to the meeting, members were provided with a Memorandum of Collaboration to review and be prepared to sign at the meeting.

4 *Connect*Oregon IV Final Review Committee

The *Connect*Oregon IV (CO IV) Final Review Committee (FRC) met on June 13, 2012. Through the process identified in Section 4.4, the FRC prioritized the 64 projects with the goal of selecting the best projects throughout the state that benefit air, marine, public transit, rail, and freight transportation. This prioritization is recorded in Section 4.7. This report meets the requirements of a "Final Review Report" identified in ORS 731-035-0060. The Director's office will transmit the Final Recommendation Report to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC). The OTC will hold a public hearing on the recommended project list in July and make its project selection decision in August 2012.

4.1 Committee Membership

The FRC is comprised of 24 members (listed below), with representatives from each of the Modal and Regional Review Committees. The members of the FRC have served the State of Oregon in a variety of capacities including the *Connect*Oregon I, II, and III consensus committees. William Thorndike is the Chair of the FRC. Mr. Thorndike currently operates his family business, Medford Fabrication, a custom steel fabrication. Additionally, Mr. Thorndike currently serves on the boards of Oregon Business Council, Asante Health System, Pacific Retirement Services, Regence- Oregon BlueCross Blue Shield, Crater Lake National Park Trust, Southern Oregon Regional Economic Development, Inc., Oregon Economic Forum, The Oregon Idea and the Northwest Area Foundation.

Committee Members

William Thorndike, Chair	Shirley Kalkhoven
Dave Anderson	Carole Knapel
Julie Brown	Susie Lahsene
Dee Burch	Roger Nyquist
Bruce Carswell	Terry Parker
Martin Callery	Mike Quilty
Robert Eaton	Bob Russell
Mark Gardiner	Al Switzer
Steve Grasty	Alan Unger
Jerry Grossnickle	Tracy Ann Whalen
Bob Hooker	Fred Warner
Tony Hyde	Ken Woods

4.2 Meeting Facilitator

ODOT selected Jim Owens of Cogan Owens Cogan, LLC, to facilitate the FRC.

4.3 Memorandum of Collaboration

At the beginning of the Final Review process each member of the FRC signed a Memorandum of Collaboration. The Memorandum details the roles and responsibilities of the participants in the process. A copy of the Memorandum of Collaboration is included in Appendix 4.

4.4 Conflict of Interest

At the start of each session, the Committee Chair required committee members to disclose all conflict of interests regarding any projects being discussed. A conflict of interest means the member is an applicant, or a consultant to the applicant, or is a committee or board member who has assisted the applicant, or has a financial benefit in the project. All conflicts of interest are recorded in the meeting notes.

4.5 Final Review Process

The committee used a Single Text Process to accomplish its work. A Single Text Process provides an opportunity for many parties to collaborate in drafting a single document.
Jim Owens facilitated the committee discussion resulting in a recommended prioritized project list. Throughout the work sessions, committee members had the opportunity to respond to the working draft prioritization documents, including this report, with the goal of achieving consensus on the final prioritized project list recommendations.

Project Matrix

In order to simultaneously present all previous reviews to the Final Review Committee, a matrix was prepared that displayed the staff tiering and modal and regional review committees' prioritizations (See Appendix 5). The working draft project matrix initially placed the projects in a blended prioritization order.

The order of project presentation was established by converting committee priorities into a ratio and then calculating the project's average of all committees' priorities. The highest average priority score (lowest number) was placed at the top of the list with subsequent projects listed in priority order. Color coding was used to indicate if the given project was in the top, middle, or lowest third of a given committee's prioritization. In addition to prioritization color coding, the staff tier and prioritization of each modal and regional committee was displayed in the matrix.

4.6 Committee Member Comments

To provide a record of the thoughts of individual members, comments were solicited at the end of the second day of meeting. The comments were collected on index cards and are in Appendix 1.

4.7 Final Review Committee Prioritization

The Final Review Committee unanimously supported the recommendation below. Following the recommendation is a table displaying the prioritized CO IV Final Review Committee Recommendation list.

ConnectOregon IV Final Review Committee proposes its recommendation to Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) to:

> Fund the list as recommended in priority order up to $ 39,536,333.00 with available resources from the Multimodal Transportation Fund, including but not limited to net bond proceeds, funds generated by loan repayment, and returned or unspent funds.

The Final Review Committee encourages the Union Pacific Railroad Company to work with Benton County, Oregon in good faith during discussions of the potential transfer of the Bailey Branch and Hull Oakes Lead to Benton County, Oregon.

The Final Review Committee further recommends that *Connect*Oregon staff work with the following project applicants to ensure project compliance with *Connect*Oregon legislation and rules as defined in ORS 367.080 through 367.086 and OAR 731-035-0020 through 731-035-0080 prior to final OTC approval.

> 4T0203 Mid-Columbia Council of Governments, The Dalles Transit Center
>
> 4R0201 City of Madras, Madras – BNSF Rail Improvement Project

Transmittal and Signatures

The following pages include the signatures of the Final Review Committee and a transmittal of the committee's recommendations to ODOT and the OTC.

June 13, 2012

Director Matthew Garrett
Oregon Department of Transportation
1158 Chemeketa Street NE
Salem, OR 97301

Dear Director Garrett:

*Connect*Oregon IV Final Review Committee Project Recommendations

On June 13, 2012, the *Connect*Oregon IV Final Review Committee completed a prioritized list of our project recommendations. This Final Recommendation Report documents the review of projects by this committee, and provides background regarding the development of the *Connect*Oregon IV program and project selection prior to the meeting of this committee.

The *Connect*Oregon IV Final Review Recommendation List included in this report records our recommendation to the Oregon Transportation Commission for consideration at the Commission's public hearing in Salem on July 18, 2012.

Sincerely,

The *Connect*Oregon IV Final Review Committee

Dave Anderson

Dave Anderson
(Signature)

6/13/12
Date

Julie Brown

Julie Brown
(Signature)

6/13/12
Date

Dee Burch

Dee Burch
(Signature)

6/13/12
Date

Bruce Carswell

(Signature)

5/13/12
Date

Martin Callery

(Signature) Date 6-13-2012

Robert Eaton

(Signature) Date 6-13-2012

Mark Gardiner

(Signature) Date 6/13/12

Steve Grasty

(Signature) Date 6-13-12

Jerry Grossnickle

(Signature) Date

Bob Hooker

(Signature) Date 6-13-12

Tony Hyde

(Signature) Date

Shirley Kalkhoven

(Signature) Date June 13, 2012

Carole Knapel

(Signature) Date 6-13-2012

BOB HOOKER

6-13-12

Susie Lahsene

(Signature) Date 6/13/12

Roger Nyquist

(Signature) Date 6/12/12

Terry Parker

(Signature) Date June 13, 2012

Mike Quilty

(Signature) Date June 13, 2012

Bob Russell

(Signature) Date 6/13/12

Al Switzer

(Signature) Date 6-13-2012

Alan Unger

(Signature) Date 6-13-2012

Tracy Ann Whalen

(Signature) Date 6/12/2012

Fred Warner

(Signature) 6/13/12 Date

Ken Woods

(Signature) 6-13-2012 Date

William Thorndike, Chair

(Signature) 6/13/2012 Date

Appendix 1 Committee Member Comments

The order of listing for the comments below is alphabetical by the last name of the commenting member.

Julie Brown
Overall the process went well. I appreciate the work the staff provided and felt the weighing process and ranking was done well. I encourage the Commission to direct staff on providing the ACTs with clear process so that all committees are ranking projects in a similar way. It was difficult making decisions on Region 4.

Robert Eaton
Comprehensive process that balanced numerous criteria (legislative, regional and modal). Good work product as a result.

Mark Gardiner
Aviation does not think Freight should get a whack at our projects – not really appropriate from our perspective. Room and logistics were good – thanks! Good job to the ODOT staff and Jim, our Chair. Process comments (most of which are upstream of today's meeting):

- The Aviation Board was not particularly pleased with the early "technical" review process by whomever. We did not feel the understanding of aviation was sufficient to make those rankings – both transportation and economic development.
- More work still needs to be done on how the region and mode processes interact (or don't). Witness Region 4's changes which were not checked with the modes.
- We need a constraint process regarding changes to projects and dollars after the applications. Witness Region 4's changes, again.
- I think it helped that the staff/consultant team provided an ordinal list at the beginning – you might even consider doing one with the regional minima already cooked in.
- As Jim noticed, I was not hot on the idea of re-opening the substantive discussion after the full list was done. People had plenty of chances to advocate for their projects before the list was finalized.

Overall the meeting was very well done, but the upstream process still needs work.

Steve Grasty
In the future the modes and Regions need to meet before this meeting. Great job!

Shirley Kalkhoven
The process went very well once we got past the usual conversation about modal ranking versus Region ranking. Members were thoughtful in their comments and provided useful responses to questions. Facilitating was very well done.

Susie Lahsene
ODOT staff has done an excellent job. The guidance, however, through rules should be "tightened up". Again I think this is a model process and one that should be promoted nationally.

The work of the committee has improved considerably through this effort. I recommend more effort on translating the benefits to the state.

Roger Nyquist
Things went well, everyone operated in good faith. Biggest improvement that could be made would be to better coordinate things.

Terry Parker
I really appreciated the positive response (as per request) to ensure that participants could hear. This should be a mandatory request in meetings of this size and nature. The preliminary work going into the session was great. Michael Bufalino did a good job of being clear about process and preference on approach building off of previous CO sessions. The conversations were respectful and civil. As in previous sessions I believe that Public Transit is under-represented in the process. The economic benefits to the state (outside of Tri-Met) for transit are not well understood or acknowledged.

It seems as if there could be a better connection between the regional and modal reviews that encourages a better exchange of information and consideration of modal and regional priorities. In some regions that may occur informally but is not apparent. The Final Review Committee could be better informed about overall themes and trends (by mode and by region) of the projects being considered by highlighting these in short summary. I always learn something new at these meetings such as the example given today about the importance of the growing pole industry. But it is hard to integrate information "on the fly" and meaningfully apply it to the range of projects under review.

Thank you for all of your hard work.

Mike Quilty
Thank you for including me on the CO IV Final Review Committee. Staff did a very good job of preparing and presenting the information. The process went smoothly and quickly. As always, our needs vastly outpace our ability to fund needed transportation infrastructure. The *Connect*Oregon program is an important part of meeting that need.

Bob Russell
Great process! The staff work was outstanding which led to a consensus on the first day.

Al Switzer
The process was much better than CO III. Best of luck with CO V.

William Thorndike
A complex task that was accomplished by good preparation and representation by stakeholders who came prepared to do the work.

Alan Unger
This was my first time being involved in the super committee. I was impressed how ODOT managed the process from Pat's opening remarks, Jerri's oversight, Michael's positive interaction with the committee and Chris's management of the spreadsheet and overhead. Bill Thorndike managed the meeting well, and Jim Owen facilitated well. We made our recommendations in one day and I think that is a first.

What would I change? Transit did not come out of the process with many projects. Transit did not get a much committee review as the other projects. All other modes were reviewed by their mode and the OFAC, then the region. Did this make a difference in the scoring and ranking? I do not know but ranking on the list is critical to funding.

There is also a community value vs. a mode value to a project. Community value takes a broader consideration to how a project creates more economic benefit than just the function of the project. Communities are also looking at multiple funding and phasing because they need to do this with tight budgets.

I hope there is a ConnectOregon V. We need to improve our infrastructure and make those connections between modes. Final approval of the projects will be in August which does not leave a lot of time in the construction season. Our asphalt plants close down in October.

Tracy Ann Whalen
This was the first time on the Final Review Committee. The process was interesting. I felt overall it was good. Region 4 had an interesting process in reducing the request amounts to fit their $4 million allocation. Other Regions should know of this innovation.

Fred Warner
Process pretty good. Should have dealt with Regions first. We took ODOT's final ranking as gospel. Maybe should have had a better discussion of the projects at the bottom of cut line. Really did not change based on the discussion. That being said, there was no compelling reason to change the order. Went as well as it could of.

Ken Woods
The priority rankings between modes and Regions was not equal. For example, 1 out of 20 has more insight than 1 out of 7. Suggest to rate them in top 1/3, middle 1/3 and bottom 1/3 for weighing for position on final list that is presented to the Final Review Committee as their starting point.

Unsigned
I feel that the Business Oregon Economic Review process missed the mark in a sizeable number of instances. This is especially true in cases where the requested grant was for the purpose of preserving existing infrastructure rather than creating new. It would be helpful to refine this process by providing a process where Business Oregon reviewers can seek input from modal or regional representatives to assess their scoring process. As these scores play a large role in the ranking, the process needs improvement.

Unsigned

The *Connect*Oregon program continues to fund well documented and vetted non-highway and transit projects that benefit all Oregonians and the Oregon economy. And as has happened in the past there is lively discussion involving the differing perspectives of the modal and regional committees. This debate is valuable in that it better informs committee members about the specific aspects of the project applications.

Appendix 2 Modal Committee Matrices

1

Connect Oregon IV
State Board of Aviation Review

REG	MODE	APP #	APPLICANT	PROJECT NAME	CO GRANT FUNDS REQUESTED	MATCH AMOUNT 20% OF CO PROJECT	ADDITIONAL MATCH	TOTAL PROJECT COST	STATUTORY & ECONOMIC BENEFIT REVIEW	Tier 1 - 41-50 Tier 2 - 31-40 Tier 3 - 21-30 Tier 4 - 1-20 Tier	MODAL COMMITTEE PRIORITY
3	A	3A0190	Jackson County/ RVI-Medford	Rehabilitate Main Runway (R/W 14-32)	$ 521,052.00	$ 130,263.00	$ 9,769,737.00	$ 10,421,052.00	45	1	1
2	A	2A0230	Port of Tillamook Bay	Runway 13-31 Rehabilitation	$ 163,296.00	$ 40,824.00	$ 3,061,794.00	$ 3,265,914.00	42	1	2
4	A	4A0178	City of Bend/Bend Municipal Airport	Taxiway A Rehabilitation/Relocation	$ 192,220.00	$ 48,055.00	$ 3,376,945.00	$ 3,617,220.00	41	1	3
2	A	2A0205	City of Newport	Runway 16/34 Rehabilitation	$ 448,500.00	$ 112,125.00	$ 8,409,375.00	$ 8,970,000.00	40	2	4
5	A	5A0199	Union County	Runway 12-30 Overlay	$ 299,200.00	$ 74,800.00	$ 5,618,100.00	$ 5,992,100.00	39	2	5
4	A	4A0191	City of Redmond	GA Ramp/Taxiway A Recon/Taxiway C Extension	$ 425,000.00	$ 106,250.00	$ 7,968,750.00	$ 8,500,000.00	39	2	6
1	A	1A0217	Port of Portland	Air Trans Center Taxilane - Phase 3	$ 3,500,000.00	$ 875,000.00	$ 13,925,000.00	$ 18,300,000.00	41	1	7
5	A	5A0241	City of Baker City	Baker City Airport Reconstruct Taxiway A	$ 45,000.00	$ 11,250.00	$ 826,855.00	$ 883,105.00	39	2	8
3	A	3A0208	City of Brookings	Regional Airport Project (Crescent City)	$ 550,000.00	$ 137,500.00	$ 21,312,500.00	$ 22,000,000.00	41	1	9
3	A	3A0188	Coos County Airport District	Hangar Demolition/Hangar Construction "SW OR Critical Links to Air Transportation"	$ 2,392,811.00	$ 598,202.75	$ 1,066,056.25	$ 4,057,070.00	39	2	10
2	A	2A0195	City of Eugene/ Eugene Airport	South Ramp Reconstruction	$ 451,111.20	$ 112,777.80	$ 187,963.00	$ 751,852.00	33	2	11
1	A	1A0240	Port of St. Helens	Water/Sewer Line Extension	$ 304,000.00	$ 76,000.00		$ 380,000.00	18	4	12
2	A	2A0245	City of Creswell Airport	Super AWOS Improvements	$ 160,000.00	$ 40,000.00	$ 148,744.00	$ 348,744.00	34	2	13
4	A	4A0184	Christmas Valley Park & Recreation Dist	Parallel Taxiway and Apron Construction	$ 607,280.00	$ 151,820.00	$ 748,180.00	$ 1,507,280.00	40	2	14
5	A	5A0198	Grant County	Runway 9/27 Rehabilitation	$ 800,000.00	$ 200,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 2,000,000.00	28	3	15

2

Connect Oregon IV
State Board of Aviation Review

REG	MODE	APP #	APPLICANT	PROJECT NAME	CO GRANT FUNDS REQUESTED	MATCH AMOUNT 20% OF CO PROJECT	ADDITIONAL MATCH	TOTAL PROJECT COST	STATUTORY & ECONOMIC BENEFIT REVIEW	Tier 1 - 41-50 Tier 2 - 31-40 Tier 3 - 21-30 Tier 4 - 1-20 Tier	MODAL COMMITTEE PRIORITY
4	A	4A0236	Lake County	Commercial Infrastructure Development	$ 726,980.00	$ 181,745.00	$ 285,060.00	$ 1,193,785.00	39	2	16
4	A	4A0243	City of Malin	Malin Municipal Airport Fueling Project	$ 192,000.00	$ 48,000.00		$ 240,000.00	33	2	17
4	A	4A0220	City of Prineville	Prineville Airport AWOS	$ 220,000.00	$ 55,000.00	$ 20,000.00	$ 295,000.00	28	3	18
5	A	5A0224	Port of Morrow	Airport Improvements	$ 299,880.00	$ 74,970.00	$ 225,030.00	$ 599,880.00	29	3	19
2	A	2A0229	City of Corvallis	Air Freight Transfer Facility	$ 567,208.80	$ 141,802.20		$ 709,011.00	25	3	20
3	A	3A0187	City of Roseburg	Taxiway Extension	$ 720,000.00	$ 180,000.00		$ 900,000.00	30	3	21
2	A	2A0244	City of Creswell Airport	Taxi Lane Improvements	$ 400,000.00	$ 100,000.00	$ 66,434.00	$ 566,434.00	25	3	22
3	A	3A0238	Sky Research, Inc	Sky Research Facilities Consolidation	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ 275,855.00	$ 2,775,855.00	22	3	23
4	A	4A0182	City of Redmond	Emergency Aircraft Dispatch Center	$ 375,000.00	$ 93,750.00	$ 2,031,250.00	$ 2,500,000.00	27	3	24
4	A	4A0216	Sisters Runway Inc	Sisters Eagle Airport Improvement Project	$ 1,597,932.80	$ 399,483.20		$ 1,997,416.00	38	2	25
2	A	2A0228	City of Corvallis	Air Terminal Rehabilitation	$ 455,104.00	$ 113,776.00		$ 568,880.00	16	4	26
4	A	4A0204	City of Klamath Falls	Rental Vehicle Service Center "Airport Intermodal Service Center"	$ 200,000.00	$ 50,000.00		$ 250,000.00	18	4	27
4	A	4A0181	Flying H Enterprises	Office/hangar for Small Aviation Business	$ 128,016.00	$ 32,004.00		$ 160,020.00	18	4	28

1

Connect Oregon IV
Marine Special Advisory Review Committee

REG	MODE	APP #	APPLICANT	PROJECT NAME	CO GRANT FUNDS REQUESTED	MATCH AMOUNT 20% OF CO PROJECT	ADDITIONAL MATCH	TOTAL PROJECT COST	STATUTORY & ECONOMIC BENEFIT REVIEW	Tier 1 - 41-50 Tier 2 - 31-40 Tier 3 - 21-30 Tier 4 - 1-20 Tier	MODAL COMMITTEE PRIORITY
1	M	1M0186	Teevin Bros Land & Timber Co., LLC	Construct T-Pier	$ 2,818,155.20	$ 704,538.80		$ 3,522,694.00	38	2	1
1	M	1M0215	Port of Portland	Terminal 6 Wharf Optimization	$ 1,200,000.00	$ 300,000.00		$ 1,500,000.00	37	2	2
1	M	1M0214	Port of Portland	T6 Berth 601 Auto Import Expansion	$ 2,240,000.00	$ 560,000.00		$ 2,800,000.00	38	2	3
2	M	2M0233	Port of Garibaldi	Commercial Avenue Wharf Reconstruction	$ 1,608,300.00	$ 402,075.00	$ 2,113,472.00	$ 4,123,847.00	43	1	4
2	M	2M0200	Port of Astoria	Pier 2 Upgrade	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 250,000.00		$ 1,250,000.00	35	2	5
2	M	2M0225	Port of Newport	Terminal Renovation	$ 483,600.00	$ 120,900.00		$ 604,500.00	37	2	6
1	M	1M0196	Sause Bros, LLC	Heavy Lift Equipment Acquisition	$ 1,208,403.84	$ 302,100.96	$ 79,499.20	$ 1,590,004.00	40	2	7
5	M	5M0193	Port of Umatilla	Multi-Modal Marine Freight Transfer Facility	$ 1,627,440.00	$ 406,860.00	$ 4,370,950.00	$ 6,405,250.00	45	1	8
5	M	5M0232	Tidewater Terminal Company	Umatilla Terminal Expansion	$ 744,161.04	$ 186,040.26		$ 930,201.30	33	2	9

Connect Oregon IV
Oregon Freight Advisory Committee

REG	MODE	APP #	APPLICANT	PROJECT NAME	CO GRANT FUNDS REQUESTED	MATCH AMOUNT 20% OF CO PROJECT	ADDITIONAL MATCH	TOTAL PROJECT COST	STATUTORY & ECONOMIC BENEFIT REVIEW	Tier 1 - 41-50 Tier 2 - 31-40 Tier 3 - 21-30 Tier 4 - 1-20 Tier	MODAL COMMITTEE PRIORITY
1	A	1A0217	Port of Portland	Air Trans Center Taxilane - Phase 3	$ 3,500,000.00	$ 875,000.00	$ 13,925,000.00	$ 18,300,000.00	41	1	1
1	R	1R0221	Tarr Acquisition LLC	Tarr Intermodal Liquid Bulk Facility	$ 1,040,000.00	$ 260,000.00	$ 1,012,498.00	$ 2,312,498.00	43	1	2
2	M	2M0233	Port of Garibaldi	Commercial Avenue Wharf Reconstruction	$ 1,608,300.00	$ 402,075.00	$ 2,113,472.00	$ 4,123,847.00	43	1	3
1	M	1M0186	Teevin Bros Land & Timber Co., LLC	Construct T-Pier	$ 2,818,155.20	$ 704,538.80		$ 3,522,694.00	38	2	4
2	A	2A0230	Port of Tillamook Bay	Runway 13-31 Rehabilitation	$ 163,296.00	$ 40,824.00	$ 3,061,794.00	$ 3,265,914.00	42	1	5
3	R	3R0192	Central Oregon & Pacific Railroad	Rail Infrastructure Improvement	$ 4,560,000.00	$ 1,140,000.00		$ 5,700,000.00	37	2	6
1	M	1M0215	Port of Portland	Terminal 6 Wharf Optimization	$ 1,200,000.00	$ 300,000.00		$ 1,500,000.00	37	2	7
2	M	2M0200	Port of Astoria	Pier 2 Upgrade	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 250,000.00		$ 1,250,000.00	35	2	8
2	M	2M0225	Port of Newport	Terminal Renovation	$ 483,600.00	$ 120,900.00		$ 604,500.00	37	2	9
1	R	1R0185	Mt Hood Railroad	Mt Hood Railroad Bridges Fortification	$ 247,313.62	$ 61,828.40		$ 309,142.02	36	2	10
4	A	4A0191	City of Redmond	GA Ramp/Taxiway A Recon/Taxiway C Extension	$ 425,000.00	$ 106,250.00	$ 7,968,750.00	$ 8,500,000.00	39	2	11
2	R	2R0180	Union Pacific Railroad Company	Bridge Replacement (MP 662.00)	$ 8,200,000.00	$ 2,050,000.00	$ 6,150,000.00	$ 16,400,000.00	32	2	12
4	R	4R0237	LRY LLC (dba Lake Railway)	Rail Relay Phase I	$ 768,000.00	$ 192,000.00		$ 960,000.00	33	2	13
1	M	1M0214	Port of Portland	T6 Berth 601 Auto Import Expansion	$ 2,240,000.00	$ 560,000.00		$ 2,800,000.00	38	2	14
2	A	2A0205	City of Newport	Runway 16/34 Rehabilitation	$ 448,500.00	$ 112,125.00	$ 8,409,375.00	$ 8,970,000.00	40	2	15

Connect Oregon IV
Oregon Freight Advisory Committee

REG	MODE	APP #	APPLICANT	PROJECT NAME	CO GRANT FUNDS REQUESTED	MATCH AMOUNT 20% OF CO PROJECT	ADDITIONAL MATCH	TOTAL PROJECT COST	STATUTORY & ECONOMIC BENEFIT REVIEW	Tier 1 - 41-50 Tier 2 - 31-40 Tier 3 - 21-30 Tier 4 - 1-20 Tier	MODAL COMMITTEE PRIORITY
2	R	2R0246	Wilco Winfield LLC	Wheat Loading Siding Extension	$ 131,858.39	$ 32,964.60	$ 11,082.01	$ 175,905.00	30	3	16
5	A	5A0199	Union County	La Grande Airport Runway 12-30 Overlay	$ 299,200.00	$ 74,800.00	$ 5,618,100.00	$ 5,992,100.00	39	2	17
5	R	5R0209	Port of Morrow	Phase 3 Track Development	$ 850,000.00	$ 212,500.00	$ 2,473,500.00	$ 3,536,000.00	27	3	18
2	R	2R0207	Fuel Logistics LLC	Eugene Rail Offload Project	$ 1,200,000.00	$ 300,000.00	$ 1,500,000.00	$ 3,000,000.00	43	1	19
4	R	4R0201	City of Madras	Madras-BNSF Rail Improvement Project	$ 988,720.00	$ 247,180.00		$ 1,235,900.00	36	2	20
4	A	4A0178	City of Bend/Bend Municipal Airport	Taxiway A Rehabilitation/Relocation	$ 192,220.00	$ 48,055.00	$ 3,376,945.00	$ 3,617,220.00	41	1	21
1	R	1R0210	Portland & Western Railroad, Inc.	Portland & Western Rainier Siding Extension	$ 427,332.00	$ 106,833.00		$ 534,165.00	29	3	22
5	M	5M0193	Port of Umatilla	Multi-Modal Marine Freight Transfer Facility	$ 1,627,440.00	$ 406,860.00	$ 4,370,950.00	$ 6,405,250.00	45	1	23
1	R	1R0219	BNSF Railway	Portland Intermodal Facility Improvements	$ 3,927,200.00	$ 981,800.00		$ 4,909,000.00	29	3	24
1	R	1R0239	Port of St. Helens	Multnomah Rail Extension	$ 156,000.00	$ 39,000.00		$ 195,000.00	27	3	25
3	A	3A0190	Jackson County/ RVI-Medford	Rehabilitate Main Runway (R/W 14-32)	$ 521,052.00	$ 130,263.00	$ 9,769,737.00	$ 10,421,052.00	45	1	26
1	M	1M0196	Sause Bros, LLC	Heavy Lift Equipment Acquisition	$ 1,208,403.84	$ 302,100.96	$ 79,499.20	$ 1,590,004.00	40	2	27
5	M	5M0232	Tidewater Terminal Company	Umatilla Terminal Expansion	$ 744,161.04	$ 186,040.26		$ 930,201.30	33	2	28
3	R	3R0179	Table Rock Group, LLC	Warehouse Rail Spur	$ 272,000.00	$ 68,000.00		$ 340,000.00	37	2	29
5	A	5A0241	City of Baker City	Baker City Airport Reconstruct Taxiway A	$ 45,000.00	$ 11,250.00	$ 826,855.00	$ 883,105.00	39	2	30

3

Connect Oregon IV
Oregon Freight Advisory Committee

REG	MODE	APP #	APPLICANT	PROJECT NAME	CO GRANT FUNDS REQUESTED	MATCH AMOUNT 20% OF CO PROJECT	ADDITIONAL MATCH	TOTAL PROJECT COST	STATUTORY & ECONOMIC BENEFIT REVIEW	Tier 1 - 41-50 Tier 2 - 31-40 Tier 3 - 21-30 Tier 4 - 1-20 Tier	MODAL COMMITTEE PRIORITY
2	R	2R0226	Willamette Valley Railway Co.	Bridge Repairs	$ 904,000.00	$ 226,000.00		$ 1,130,000.00	23	3	31
2	R	2R0212	Portland & Western Railroad, Inc.	Marion County 3-Mile Rail Improvement	$ 970,430.75	$ 242,607.69	$ 63,844.13	$ 1,276,882.57	22	3	32
2	R	2R0202	White's Hauling & Farm, LLC	White's Grain & Seed Railcar Loading Site	$ 750,282.60	$ 187,570.40		$ 937,853.00	31	2	33
5	R	5R0197	Oregon Eastern Railroad	Malheur Jct. Wye Project #2	$ 53,564.00	$ 13,391.00		$ 66,955.00	21	3	34
2	A	2A0229	City of Corvallis	Air Freight Transfer Facility	$ 567,208.80	$ 141,802.20		$ 709,011.00	25	3	35
2	R	2R0194	Lost Creel Rock Products, LLC	Green Hill Road Multimodal Facility	$ 477,286.40	$ 119,321.60	$ 585,575.00	$ 1,182,183.00	44	1	36
3	A	3A0187	City of Roseburg	Taxiway Extension	$ 720,000.00	$ 180,000.00		$ 900,000.00	30	3	37
2	R	2R0222	Benton County	Bailey Branch Acquisition Rehabilitation	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 500,000.00		$ 2,500,000.00	28	3	38
2	R	2R0231	City of Corvallis	Airport Industrial Park Rail Spur Rehabilitation	$ 368,740.00	$ 92,185.00		$ 460,925.00	17	4	39

1

Connect Oregon IV
Rail Advisory Committee

REG	MODE	APP #	APPLICANT	PROJECT NAME	CO GRANT FUNDS REQUESTED	MATCH AMOUNT 20% OF CO PROJECT	ADDITIONAL MATCH	TOTAL PROJECT COST	STATUTORY & ECONOMIC BENEFIT REVIEW	Tier 1 - 41-50 Tier 2 - 31-40 Tier 3 - 21-30 Tier 4 - 1-20 Tier	MODAL COMMITTEE PRIORITY
3	R	3R0192	Central Oregon & Pacific Railroad	Rail Infrastructure Improvement	$ 4,560,000.00	$ 1,140,000.00		$ 5,700,000.00	37	2	1
4	R	4R0237	LRY LLC (dba Lake Railway)	Rail Relay Phase I	$ 768,000.00	$ 192,000.00		$ 960,000.00	33	2	2
2	R	2R0180	Union Pacific Railroad Company	Bridge Replacement (MP 662.00)	$ 8,200,000.00	$ 2,050,000.00	$ 6,150,000.00	$ 16,400,000.00	32	2	3
1	R	1R0185	Mt Hood Railroad	Mt Hood Railroad Bridges Fortification	$ 247,313.62	$ 61,828.40		$ 309,142.02	36	2	4
2	R	2R0212	Portland & Western Railroad, Inc.	Marion County 3-Mile Rail Improvement	$ 970,430.75	$ 242,607.69	$ 63,844.13	$ 1,276,882.57	22	3	5
1	R	1R0221	Tarr Acquisition LLC	Tarr Intermodal Liquid Bulk Facility	$ 1,040,000.00	$ 260,000.00	$ 1,012,498.00	$ 2,312,498.00	43	1	6
1	R	1R0219	BNSF Railway	Portland Intermodal Facility Improvements	$ 3,927,200.00	$ 981,800.00		$ 4,909,000.00	29	3	7
4	R	4R0201	City of Madras	Madras-BNSF Rail Improvement Project	$ 988,720.00	$ 247,180.00		$ 1,235,900.00	36	2	8
2	R	2R0246	Wilco Winfield LLC	Wheat Loading Siding Extension	$ 131,858.39	$ 32,964.60	$ 11,082.01	$ 175,905.00	30	3	9
5	R	5R0209	Port of Morrow	Phase 3 Track Development	$ 850,000.00	$ 212,500.00	$ 2,473,500.00	$ 3,536,000.00	27	3	10
5	R	5R0197	Oregon Eastern Railroad	Malheur Jct. Wye Project #2	$ 53,564.00	$ 13,391.00		$ 66,955.00	21	3	11
3	R	3R0179	Table Rock Group, LLC	Warehouse Rail Spur	$ 272,000.00	$ 68,000.00		$ 340,000.00	37	2	12
1	R	1R0210	Portland & Western Railroad, Inc.	Portland & Western Rainier Siding Extension	$ 427,332.00	$ 106,833.00		$ 534,165.00	29	3	13
2	R	2R0226	Willamette Valley Railway Co.	Bridge Repairs	$ 904,000.00	$ 226,000.00		$ 1,130,000.00	23	3	14
1	R	1R0239	Port of St. Helens	Multnomah Rail Extension	$ 156,000.00	$ 39,000.00		$ 195,000.00	27	3	15

2

Connect Oregon IV
Rail Advisory Committee

REG	MODE	APP #	APPLICANT	PROJECT NAME	CO GRANT FUNDS REQUESTED	MATCH AMOUNT 20% OF CO PROJECT	ADDITIONAL MATCH	TOTAL PROJECT COST	STATUTORY & ECONOMIC BENEFIT REVIEW	Tier 1 - 41-50 Tier 2 - 31-40 Tier 3 - 21-30 Tier 4 - 1-20 Tier	MODAL COMMITTEE PRIORITY
2	R	2R0207	Fuel Logistics LLC	Eugene Rail Offload Project	$ 1,200,000.00	$ 300,000.00	$ 1,500,000.00	$ 3,000,000.00	43	1	16
2	R	2R0202	White's Hauling & Farm, LLC	White's Grain & Seed Railcar Loading Site	$ 750,282.60	$ 187,570.40		$ 937,853.00	31	2	17
2	R	2R0222	Benton County	Bailey Branch Acquisition Rehabilitation	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 500,000.00		$ 2,500,000.00	28	3	18
2	R	2R0194	Lost Creel Rock Products, LLC	Green Hill Road Multimodal Facility	$ 477,286.40	$ 119,321.60	$ 585,575.00	$ 1,182,183.00	44	1	19
2	R	2R0231	City of Corvallis	Airport Industrial Park Rail Spur Rehabilitation	$ 368,740.00	$ 92,185.00		$ 460,925.00	17	4	20

Connect Oregon IV
Public Transit Review Committee

REG	MODE	APP #	APPLICANT	PROJECT NAME	CO GRANT FUNDS REQUESTED	MATCH AMOUNT 20% OF GRANT	ADDITIONAL MATCH	TOTAL PROJECT COST	STATUTORY & ECONOMIC BENEFIT REVIEW	Tier 1 - 41-50 Tier 2 - 31-40 Tier 3 - 21-30 Tier 4 - 1-20 Tier	MODAL COMMITTEE PRIORITY
3	T	3T0189	Rogue Valley Transportation District	Radio System Replacement & Upgrade	$ 148,400.00	$ 37,100.00	$ 557,368.00	$ 742,868.00	45	1	1
1	T	1T0213	Ride Connection	Resource & Operations Center	$ 2,750,000.00	$ 687,500.00	$ 1,884,592.00	$ 5,322,092.00	43	1	2
2	T	2T0206	Salem Area Transit District	Downtown Transit Mall Rehabilitation	$ 3,000,000.00	$ 750,000.00		$ 3,750,000.00	33	2	3
2	T	2T0218	Yamhill County	Yamhill County Intermodal Transit Center	$ 1,162,400.00	$ 290,600.00	$ 349,400.00	$ 1,802,400.00	38	2	4
1	T	1T0235	TriMet	E 181st MAX Station Safety & Security	$ 736,480.00	$ 184,120.00	$ 257,400.00	$ 1,178,000.00	39	2	5
4	T	4T0203	Mid-Columbia Council of Governments	The Dalles Transit Center	$ 2,532,500.00	$ 633,125.00	$ 334,375.00	$ 3,500,000.00	32	2	6
2	T	2T0234	City of Corvallis	Transit Operations & Maintenance Facility	$ 1,600,000.00	$ 400,000.00	$ 8,000,000.00	$ 10,000,000.00	34	2	7

Appendix 3 Regional Committee Matrices

Connect Oregon IV
Region 1 Special Review Committee

REG	MODE	APP #	APPLICANT	PROJECT NAME	CO GRANT FUNDS REQUESTED	MATCH AMOUNT 20% OF GRANT	ADDITIONAL MATCH	TOTAL PROJECT COST	STATUTORY & ECONOMIC BENEFIT REVIEW	Tier 1 - 41-50 Tier 2 - 31-40 Tier 3 - 21-30 Tier 4 - 1-20 Tier	PRIORITY	COMMENTS
1	A	1A0217	Port of Portland	Air Trans Center Taxilane Upgrade - Pase 3	$ 3,500,000.00	$ 875,000.00	$ 13,925,000.00	$ 18,300,000.00	41	1	1	
1	R	1R0221	Tarr Acquisition LLC	Tarr Intermodal Liquid Bulk Facility	$ 1,040,000.00	$ 260,000.00	$ 1,012,498.00	$ 2,312,498.00	43	1	2	
1	T	1T0213	Ride Connection	Resource & Operations Center	$ 2,750,000.00	$ 687,500.00	$ 1,884,592.00	$ 5,322,092.00	43	1	3	
1	M	1M0186	Teevin Bros Land & Timber Co., LLC	Construct T-Pier	$ 2,818,155.20	$ 704,538.80		$ 3,522,694.00	38	2	4	
1	R	1R0185	Mt Hood Railroad	Mt Hood Railroad Bridges Fortification	$ 247,313.62	$ 61,828.40		$ 309,142.02	36	2	5	
1	M	1M0215	Port of Portland	Terminal 6 Wharf Optimization	$ 1,200,000.00	$ 300,000.00		$ 1,500,000.00	37	2	6	
1	M	1M0214	Port of Portland	T6 Berth 601 Auto Import Expansion	$ 2,240,000.00	$ 560,000.00		$ 2,800,000.00	38	2	7	
1	T	1T0235	TriMet	E 181st MAX Station Safety & Security	$ 736,480.00	$ 184,120.00	$ 257,400.00	$ 1,178,000.00	39	2	8	
1	R	1R0210	Portland & Western Railroad, Inc.	Portland & Western Rainier Siding Extension	$ 427,332.00	$ 106,833.00		$ 534,165.00	29	3	9	
1	R	1R0239	Port of St. Helens	Multnomah Rail Extension	$ 156,000.00	$ 39,000.00		$ 195,000.00	27	3	10	
1	R	1R0219	BNSF Railway	Portland Intermodal Facility Improvements	$ 3,927,200.00	$ 981,800.00		$ 4,909,000.00	29	3	11	
1	M	1M0196	Sause Bros, LLC	Heavy Lift Equipment Acquisition	$ 1,208,403.84	$ 302,100.96	$ 79,499.20	$ 1,590,004.00	40	2	12	
1	A	1A0240	Port of St. Helens	Water/Sewer Line Extension	$ 304,000.00	$ 76,000.00		$ 380,000.00	18	4	13	

Connect Oregon IV
Region 2 Review Committee

REG	MODE	APP #	APPLICANT	PROJECT NAME	CO GRANT FUNDS REQUESTED	MATCH AMOUNT 20% OF CO PROJECT	ADDITIONAL MATCH	TOTAL PROJECT COST	STATUTORY & ECONOMIC BENEFIT REVIEW	Tier 1 - 41-50 Tier 2 - 31-40 Tier 3 - 21-30 Tier 4 - 1-20 Tier	REGION COMMITTEE PRIORITY	COMMENTS
2	R	2R0246	Wilco Winfield LLC	Wheat Loading Siding Extension	$ 131,858.39	$ 32,964.60	$ 11,082.01	$ 175,905.00	30	3	1	
2	M	2M0233	Port of Garibaldi	Commercial Avenue Wharf Reconstruction	$ 1,608,300.00	$ 402,075.00	$ 2,113,472.00	$ 4,123,847.00	43	1	2	
2	R	2R0180	Union Pacific Railroad Company	Bridge Replacement (MP 662.00)	$ 8,200,000.00	$ 2,050,000.00	$ 6,150,000.00	$ 16,400,000.00	32	2	3	Recommend funding at $5 million with a condition requiring UPRR to dedicate Bailey Branch right-of-way (Project 2R0222) to Benton County.
2	R	2R0202	White's Hauling & Farm, LLC	White Grain and Seed Railcar Loading Site	$ 750,282.60	$ 187,570.40		$ 937,853.00	31	2	4	
2	A	2A0230	Port of Tillamook Bay	Runway 13-31 Rehabilitation	$ 163,296.00	$ 40,824.00	$ 3,061,794.00	$ 3,265,914.00	42	1	5	
2	A	2A0205	City of Newport	Runway 16/34 Rehabilitation	$ 448,500.00	$ 112,125.00	$ 8,409,375.00	$ 8,970,000.00	40	2	6	
2	A	2A0245	City of Creswell Airport	Super AWOS Improvements	$ 160,000.00	$ 40,000.00	$ 148,744.00	$ 348,744.00	34	2	7	
2	A	2A0195	City of Eugene/ Eugene Airport	South Ramp Reconstruction	$ 451,111.20	$ 112,777.80	$ 187,963.00	$ 751,852.00	33	2	8	
2	M	2M0200	Port of Astoria	Pier 2 Upgrade	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 250,000.00		$ 1,250,000.00	35	2	9	
2	T	2T0218	Yamhill County	Yamhill County Intermodal Transit Center	$ 1,162,400.00	$ 290,600.00	$ 349,400.00	$ 1,802,400.00	38	2	10	
2	A	2A0244	City of Creswell Airport	Taxi Lane Improvements	$ 400,000.00	$ 100,000.00	$ 66,434.00	$ 566,434.00	25	3	11	
2	R	2R0207	Fuel Logistics LLC	Eugene Rail Offload Project	$ 1,200,000.00	$ 300,000.00	$ 1,500,000.00	$ 3,000,000.00	43	1	12	
2	R	2R0226	Willamette Valley Railway Co	Bridge Repairs	$ 904,000.00	$ 226,000.00		$ 1,130,000.00	23	3	13	
2	M	2M0225	Port of Newport	Terminal Renovation	$ 483,600.00	$ 120,900.00		$ 604,500.00	37	2	14	

Connect Oregon IV
Region 2 Review Committee

REG	MODE	APP #	APPLICANT	PROJECT NAME	CO GRANT FUNDS REQUESTED	MATCH AMOUNT 20% OF CO PROJECT	ADDITIONAL MATCH	TOTAL PROJECT COST	STATUTORY & ECONOMIC BENEFIT REVIEW	Tier 1 - 41-50 Tier 2 - 31-40 Tier 3 - 21-30 Tier 4 - 1-20 Tier	REGION COMMITTEE PRIORITY	COMMENTS
2	R	2R0231	City of Corvallis	Airport Industrial Park Rail Spur Rehabilitation	$ 368,740.00	$ 92,185.00		$ 460,925.00	17	4	15	
2	R	2R0212	Portland & Western Railroad, Inc.	Marion County 3-Mile Rail Improvement	$ 970,430.75	$ 242,607.69	$ 63,844.13	$ 1,276,882.57	22	3	16	
2	T	2T0234	City of Corvallis	Transit Operations & Maintenance Facility	$ 1,600,000.00	$ 400,000.00	$ 8,000,000.00	$ 10,000,000.00	34	2	17	
2	A	2A0229	City of Corvallis	Air Freight Transfer Facility	$ 567,208.80	$ 141,802.20		$ 709,011.00	25	3	18	
2	T	2T0206	Salem Area Transit District	Downtown Transit Mall Rehabilitation	$ 3,000,000.00	$ 750,000.00		$ 3,750,000.00	33	2	19	
2	R	2R0222	Benton County	Bailey Branch Acquisition and Rehabilitation	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 500,000.00		$ 2,500,000.00	28	3	20	Combine with UPRR bridge replacement project if UP is willing to dedicate the railroad right-of-way to Benton County as part of funding for the bridge replacement.
2	A	2A0228	City of Corvallis	Air Terminal Rehabilitation	$ 455,104.00	$ 113,776.00		$ 568,880.00	16	4	21	
2	R	2R0194	Lost Creel Rock Products, LLC	Green Hill Road Multimodal Facility	$ 477,286.40	$ 119,321.60	$ 585,575.00	$ 1,182,183.00	44	1	22	
2	R	2R0247	Roseburg Forest Products Co.	UP Spur Expansion	$ 4,000,000.00	$ 1,000,000.00	$ 3,809,612.00	$ 8,809,612.00	27	3		application withdrawn

Connect Oregon IV
Region 3 Review Committee

REG	MODE	APP #	APPLICANT	PROJECT NAME	CO GRANT FUNDS REQUESTED	MATCH AMOUNT 20% OF OF CO PROJECT	ADDITIONAL MATCH	TOTAL PROJECT COST	STATUTORY & ECONOMIC BENEFIT REVIEW	Tier 1 - 41-50 Tier 2 - 31-40 Tier 3 - 21-30 Tier 4 - 1-20 Tier	REGIONAL COMMITTEE PRIORITY	COMMENTS
3	A	3A0190	Jackson County RVI-Medford	Main Runway Rehabilitation (R/W 14-32)	$ 521,052.00	$ 130,263.00	$ 9,769,737.00	$ 10,421,052.00	45	1	1	
3	R	3R0192	Central Oregon & Pacific Railroad	Rail Infrastructure Improvement	$ 4,560,000.00	$ 1,140,000.00		$ 5,700,000.00	37	2	2	For Region 3, most potential to benefit the economy of the region and state. Reduce dependence on I-5 for freight traffic and lower maintenance fees over time. Highway funds are declining. Life cyloe saving to Interstate.
3	A	3A0187	City of Roseburg	Taxiway Extension	$ 720,000.00	$ 180,000.00		$ 900,000.00	30	3	3	Intrinsic to the whole project from *Connect* Oregon III. Makes the project safer and more efficient. If finished, measurable improves Statuatory Consideration #3. Creates more jobs and improves the economy.
3	T	3T0189	Rogue Valley Transportation District	Radio System Replacement and Upgrade	$ 148,400.00	$ 37,100.00	$ 557,368.00	$ 742,868.00	45	1	4	
3	A	3A0188	Coos County Airport District	Hangar Demolition/Hangar Construction (SW OR Critical Links to Air Transportation)	$ 2,392,811.00	$ 598,202.75	$ 1,066,056.25	$ 4,057,070.00	39	2	5	
3	A	3A0208	City of Brookings	Regional Airport Project (Crescent City)	$ 550,000.00	$ 137,500.00	$ 21,312,500.00	$ 22,000,000.00	41	1	6	
3	A	3A0238	Sky Research, Inc	Sky Research Facilities Consolidation	$ 2,000,000.00	$ 500,000.00	$ 275,855.00	$ 2,775,855.00	22	3	7	
3	R	3R0179	Table Rock Group, LLC	Warehouse Rail Spur	$ 272,000.00	$ 68,000.00		$ 340,000.00	37	2	8	

Connect Oregon IV
Region 4 Review Committee

REG	MODE	APP #	APPLICANT	PROJECT NAME	CO GRANT FUNDS REQUESTED	MATCH AMOUNT 20% OF CO PROJECT	ADDITIONAL MATCH	TOTAL PROJECT COST	STATUTORY & ECONOMIC BENEFIT REVIEW	Tier 1 - 41-50 Tier 2 - 31-40 Tier 3 - 21-30 Tier 4 - 1-20 Tier	REGION COMMITTEE PRIORITY	COMMENTS
4	R	4R0237	LRY LLC (dba Lake Railway)	L.C. RR Rail Relay Phase I	$ 768,000.00	$ 192,000.00		$ 960,000.00	33	2	1	Region 4 Review Committee recommends funding this project at $742,070. The recommendation includes $185,515 of Applicant match for a total project cost of $927,585.
4	A	4A0178	City of Bend/Bend Municipal Airport	Taxiway A Rehabilitation/ Relocation	$ 192,220.00	$ 48,055.00	$ 3,376,945.00	$ 3,617,220.00	41	1	2	
4	T	4T0203	Mid-Columbia Council of Governments	The Dalles Transit Center	$ 2,532,500.00	$ 633,125.00	$ 334,375.00	$ 3,500,000.00	32	2	3	Region 4 Review Committee recommends funding this project at $750,000. The recommendation includes $967,500 of Applicant match for a total project cost of $1,717,500.
4	A	4A0236	Lake County	Commercial Infrastructure Development	$ 726,980.00	$ 181,745.00	$ 285,060.00	$ 1,193,785.00	39	2	4	Region 4 Review Committee recommends funding this project at $526,980. The recommendation includes $466,805 of Applicant match for a total project cost of $993,785.
4	A	4A0191	City of Redmond	Reconstruction GA Ramp,and Reconstruction Taxiway A, and Taxiway C Extension	$ 425,000.00	$ 106,250.00	$ 7,968,750.00	$ 8,500,000.00	39	2	5	Region 4 Review Committee recommends funding this project at $350,000. The recommendation includes $8,150,000 of Applicant match for a total project cost of $8,500,000.
4	A	4A0216	Sisters Runway Inc	Sisters Eagle Airport Improvement Project	$ 1,597,932.80	$ 399,483.20		$ 1,997,416.00	38	2	6	Region 4 Review Committee recommends funding this project at $599,710. The recommendation includes $310,000 of Applicant match for a total project cost of $909,710.
4	A	4A0243	City of Malin	Malin Municipal Airport Fueling Project	$ 192,000.00	$ 48,000.00		$ 240,000.00	33	2	7	Region 4 Review Committee recommends funding this project at $110,000. The recommendation includes $30,000 of Applicant match for a total project cost of $140,000.
4	R	4R0201	City of Madras	Madras-BNSF Rail Improvement Project	$ 988,720.00	$ 247,180.00		$ 1,235,900.00	36	2	8	Region 4 Review Committee recommends funding this project at $619,020. The recommendation includes $247,180 of Applicant match for a total project cost of $866,200.
4	A	4A0220	City of Prineville	Prineville Airport AWOS	$ 220,000.00	$ 55,000.00	$ 20,000.00	$ 295,000.00	28	3	9	Region 4 Review Committee recommends funding this project at $110,000. The recommendation includes $185,000 of Applicant match for a total project cost of $295,000.
4	A	4A0184	Christmas Valley Park & Recreation District	Parallel Taxiway and Apron Construction	$ 607,280.00	$ 151,820.00	$ 748,180.00	$ 1,507,280.00	40	2	10	

Connect Oregon IV
Region 4 Review Committee

REG	MODE	APP #	APPLICANT	PROJECT NAME	CO GRANT FUNDS REQUESTED	MATCH AMOUNT 20% OF CO PROJECT	ADDITIONAL MATCH	TOTAL PROJECT COST	STATUTORY & ECONOMIC BENEFIT REVIEW	Tier 1 - 41-50 Tier 2 - 31-40 Tier 3 - 21-30 Tier 4 - 1-20 Tier	REGION COMMITTEE PRIORITY	COMMENTS
4	A	4A0182	City of Redmond	Emergency Aircraft Dispatch Center	$ 375,000.00	$ 93,750.00	$ 2,031,250.00	$ 2,500,000.00	27	3	11	
4	A	4A0204	City of Klamath Falls	Rental Vehicle Service Center "Airport Intermodal Service Center"	$ 200,000.00	$ 50,000.00		$ 250,000.00	18	4	12	
4	A	4A0181	Flying H Enterprises	Office/hangar for Small Aviation Business	$ 128,016.00	$ 32,004.00		$ 160,020.00	18	4	13	

Connect Oregon IV
Region 5 Review Committee

REG	MODE	APP #	APPLICANT	PROJECT NAME	CO GRANT FUNDS REQUESTED	MATCH AMOUNT 20% OF CO PROJECT	ADDITIONAL MATCH	TOTAL PROJECT COST	STATUTORY & ECONOMIC BENEFIT REVIEW	Tier 1 - 41-50 Tier 2 - 31-40 Tier 3 - 21-30 Tier 4 - 1-20 Tier	REGIONAL COMMITTEEP RIORITY
5	A	5A0199	Union County	Runway 12-30 Overlay	$ 299,200.00	$ 74,800.00	$ 5,618,100.00	$ 5,992,100.00	39	2	1
5	A	5A0241	City of Baker City	Baker City Airport Reconstruct Taxiway A	$ 45,000.00	$ 11,250.00	$ 826,855.00	$ 883,105.00	39	2	2
5	A	5A0198	Grant County	Runway 9/27 Rehabilitation	$ 1,600,000.00	$ 400,000.00	$ 62,500.00	$ 2,062,500.00	28	3	3
5	R	5R0209	Port of Morrow	Port of Morrow Track Development	$ 850,000.00	$ 212,500.00	$ 2,473,500.00	$ 3,536,000.00	27	3	4
5	R	5R0197	Oregon Eastern Railroad	Malheur Jct. Wye Project #2	$ 53,564.00	$ 13,391.00		$ 66,955.00	21	3	5
5	M	5M0193	Port of Umatilla	Multi-Modal Marine Freight Transfer Facility	$ 1,627,440.00	$ 406,860.00	$ 4,370,950.00	$ 6,405,250.00	45	1	6
5	M	5M0232	Tidewater Terminal Company	Umatilla Terminal Expansion	$ 744,161.04	$ 186,040.26		$ 930,201.30	33	2	7
5	A	5A0224	Port of Morrow	Airport Improvements	$ 299,880.00	$ 74,970.00	$ 225,030.00	$ 599,880.00	29	3	8

Appendix 4 Memorandum of Collaboration

Oregon Department of Transportation

*Connect*Oregon IV Final Review Committee

MEMORANDUM OF COLLABORATION

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the *Connect*Oregon IV Final Review Committee (FRC) members agree to collaborate as follows:

I. The Director of the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) has convened the *Connect*Oregon IV Final Review Committee (FRC) to develop recommendations regarding which projects should be funded under the *Connect*Oregon IV program. The Committee, assisted by a neutral facilitator, will study available information, develop written recommendations, and submit its written recommendations to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC).

The Director charges FRC with the responsibility of developing recommendations regarding which projects should be funded under the *Connect*Oregon IV program. The goal is to select the best projects across the board to benefit air, rail, marine, and transit infrastructure to ensure Oregon's transportation system is strong, diverse, and efficient.

A. **Duties and Responsibilities**

Members of FRC agree to fulfill their responsibilities through attending and participating in committee meetings, studying the available information, and participating in the development of recommendations. Members of FRC agree to participate in good faith and to act in the best interests of the committee and its charge. To this end, members agree to consider the state transportation system as a whole, and to place the interests of the entire state above any particular political, modal, and regional affiliations or other interests in order to bring the selection process to a successful conclusion. Members of FRC accept the responsibility to collaborate in developing recommendations that are fair and constructive for the entire state.

In light of the above, FRC members accept the following responsibilities:

1) To attend committee meetings and work sessions;

2) To study the available information relevant to the charge;
3) To participate in developing sound, written recommendations to the OTC;
4) Except as otherwise provided in Section IV(A)(4) below, to inform, and to make a good faith effort to seek support from and gain the ratification of their represented groups for the work and the work product of FRC;
5) To promptly advise the Director of any information that would affect the work of the committee; and
6) At the start of each meeting session declare any "actual conflict of interest," ORS 244.020(1), or any "potential conflict of interest," ORS 244.020(12). Members declaring such actual or potential conflict of interest shall comply with the requirements of ORS Chapter 244 concerning conflicts of interest, including ORS 244.1201.

B. Use of Work Products

The Director and the OTC acknowledge and appreciate the time, effort and resources expended by FRC members in this collaborative process. Although ODOT is not required to implement FRC recommendations verbatim, the Director acknowledges that the recommendations from the committee will be forwarded to the OTC for final voting.

C. Membership and Term

The FRC includes representatives from five regional and five modal review committees and individuals from the transportation industry. A roster of committee members is attached.

The work of FRC will commence prior to the first meeting on June 13, 2012 and will conclude following submission of its recommendations to the Director, or at such time ODOT determines it is not reasonable to expect that the committee will be able to fulfill its charge.

II. ODOT ROLE

ODOT will provide technical support, substantive expertise, logistical assistance, administrative assistance, and advice to the FRC, but will not have a vote at committee meetings.

---

[1] ORS 244.120(2) An elected public official, other than a member of the Legislative Assembly, or an appointed public official serving on a board or commission, shall:

(a) When met with a potential conflict of interest, announce publicly the nature of the potential conflict prior to taking any action thereon in the capacity of a public official; or

(b) When met with an actual conflict of interest, announce publicly the nature of the actual conflict and:

(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, refrain from participating as a public official in any discussion or debate on the issue out of which the actual conflict arises or from voting on the issue.

(B) If any public official's vote is necessary to meet a requirement of a minimum number of votes to take official action, be eligible to vote, but not to participate as a public official in any discussion or debate on the issue out of which the actual conflict arises.

Although ODOT will not be a voting member, it may comment or make suggestions on relevant decision points. ODOT's comments and suggestions will be given the same consideration as those of other committee members.

III. FACILITATOR ROLE

ODOT has contracted with Jim Owens, Principal at Cogan Owens Cogan, LLC (COC) as an independent, neutral third party whose role is to facilitate the FRC meetings, help develop committee recommendations, and produce a final report. As a neutral collaborative process provider, COC will not act as an advocate on any issue for ODOT, any interest group, or any member of the committee. While COC may make recommendations regarding the committee process, COC will not make any substantive decisions. COC is being compensated by ODOT pursuant to a contract that is available for review.

COC recommends a consensus decision-making process to assist FRC members in developing recommendations to ODOT. COC will use a single text collaborative process designed for the purpose of assisting groups in developing consensus-based documents that reflect a range of perspectives. Other responsibilities of the facilitator include:

A. Offer recommendations to ODOT relating to the FRC process.
B. Work collaboratively with all ODOT staff and executive team members to assist the FRC in its work. COC and ODOT designees may meet individually with FRC members to develop understanding of issues, resolve questions or apparent conflicts, or as otherwise needed to assist FRC in fulfilling its charge.
C. Provide procedures to help guide the committee in its work.
D. Advise ODOT if it appears that the FRC will be unable to fulfill its charge.

COC encourages FRC members to communicate information or concerns to it regarding the process for developing recommendations, the recommendations, or other substantive issues. FRC members are encouraged to communicate with ODOT regarding technical, logistical and administrative support issues.

IV. FRC OPERATING PROCEDURES

A. Ground Rules

Ground rules set the tone for the committee process. Ground rules focus members on the efficient acquisition, thoughtful evaluation, and reasoned discussion of data in order to produce valuable recommendations to ODOT. The following ground rules will be utilized by the committee:

1) **Voting**: During the consensus decision-making process, each member of the FRC, except for the non-voting representative of ODOT, will have one equal vote.
2) **Decision Rules**: The committee will discuss decision rules prior to beginning the formulation of recommendations. Decision rules include the consensus decision-making procedure and the single-text process. Questions relating to the process will

be assessed by COC, and the recommendation submitted by COC to the committee will be decided by majority vote of those committee members present if a quorum is in attendance.

3) **Protocols:** FRC members agree to:

   (a) Participate fully and in good faith;
   (b) Comment constructively and specifically, making points concisely to ensure sufficient opportunities for all members to be heard;
   (c) Allow one person to speak at a time;
   (d) Address the issues in neutral terms without personal criticism of individuals;
   (e) Explore all options; and
   (f) Keep an open mind.

Each member of FRC agrees to participate in good faith. For purposes of the FRC, "good faith" means honesty in fact and conduct. This does not preclude FRC members from taking inconsistent or opposing positions with or from those taken by FRC, and does not preclude the participation of members or their constituents in other forums, such as a legislative session, administrative hearing, or judicial proceeding. Members of FRC undertake a commitment to act in the best interests of the committee, and to refrain from activity that would undermine its ability to fulfill its charge.

B. Development of Recommendations

COC will use a consensus decision-making model to facilitate FRC's decision-making and to ensure that the committee receives the collective benefit of the individual views, experience, background, training and expertise of its members. COC will use a single text process to assist the committee in drafting, editing and refining its recommendations.

1) **Consensus Decision-Making.** Consensus decision-making is a process that allows meeting participants to consider proposals, express opinions, and discuss options for reaching general agreement. This model provides an opportunity for discussion of underlying values and concerns in the overall effort of developing widely accepted solutions. Consensus does not mean 100% agreement on every aspect of every issue. Instead, consensus means general support for a decision taken as a whole. This allows group members to vote in support of a proposal even though they might prefer to have it modified in some manner in order to give it their full support.

   The facilitator will describe the proposed recommendation or decision. Meeting participants will be invited to vote by responding with one of three votes:

   - "One" indicates full support for the proposal as stated.
   - "Two" indicates that the participant generally agrees with the proposal as stated, but would prefer to have it modified in some manner in order to give it full support. Nevertheless, the member will support the proposal even if the rest of the group does not approve his or her suggested modification. A "two" vote indicates general support.

- "Three" indicates rejection of the proposal as stated.

The facilitator will provide opportunities for participants who voted "two" to explain their suggested modifications to the proposal. Modifications will be considered one by one with a simple majority vote. Next, the facilitator will invite those participants who voted "three" to explain their reasons for not supporting the proposed recommendation, and to offer their suggested modification or alternative recommendation. These modifications are also considered one by one with a simple majority vote.

The consensus voting process will be repeated as necessary to assist the group in achieving consensus regarding a particular recommendation or proposal. Consensus is defined as all participants voting "one" or "two."

If the group is unable to reach consensus, the facilitator will call for a traditional vote to determine the majority view. For some issues, participants voting in the minority may have an opportunity to submit a minority report to accompany the majority recommendation.

2) **Single Text Process.** The committee will use a Single Text Process to accomplish its work. A Single Text Process provides an opportunity for many parties to collaborate in drafting a single document. The process will allow the committee to evaluate an existing draft of recommendations and propose changes to satisfy the concerns of committee members.

   COC will facilitate a committee discussion to assist in the preliminary phases of formulating recommendations, and in determining the format of recommendations. Throughout the work sessions, committee members will have the opportunity to respond the Discussion Draft with the goal of achieving consensus on proposed recommendations. At the last committee meeting, COC will provide the opportunity for final voting on each recommendation and on whether the recommendations accurately reflect the work of the committee.

   Should it appear to COC that the committee will require additional work sessions beyond the sessions scheduled in order to complete its work, COC will communicate this to ODOT prior to the conclusion of the last scheduled meeting.

   To assist in the proper understanding of the working drafts, the following information will appear on each page of the master document:

   This document is a Discussion Draft for use of FRC. This Discussion Draft is a Work in Progress and does not reflect the final recommendations of the committee. This Discussion Draft was prepared by COC only as a discussion aid, and does not necessarily reflect the individual views of any members of FRC or ODOT. At its final meeting, FRC will have the opportunity to suggest changes for its final recommendations to ODOT.

C. Public Status of FRC Meetings and Records

FRC meetings are open to the public. However, as work sessions, time for public testimony will not be allocated on meeting agendas. ODOT will provide notice to the public regarding the dates, times and locations of meetings.

FRC records, including formal documents, discussion drafts, minutes and exhibits, are public records. Communications of the committee are not confidential because the meetings and records of the committee are open to the public. "Communications" refers to all statements and votes made during committee meetings, memoranda, work projects, records, documents or materials developed to fulfill the charge, including electronic mail correspondence to ODOT or to COC. The personal, private notes of individual committee members might be considered to be public to the extent they "relate to the conduct of the public's business," (ORS 192.410(4)).

D. Communication with the Media.

While not precluded from communicating with the media, FRC members agree to:

1) Generally defer to the FRC chair and ODOT staff for all media communications related to the FRC process and its recommendations;
2) Not to negotiate through the media, or to use the media to undermine the work of FRC.
3) Raise all of their concerns, especially those being raised for the first time, at a FRC meeting and not in or through the media.

E. Committee Vacancy.

Should a vacancy occur on the FRC during its term, the OTC may appoint a replacement member. The votes of any replacement members will be effective from the day of their appointment, and replacement members will not be able to vote retroactively.

F. Removal of the Neutral Facilitator.

FRC members may recommend to ODOT that COC be removed at the neutral facilitator by a majority vote of all voting members present at a properly noticed meeting. The ultimate decision on the removal and replacement of the facilitator will rest with the Director.

V. LEGAL ADVICE.

ODOT, by statute, is represented by and receives its legal advice from the Oregon Attorney General and the Oregon Department of Justice. Any DOJ comments made during FRC meetings or otherwise relevant to the work of FRC are not to be construed as legal advice on any specific project. Membership on FRC is not a substitute for independent legal advice. If necessary and if so desired, members of FRC may seek independent legal advice from their own counsel.

VI. INTERPRETATION OF THE MEMORANDUM OF COLLABORATION.

COC shall interpret the ground rules of this Memorandum pursuant to its position as the neutral facilitator.

CONNECTOREGON IV FINAL REVIEW COMMITTEE
MEMORANDUM OF COLLABORATON

This Memorandum of Collaboration sets forth the operating agreements and expectations of the *Connect*Oregon IV Final Review Committee and the Oregon Department of Transportation and is not intended to create binding legal obligations among members or between members and ODOT. By signing below, *Connect*Oregon IV Final Review Committee Members agree to the terms of this Memorandum of Collaboration.

(Members listed alphabetically)

Dave Anderson

(Signature) Date 6/13/12

Julie Brown

(Signature) Date 6/13/12

Dee Burch

(Signature) Date 6/13/12

Bruce Carswell

(Signature) Date 6/13/12

Martin Callery

(Signature) Date 6-13-2012

Robert Eaton

(Signature) Date 6/13/12

Mark Gardiner

(Signature) Date 6/13/12

(Signature)

Steve Grasty

(Signature) Date 6/13/2012

Jerry Grossnickle

(Signature) Date 6/13/2012

Bob Hooker

(Signature) Date 6/13/12

Tony Hyde

(Signature) Date 6/13/12

Shirley Kalkhoven

(Signature) Date June 13, 2012

Carole Knapel

(Signature) Date June 13, 2012

Susie Lahsene

(Signature) Date June 13, 2012

Roger Nyquist

(Signature) Date 6/13/12

Terry Parker

(Signature) Date 13 June 12

Mike Quilty

(Signature) Date June 13, 2012

Bob Russell

(Signature) Date 6/13/12

Alan Unger 6/13/12

Al Switzer

(Signature) Date 6-13-2012

Tracy Ann Whalen

(Signature) Date 6/13/2012

Fred Warner

(Signature) Date 6/13/12

Ken Woods

(Signature) Date 6-13-2012

William Thorndike

(Signature) Date 6/13/2012

Jerri L. Bohard, Administrator
Transportation Development Division
Oregon Department of Transportation

6/13/12
Date

Jim Owens, Principal
Cogan Owens Cogan, LLC

6/13/12
Date

Appendix 5 Staff Presentation of Projects for Review (06/13/12)

APP. #	APPLICANT	PROJECT NAME	Fund? (Y/N)	TIER	Aviation Priority	OFAC Priority	Transit Priority	Rail Priority	Marine Priority	Region Priority
	ODOT	Project Selection, Administration, and Debt Service	Y							
1A0217	Port of Portland	Air Trans Center Taxilane-Phase 3		1	7	1				1
3R0192	Central Oregon & Pacific Railroad	Rail Infrastructure Improvement		2		6		1		2
1M0186	Teevin Bros Land & Timber Co., LLC	T-Pier		2		4			1	4
2A0230	Port of Tillamook Bay	Runway 13-31 Rehabilitation		1	2	5				5
1R0221	Tarr Acquisition LLC	Tarr Intermodal Liquid Bulk Facility		1		2		6		2
4R0237	LRY LLC (dba Lake Railway)	L.C. RR rail relay Phase I		2		13		2		1
2M0233	Port of Garibaldi	Commercial Avenue Wharf Reconstruction		1		3			4	2
1T0213	Ride Connection	Resource & Operations Center		1			2			3
2R0180	Union Pacific Railroad Company	Bridge Replacement (MP 662.00)		2		12		3		3
5A0199	Union County	Runway 12-30 Overlay		2	5	17				1
3T0189	Rogue Valley Transportation District	Radio System Replacement & Upgrade		1			1			4
3A0190	Jackson County/Rogue Valley Intl-Medford	Main Runway 14-32 Rehabilitation		1	1	26				1
1M0215	Port of Portland	Terminal 6 Wharf Optimization		2		7			2	6
4A0178	City of Bend/Bend Aviation	Taxiway A		1	3	21				2
2A0205	City of Newport	Runway 16/34 Rehabilitation		2	4	15				6
1R0185	Mt Hood Railroad	Mt Hood RR Bridges Fortification		2		10		4		5

4A0191	City of Redmond	GA Ramp/Taxiway A Recon/Taxiway C Extension		**2**	**6**	**11**				**5**
2R0246	Wilco Winfield LLC	Wheat loading siding extension		**3**		**16**		**9**		**1**
2M0200	Port of Astoria	Pier 2 Upgrade		**2**		**8**			**5**	**9**
2A0195	City of Eugene - Eugene Airport	South Ramp Reconstruction		**2**	**11**					**8**
1M0214	Port of Portland	T6 Berth 601 Auto Import Expansion		**2**		**14**			**3**	**7**
2A0245	City of Creswell Airport	Super AWOS Improvements		**2**	**13**					**7**
5A0241	City of Baker City	Baker City Airport Taxiway A		**2**	**8**	**30**				**2**
5A0198	Grant County	Runway 9/27 Rehabilitation		**3**	**15**					**3**
4A0236	Lake County	Commercial Infrastructure Development		**2**	**16**					**4**
3A0188	Coos County Airport District	SW OR Critical Links to Air Transportation		**2**	**10**					**5**
2T0218	Yamhill County	Yamhill County Intermodal Transit Center		**2**			**4**			**10**
5R0209	Port of Morrow	Port of Morrow Track Development		**3**		**18**		**10**		**4**
4T0203	Mid-Columbia Council of Governments	The Dalles Transit Center		**2**			**6**			**3**
2M0225	Port of Newport	Terminal Renovation		**2**		**9**			**6**	**14**
3A0208	City of Brookings	Regional Airport Project		**1**	**9**					**6**
4R0201	City of Madras	Madras-BNSF Rail Improvement Project		**2**		**20**		**8**		**8**
4A0243	City of Malin	Malin Municipal Airport Fueling Project		**2**	**17**					**7**
1R0219	BNSF Railway	Portland Intermodal Facility Improvements		**3**		**24**		**7**		**11**
2T0206	Salem Area Transit District	Downtown Transit Mall Rehabilitation		**2**			**3**			**19**
1T0235	TriMet	E 181st MAX Station Safety & Security		**2**			**5**			**8**
2R0212	Portland & Western Railroad, Inc.	Marion County 3 Mile Rail Improvement		**3**		**32**		**5**		**16**
2R0207	Fuel Logistics LLC	Eugene Rail Offload Project		**1**		**19**		**16**		**12**

4A0184	Christmas Valley Park & Recreation District	Parallel Taxiway and Apron Construction		**2**	**14**					**10**
1R0210	Portland & Western Railroad, Inc.	Portland & Western Rainier Siding Extension		**3**		**22**		**13**		**9**
2R0202	White's Hauling & Farm, LLC	White Grain & Seed Railcar Loading Site		**2**		**33**		**17**		**4**
2A0244	City of Creswell Airport	Taxi Lane Improvements		**3**	**22**					**11**
4A0220	City of Prineville	Prineville Airport AWOS		**3**	**18**					**9**
5R0197	Oregon Eastern Railroad	Malheur Jct. Wye Project #2		**3**		**34**		**11**		**5**
4A0216	Sisters Runway Inc	Sisters Eagle Airport Improvement Project		**2**	**25**					**6**
3A0187	City of Roseburg	Taxiway Extension		**3**	**21**	**37**				**3**
2R0226	Willamette Valley Railway Co	Bridge Repairs		**3**		**31**		**14**		**13**
1A0240	Port of St. Helens	Water/Sewer Line Extension		**4**	**12**					**13**
5M0193	Port of Umatilla	Multi-Modal Marine Freight Transfer Facility		**1**		**23**			**8**	**6**
1R0239	Port of St. Helens	Multnomah Rail Extension		**3**		**25**		**15**		**10**
3R0179	Table Rock Group, LLC	Warehouse Rail Spur		**2**		**29**		**12**		**8**
1M0196	Sause Bros, LLC	Heavy Lift Equipment Acquisition		**2**		**27**			**7**	**12**
5A0224	Port of Morrow	Airport Improvements		**3**	**19**					**8**
3A0238	Sky Research, Inc	Sky Research Facilities Consolidation		**3**	**23**					**7**
2A0229	City of Corvallis	Air Freight Transfer Facility		**3**	**20**	**35**				**18**
5M0232	Tidewater Terminal Company	Umatilla Terminal Expansion		**2**		**28**			**9**	**7**
2T0234	City of Corvallis	Transit Operations & Maintenance Facility		**2**			**7**			**17**
4A0182	City of Redmond	Emergency Aircraft Dispatch Center		**3**	**24**					**11**
2R0231	City of Corvallis	Airport Industrial Park Rail Spur Rehabilitation		**4**		**39**		**20**		**15**
4A0204	City of Klamath Falls	Airport Intermodal Service Center		**4**	**27**					**12**

2R0222	Benton County	Bailey Branch Acquisition Rehabilitation		**3**		**38**		**18**		**20**
2A0228	City of Corvallis	Air Terminal Rehabilitation		**4**	**26**					**21**
2R0194	Lost Creek Rock Products, LLC	Green Hill Road Multimodal Facility		**1**		**36**		**19**		**22**
4A0181	Flying H Enterprises	Office/hangar for small aviation business		**4**	**28**					**13**