

Region 2 Review Committee – meeting agenda

August 26, 2026 – 1:00 to 3:00

This meeting will be conducted both in-person and by video conference

The in-person meeting will be held at the following location:

ODOT Region 2 offices – 455 Airport Road SE., Salem

Building B – Mt. Jefferson conference room

To join the meeting from your computer, tablet, or smartphone:

[click here to join the meeting](#)

Meeting ID: 227 329 431 368 894 Passcode: P9fP9rD7 [Download Teams](#) | [Join on the web](#)

To call in (audio only): 1 971-277-1965 Phone conference ID: 405 715 31#

***Note:** Times listed are approximate. Individuals interested in a particular item are advised to arrive at the start of the meeting. If you are participating by videoconference or phone, please mute you microphone when you are not speaking.*

- 1. Call to order** (welcome and introductions) (10 minutes) **1:00**
Facilitator: Bill Johnston – ODOT Region Planner
- 2. Review instructions for the meeting** (5 minutes) **1:10**
Reference: Attachment A
- 3. Conflict of interest declarations** (5 minutes) **1:15**
Request: Please disclosed any actual or potential conflicts of interest.
Reference: Attachment F
- 4. Public comment** (10 minutes) **1:20**
 - The meeting facilitator will ask if there are comments from the audience.
 - Please state your name, address, and affiliation (if any).
 - Applicants wishing to comment on their projects are advised to do so during this portion of the meeting. If the Committee invites them to speak later it would only be for the purpose of answering questions.
 - Please limit your comments to three minutes.

- 4. Project review (20 minutes) 1:30**
Summary: Each ACT will briefly describe the proposed projects (applications) in their area. Please also explain the rationale for the project rankings.
Reference: Attachment B
- 5. Preliminary discussion (20 minutes) 1:50**
Summary: Committee members will discuss the proposed projects. This may include questioning the preliminary rankings based on the quantitative scoring, or the preferences of the individual ACTs. Members may suggest alternate rankings. Ideally, the committee will agree on a method for ranking projects, prior to the final discussion (Item 7).
Reference: Attachments C and D
- 6. Private discussions (and break) (15 minutes) 2:10**
Summary: Separate rooms will be provided (for those attending the meeting in person) for the representatives from each ACT to briefly talk among themselves. This is an opportunity to consider the comments from others, consider changing their rankings, and to discuss other negotiating strategy.
- 7. Project ranking (25 minutes) 2:25**
Summary: Committee members will reconvene as a group for further discussion. They will attempt to reach a negotiated consensus in terms of how to rank the projects. If there is no consensus, the Committee will consider a motion to rank the projects in a particular order, and an up or down vote will be taken. More than one motion and vote may be required.
Reference: Attachments C and D
- 8. Region 2 representative for the Statewide Review Committee (5 min.) 2:50**
Summary: The committee needs to identify one primary and one alternate member to represent Region 2 at the Final Review Committee meeting that will be held on September 8.
- 9. Debrief (5 minutes) 2:55**
Summary: If time allows, the Committee members will review and discuss the process that was used at this meeting to rank the projects. This feedback will help staff improve the process for the next Connect Oregon funding cycle.

If you have any questions about this meeting, or need special accommodation, please contact Bill Johnston at 503.910.5058 or bill.w.johnston@odot.oregon.gov

Attachments

The follow is a summary of the attachments included in this meeting packet. A more detailed summary is provided on the cover page for each attachment. The page numbers refer to the numbered pages in the meeting packet, in the lower right corner.

A. Instructions and meeting participants (5 pages) [page 4]

1. **Overview and instructions** – Please read this document prior to the meeting (3 pages)
2. **Meeting participants** (1 page)

B. Project descriptions and funding summary (7 pages) [page 9]

1. **Region 2 projects** – Brief descriptions of the 15 proposed projects in Region 2. (5 pages)
2. **Funding summary** – Region 2 and statewide – Summary tables showing the funding requested within each Region and by mode of transportation. (1 page)

C. Preliminary evaluation by other committees (14 pages) [page 16]

1. **Review criteria and scoring** – Describes the “statutory review considerations” used by Connect Oregon staff and others to evaluate and score the applications. (2 pages)
2. **Table 1: Preliminary evaluation of Region 2 applications** – Shows the scores for the 15 proposed projects in Region 2. (1 page)
3. **Table 2: Preliminary evaluation of all applications** – Shows the scores for all 37 applications, statewide. (2 pages)
4. **Regional Solutions Team (RST) review** – Comments and rankings assigned by the Region 2 RST, for the 15 projects within Region 2. (8 pages)

D. Region 2 evaluation (5 pages) [page 30]

1. **Recommended method for ranking projects** – Four options are provided. (3 pages)
2. **Table 3: Region 2 evaluation worksheet** – Shows adjusted rankings, to account for ACT preferences. Identifies projects that deviate significantly from the rankings based on the statutory considerations scores, or the RST rankings. (1 page)

E. Previous Region 2 reviews (9 pages) [page 35]

1. **Connect Oregon 6** – Summary of 2016 Region 2 Review Committee meeting. (2 pages)
2. **Connect Oregon 8** – Summary of 2022 Region 2 Review Committee meeting. (2 pages)
3. **Changes for 2024** – Summary of key changes for CO9. (2 pages)
4. **Connect Oregon 9** – Summary of 2024 Region 2 Review Committee meeting. (2 pages)

F. Conflict of interest and ethics review (7 pages) [page 44]

Attachment A

Instructions and meeting participants

Included in this attachment are the following documents:

- 1. Overview and instructions** – Please read this document prior to the meeting (3 pages)
- 2. Meeting participants** (1 page)

Overview and instructions

A. Objective

The primary objective of the meeting on August 26 is to review and rank 15 grant applications for proposed projects in Region 2. The committee also needs to identify one primary and one alternate member to represent Region 2 at the Final Review Committee meeting that will be held on September 8.

B. Region, modal, and statewide review process

There are a total of 37 applications statewide. The other Regions are reviewing and ranking the projects in their areas. Modal review committees (aviation, freight, rail and marine) have also reviewed the applications. Others involved include the Regional Solutions Teams (staff from Business Oregon and other agencies) and Connect Oregon staff.

The Final Review Committee (that will meet on September 8 August) will consider all this input and develop a list of recommended projects to fund. Their recommendations will be presented to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) in October.

C. Region 2 review procedure

1. Prior to the meeting, review the agenda and the attachments included in this meeting packet. There is a considerable amount of information (47pages). **It is not necessary to read every document.** Some committee members may be interested in more detail than others.

If you have limited time to prepare, **you can expedite your review by focusing on the documents included in Attachment D** (Region 2 evaluation). Included in this attachment is an evaluation worksheet and a recommend method for ranking the projects. Refer to item 10 below.

It may also be helpful to review the summary of the 2024 Connect Oregon 9 review in Attachment E (2 pages). Note that the Region 2 Review Committee relied on the preliminary rankings (based on the scores provided by Connect Oregon staff) to guide their rankings. They also deferred to the preferences of each ACT in ranking the projects within their areas. This year's committee may or may not decide to use a similar approach.

2. A list of all the attachments is provided on the first page of this meeting packet (after the meeting agenda). Some attachments include more than one document. The cover page for each attachment describes the documents that are included. Some of the cover pages provide additional instructions.

3. There are several tables included in the meeting packet. They are PDF versions of Excel worksheets. They have been formatted for printing on 8-1/2 x 11 paper. The text may be somewhat difficult to read at this scale. It is assumed that most participants will review the packet in digital format, on a computer screen, which allows the text to be enlarged. At the meeting, the documents being discussed will be displayed on a large screen at the front of the room. Those of you who are participating by video conference can view the documents close up on your own screen.

Staff is not providing printed copies of the meeting packet. However, staff will provide a printed copy of the evaluation worksheet (Attachment D.2, Table 3) at a larger scale (11 x 17) for the participants to refer to at the meeting. Participants may print and bring with them their own copy of the entire packet if they like.

4. A summary description of the 15 Region 2 projects is provided in Attachment B. The applicants have been invited to attend the meeting, to answer questions if necessary.
5. Each of the four Region 2 ACTs has reviewed the applications in their area. Their preferred ranking (for the projects in their area) are indicated in the evaluation worksheet (Attachment D.2).
6. Connect Oregon staff, with assistance from others, previously scored the applications based on their consistency with the criteria provided in state statutes and administrative rules. These are referred to as “statutory review considerations.” The scores for each project are provided in Attachment C.2 (Table 1) and C.3 (Table 2).
7. The modal committees (referred to previously) also scored the applications. The results are also shown in Table 1 and Table 2. The Regional Solutions Team’s comments and ratings are provided in Attachment C.4 and summarized in Table 3.
8. The Region 2 Review Committee is not expected to evaluate the projects as thoroughly or *quantitatively* as Connect Oregon staff were required to, in order to develop the statutory considerations scores. The role of the regional review committees is to provide a local and regional perspective. There may be *qualitative* considerations that those who are familiar with the local economy and transportation system are aware of that aren’t reflected in the scoring.
9. The Region 2 Review Committee’s rankings may differ from the preliminary rankings based on the scores assigned by Connect Oregon staff. However, the committee should provide some rationale for ranking a project either lower or higher.
10. Attachment D.1 describes several different approaches (methods) the committee could use to rank the Region 2 projects. A staff recommendation is provided. For reference, Attachment E describes the methods that previous Region 2 Review Committees used

to evaluate the CO6, CO8 and CO9 applications in 2016, 2022 and 2024. **Note that there is no predetermined allocation of funds for each Region.** This method was used for the earlier funding cycles (through CO6) but hasn't been used since then.

11. Note the private discussions referred to in the meeting agenda (Item 6). Separate rooms will be provided for representatives from each ACT to talk among themselves, after the preliminary discussion, to discuss negotiating strategy.¹ This accommodation was provided in the past for previous Region 2 Review Committees. These rooms will not have video connections. Those participating remotely will need to connect with their team by phone.
12. Staff will review these instructions and documents with the committee at the meeting on August 26. If you have any questions or concerns before then please contact Bill Johnston at 503.910.5058 or bill.w.johnston@odot.oregon.gov.

D. Conflict of interest disclosure

At the start of the meeting, committee members will be asked to disclose any conflicts of interest relating to any of the projects being considered.

There are two types. An *actual* conflict of interest exists when an individual has a financial interest in the project. A *potential* conflict of interest exists when an individual's relatives or business they are associated with has a financial interest in the project. This is also referred to as "the appearance of a conflict of interest."

Committee members who have a potential conflict of interest may participate in the evaluation, provided they disclose the conflict. Members who have an actual conflict of interest must refrain from discussion, debate or voting on the project of concern.

A more detailed explanation of this is provided in Attachment F.

E. Complete instructions

The responsibilities of the region review committees are described in more detail in a 37-page document titled *Connect Oregon: Instructions for Reviewers*, prepared by Connect Oregon staff. It can be found on the Connect Oregon webpage (in the *Application Documents and Review Information* section) at the following link:

<https://www.oregon.gov/odot/programs/pages/connectoregon.aspx>

¹ **There was more emphasis on negotiating and "horse trading" in the past,** when each Region had a predetermined allocation of funds and had more influence in project selection. There has been less need for this in recent funding cycles (since CO8) because there is no set amount of funding allocated to Region 2 (or any other Region).

Region 2 Review Committee – meeting participants

(refer to the notes at the bottom of the page)

	name	ACT role	affiliation	title	email address	notes
1.	Northwest ACT	NWACT (Area 1)				
	Casey Garrett	chair	Columbia County	Commissioner	casey.garrett@columbiacountyor.gov	
	TBD					Liane Welch is not available
	Bill Jablonski	ODOT staff support	ODOT	Area Manager	William.R.JABLONSKI@odot.oregon.gov	ACT member
	Caroline Crisp	ODOT staff support	ODOT	Region Planner	Caroline.CRISP@odot.oregon.gov	
2.	Mid-Willamette Valley ACT	MWACT (Area 3)				
	Lyle Mordhorst	chair	Polk County	Commissioner	mordhorst.lyle@co.polk.or.us	
	Chris Chenoweth	vice chair	City of McMinnville	Councilor	Chris.Chenoweth@mcminnvilleoregon.gov	
	Anna Henson	ODOT staff support	ODOT	Area Manager	anna.henson@odot.oregon.gov	ACT member
	Brandon Williams	ODOT staff support	ODOT	Region Planner	brandon.williams@odot.oregon.gov	
3.	Cascades West ACT	CWACT (Area 4)				
	Walter Chuck	chair	Lincoln County	Commissioner	wchuck@co.lincoln.or.us	
	Roger Nyquist	chair-elect	Linn County	Commissioner	rnyquist@co.linn.or.us	
	Christine Hildebrant	ODOT staff support	ODOT	Area Manager	christine.d.hildebrant@odot.oregon.gov	ACT member
	James Feldmann	ODOT staff support	ODOT	Region Planner	james.feldmann@odot.oregon.gov	
4.	Lane Area ACT	LaneACT (Area 5)				
	Jennifer Yeh	chair	City of Eugene	Councilor	jyeh@eugene-or.gov	
	Becky Taylor	ACT member (alternate)	Lane County	Senior Transportation Planner	becky.taylor@lanecountyor.gov	substituting for Ryan Ceniga
	Ian Roholt	ODOT staff support	ODOT	Interim Area Manager	ian.ROHOLT@odot.oregon.gov	ACT member
5.	Other participants					
	Bill Johnston	meeting facilitator	ODOT	Region Planner (Area 5)	bill.w.johnston@odot.oregon.gov	
	Catherine Schneider	meeting facilitator	ODOT	Office Specialist	Catherine.A.SCHNEIDER@odot.oregon.gov	
	Savannah Crawford	observer	ODOT	Region 2 Manager	Savannah.CRAWFORD@odot.oregon.gov	
	Naomi Zwerdling	observer	ODOT	Region 2 Planning Manager	Naomi.ZWERDLING@odot.oregon.gov	
	John Boren	observer	ODOT	Freight Program Manager	john.boren@odot.oregon.gov	

Notes

1. This is a tentative list of the people who will be attending this meeting. An updated list will be provided at the meeting.
2. This list was compiled by Bill Johnston. Updated August 19, 2026.

Project descriptions and funding summary

Included in this attachment are the following documents:

- 1. Region 2 projects** – Summary descriptions of the 15 projects in Region 2. (5 pages)
- 2. Funding summary** – Summary tables showing the amount of funding requested by mode of transportation (aviation, marine, rail), region, and area (within Region 2). (1 page)

Region 2 projects

This document provides short descriptions of the 15 applications (proposed projects) in Region 2. The projects are grouped by area. Within each area, the projects are presented in the order they were ranked by the ACT. The complete applications are available to view and download on the Connect Oregon webpage. [\[link\]](#)

Area 1 projects (Northwest ACT)

1.1 – Port of Astoria (applicant) **2M532** (application number)

Pier 2 West Rehabilitation

Description: The project is to save Pier 2 West at the Port of Astoria. Buttressed by a failing seawall and overlaid by a dilapidated deck with temporary steel-plate fixes, the spectre of near-term failure demands rehabilitation. Temporary, emergency repairs were made throughout 2025 at a cost of just over \$720,000. The basis of design is to install a new seawall at the existing dock face, backfill behind it, and overlay the new backfill with concrete pavement.

Funding requested: \$10,426,950 **Total project cost:** \$36,164,008

Contacts: (1) Shane Jensen (Grant & Project Consultant) shane@avhconsult.com
(2) Matt McGrath (Deputy Director, Port of Astoria) mmcgrath@portofastoria.com

1.2 – Port of Columbia County (applicant) **2M535** (application number)

Port Westward Beaver Dock Modernization

Description: The project will further the pipe bridge extension funded through Connect Oregon 9. The project will realign pipelines, related infrastructure, and walkways onto a modern seismically designed pipe bridge extension, removing them from the World War II-era wooden dock built with creosote piles, moving the facility toward compliance with the seismic resiliency requirements of Oregon Senate Bill 1567. Notably, the Port of Columbia County is the only public entity directly impacted by SB 1567

Funding requested: \$2,500,000 **Total project cost:** \$10,150,000

Contact: Elliot Levin (North County Operations Manager) levin@portofcolumbiacounty.org

1.3 – City of Warrenton (applicant) **2M533** (application number)

Warrenton Marina E Dock Replacement

Description: The project will replace the commercial E Dock at the Warrenton Marina, constructing a moorage facility designed to support large commercial fishing vessels. The dock will include approximately 700 feet of main dock with six 70-foot berths and sixteen 60-foot berths, serving 22 vessels. The project will provide safe, reliable berthing, improve

infrastructure resilience, and ensure the continued use of a critical component of seafood transportation on the working waterfront.

Funding requested: \$2,500,000 **Total project cost:** \$2,800,000

Contact: Jessica McDonald (Harbormaster) jmcdonald@warrentonoregon.us

1.4 – Pacific Seafood (applicant) **2M534** (application number)

Pacific Seafood - Warrenton - Fuel & Ice Dock Repair

Description: Project will rehabilitate a 165-foot fuel and ice dock located on the Skipanon River in Warrenton. This includes replacing or repairing timber posts, piles, and x-bracing under the dock. On the west side of the dock, the project will replace the entire bull rail. On the east side of the dock, it will include demolition of the existing fender pile, a 1' wide section of concrete deck, bull rail, and stringers and then install reinforced concrete bull rail, fender piles, and a fender waller system.

Funding requested: \$1,481,361 **Total project cost:** \$2,116,230

Contact: Isabella Johnson (Government Affairs Manager) bejohnson@pacificseafood.com

Area 3 projects (Mid-Willamette Valley ACT)

3.1 – Portland & Western Railroad (applicant) **2R530** (application number)

Woodburn to Wilsonville Rail Modernization, Safety, and Capacity Improvement Project

Description: The project will rehabilitate approximately 400 feet of existing rail spur at the Philomath Planer Mill to restore active rail service. Improvements include removal and replacement of failed rail sections, installation of ~25 new ties, sub-ballast and geotextile, gauge correction, removal/replacement of crossings, and track surfacing. The resulting asset will enable safe, functional short-line rail access for the phase 1 startup of the planer mill.

Funding requested: \$349,428 **Total project cost:** \$698,855

Contact: 2024 Contact: Ross Lane (AVP, Government Affairs) ross.lane@gwrr.com

3.2 – Trimble Aviation (applicant) **2A531** (application number)

McMinnville Airport Terminal Construction and Quonset Hangar Remodel

Description: Trimble Aviation proposes construction of a 1,300-square-foot terminal building and associated site improvements at McMinnville Municipal Airport, along with structural rehabilitation of an existing WWII-era hangar. The \$750,000 project supports documented growth in aircraft operations, turbine activity, and aviation-sector investment, while leveraging \$225,000 in private capital to strengthen rural transportation infrastructure.

Funding requested: \$525,000 **Total project cost:** \$750,000

Contact: Alison Row (President) alison@jerrytrimblehelicopters.com

3.2 – Aurora Airport Improvement Association (applicant) **2A529** (application number)

Aurora Airport - Secure Internal Circulation Road

Description: Create a continuous interior road between Yellow Gate Lane and Stenbock Way, fully inside the FAA security fencing at Aurora State Airport. Also add zipper-style striping to existing paved areas to extend the roadway through the airports central portion, enabling airport businesses, delivery services, and properly roadway through the airports central portion, enabling airport businesses, delivery services, and properly badged personnel to move between airport areas while remaining inside the security fence and outside of the Control Tower controlled areas.

Funding requested: \$966,133 **Total project cost:** \$1,380,190

Contact: Perry Nickerson (President) Perry@pacificflight.aero

Area 4 projects (Cascades West ACT)

4.1 – Philomath Sawmill, LLC (applicant) **2R528** (application number)

Philomath Planer Mill Phase 1

Description: The project will rehabilitate approximately 400 feet of existing rail spur at the Philomath Planer Mill to restore active rail service. Improvements include removal and replacement of failed rail sections, installation of ~25 new ties, sub-ballast and geotextile, gauge correction, removal/replacement of crossings, and track surfacing. The resulting asset will enable safe, functional short-line rail access for the phase 1 startup of the planer mill.

Funding requested: \$165,743 **Total project cost:** \$236,775

Contact: Jared Revay (Director of Manufacturing) jared.revay@swinerton.com

4.2 – CLT Lab, LLC (applicant) **2R540** (application number)

Timberlab Connection to P&WR

Description: Project will construct approximately 3,000 feet of new industrial rail track, including a rail spur, two industry tracks, turnouts, ballast, drainage, and related improvements connecting Timberlab's manufacturing facility to the Portland & Western Railroad. The project will provide freight rail access enabling efficient inbound and outbound shipments while reducing truck traffic and improving freight system performance.

Funding requested: \$3,035,252 **Total project cost:** \$4,336,074

Contact: Jared Revay (Director of Manufacturing) jared.revay@swinerton.com

4.3 – Port of Newport (applicant) **2M537** (application number)

Port of Newport International Terminal Dolphin Installation

Description: The Port of Newport proposes installation of a breasting dolphin at the Newport International Terminal, and replacement of a mooring dolphin with a breasting dolphin.

Funding requested: \$1,138,150 **Total project cost:** \$1,625,929

Contact: Paula Miranda (Executive Director) pmiranda@portofnewport.com

4.4 – Port of Newport (applicant) **2M538** (application number)

Port of Newport South Beach Dredging

Description: Funds will be used to dredge the north end of the South Beach Marina (SBM) located along the south shore of Yaquina Bay in Newport, Oregon, which has not been dredged in almost 30 years.

Funding requested: \$1,050,000 **Total project cost:** \$1,500,000

Contact: Paula Miranda (Executive Director) pmiranda@portofnewport.com

4.5 – City of Corvallis (applicant) **2A527** (application number)

Corvallis Airport Hangar Taxilane Improvement

Description: The purpose of this project is to extend the west-side hangar taxilane extension to provide access to new ground lease parcels. CVO's existing hangar areas are near full capacity along with serving their useful life. According to the FAA guidance (FAA Order 5100.38 and AC 150/5300-13A), airports should maintain adequate hangar capacity to meet demand and support based-aircraft growth. Without this project, the airport cannot accommodate new based aircraft or generate additional lease revenue. The project will include the construction of new taxilane pavement along with stormwater and underground utility improvements.

Funding requested: \$800,000 **Total project cost:** \$2,620,560

Contact: Rison Pereira (Airport Coordinator) airport@corvallisoregon.gov

4.6 – City of Harrisburg (applicant) **2R541** (application number)

Harrisburg 4th St Corridor Railroad Rehabilitation and Grade Crossing Improvement Project

Description: The project area is the railroad line that runs on 4th St between Smith St and LaSalle St in Harrisburg, OR. The project will daylight BNSF-owned train tracks embedded in the center of 4th St and rehabilitate them. It would separate overlapping motorized and non-motorized transportation facilities by isolating tracks with curbing and closing three at-grade crossings. The Project would improve safety, mobility, and state of good repair of the railroad in the project area.

Funding requested: \$2,804,767 **Total project cost:** \$4,006,810

Contacts: (1) Michele Eldridge (City Administrator) meldridge@ci.harrisburg.or.us
(2) Kritika Jetley (Assistant Director, Public Projects) kritika.jetley@bnsf.com

4.7 – Western University of Health Sciences (applicant) **2R539** (application number)

WesternU Oregon Railroad Grade-Separated Undercrossing (Lebanon)

Description: Project will support the construction of a rail underpass and public street access at WesternU's second campus development in Lebanon, Oregon.

Funding requested: \$3,967,600 **Total project cost:** \$5,668,000

Contact: Denise Cornish (Senior Vice President) Dcornish@westernu.edu

Area 5 projects (Lane ACT)

5.1 – City of Eugene (applicant) **2A536** (application number)

Eugene Airport Concourse A Expansion and ADA Lift

Description: This project will construct an additional 7,000 square foot of seating area in Concourse A and add an ADA emergency exit lift from the airside.

Funding requested: \$3,897,360 **Total project cost:** \$17,457,830

Contact: Cathryn Stephens (Airport Director) CStephens@eugene-or.gov

Other regions

Complete applications for the proposed projects in other Regions are also posted on the Connect Oregon webpage.

Funding summary

The State Legislature has authorized a total of **\$30 million** for the 2026 Connect Oregon program.

Statewide, grant applications were received for 37 projects totaling **\$84 million** in requested funding. Within Region 2, grant applications were received for 15 projects totaling **\$35 million** in requested funding.

Projects in three modal categories are eligible for funding: aviation, marine and rail. The tables below show the types of applications received by mode, region, and area (within Region 2).

Funding by mode, region, and area

	mode	funding requested	applications
	Aviation (A)	\$30,737,340	15
	Marine (M)	\$37,034,708	13
	Rail (R)	\$16,591,720	9
	Totals:	\$84,363,767	37

	region	funding requested	applications
	Region 1	\$18,167,479	8
	Region 2	\$35,607,744	15
	Region 3	\$9,770,654	5
	Region 4	\$6,880,747	2
	Region 5	\$13,937,145	7
	Totals:	\$84,363,769	37

	area (within Region 2)	funding requested	applications
	Area 1	\$16,908,311	4
	Area 3	\$1,840,561	3
	Area 4	\$12,961,512	7
	Area 5	\$3,897,360	1
	Totals:	\$35,607,744	15

Preliminary evaluation by other committees

Included in this attachment are the following documents:

1. **Review criteria and scoring** – Describes the “statutory review considerations” (criteria) used by Connect Oregon staff and others to evaluate and score the applications. (2 pages)
2. **Table 1: Preliminary evaluation of Region 2 applications** – Shows the scores for the 15 proposed projects in Region 2. (1 page)
3. **Table 2: Preliminary evaluation of all applications** – Shows the scores for all 37 proposed projects, statewide. (2 pages)
4. **Regional Solutions Team (RST) review** – Comments and rankings assigned by the Region 2 RST, for the 15 projects within Region 2. (8 pages)

Review criteria and scoring

The information provided in this attachment is included in a document titled *Connect Oregon: Instructions to Reviewers* (referred to here as *CO Instructions*) prepared by Connect Oregon staff (from ODOT and other state agencies). The complete 37-page document is available on the Connect Oregon webpage (Application Documents and Review Information): [\[link\]](#) Only the most relevant information is provided here.

The Region 2 Review Committee doesn't need to be overly concerned about these review criteria. They are primarily for the use of Connect Oregon staff and others who are responsible for scoring the applications. The committee's role in reviewing the applications is to provide a regional and local perspective on the proposed projects in Region 2. The purpose in providing this information here is to assist the committee members in understanding the scoring that has been used to develop the preliminary project rankings referred to elsewhere in this document.

1. Statutory Review Considerations (excerpt from CO Instructions, p.6)

OAR 731-035-0060 requires the Oregon Transportation Commission to [consider the following criteria in evaluating funding requests]:

- A. Whether a proposed 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.
- C. Whether a proposed project is a critical link connecting elements of Oregon's transportation system that will measurably improve utilization and efficiency of the system.
- D. The proportion of the cost of a proposed project that is borne by the Applicant or contributed from any other source other than the Connect Oregon Fund.
- E. Whether a proposed transportation project is ready for construction. A project will be considered ready for construction if the Applicant can demonstrate that:
 - a. Community engagement/outreach has occurred prior to or at the time of application submission.
 - b. Project completion can be achieved within 3 years of the award of the grant by submitting a project schedule that includes project stages and dates of major milestones.
 - c. Matching funds have been secured 30 calendar days before the Commission's decision to award funds.
 - d. Site ownership or control is secured 30 calendar days before the Commission's decision to award funds.
 - e. Final land use actions necessary to support the proposed project have been approved by the local government 60 calendar days before the Commission's decision to award funds.

- f. Limited Land Use Decision rendered by the appropriate local government received within six months of execution of Agreement.
- g. Securing all permits needed for construction within nine months of execution of an Agreement.
- F. Whether a proposed transportation project has a useful life expectancy that offers maximum benefit to the state.
- G. Whether a proposed transportation project is located near operations conducted for mining aggregate or processing aggregate as described in ORS 215.213 (2)(d) or 215.283 (2)(b).

2. Economic Benefit Review (excerpt from CO Instructions, p.7)

ODOT economists and Business Oregon development officers will conduct an economic benefit review of the reasonableness of the economic benefit claimed in each project application. The Economic Benefit Review is an element of the statutory considerations review and included in the score for tiering. The economic benefit review will include (but not limited to):

- A review of the application’s analytical methodology for estimating project benefits;
- A review of the project’s likelihood to retain or generate new distinct jobs in Oregon (not just move jobs from one part of the state to another);
- A review of the project’s level certainty to produce benefits; and
- A review of the project’s potential for public benefits.

A report will be completed for each application documenting the results of the review. This report will be submitted to the ODOT Freight Planning Unit by April 22, 2026.

3. Evaluation process (refer to CO Instructions, p.11)

For previous Connect Oregon funding cycles, review committees were required to sort projects into “Tiers” based on how many of the Statutory Considerations identified in OAR 731-035-0060 were met by the project. This is no longer required. The projects have been ranked (preliminarily) based on the scores assigned by the modal committees and other reviewers.

4. Additional explanation (from Region 2 staff)

A maximum of 90 points can be awarded for statutory considerations. A maximum of 20 points can be awarded for economic benefit. The total maximum score is 110 points.

Points are awarded for statutory considerations: a, c, d, e, f, and g (25, 20, 10, 20, 10 and 5 points, respectively).

Equity and Climate Change are two additional considerations. They’re not awarded points. They’re rated qualitatively as NP, LP or SP. The following is a key to the notation.

NP – No positive benefit; LP – Limited positive benefit; SP – Significant positive benefit

Attachment C.2 – Table 1: Preliminary evaluation of Region 2 applications

Ranked by total statutory consideration score (column 17) (note 1)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Mode	Public/Private	Region	Area	County	Application No.	Applicant	Project name	Total project cost	CO grant funds requested	Total project match	% match	Modal Committee Statutory Review	RDO review score	ODOT economist score	Economic review average	Total score	Equity consideration	Climate consideration	Region 2 priority
note 2												(note 3)	(note 4)	(note 4)	(note 5)	(note 6-7)	(note 8)	(note 8)	
M	PU	2	1	Clatsop	2M532	Port of Astoria	Pier 2 West Rehabilitation	\$ 36,164,008	\$ 10,426,950	\$ 25,737,058	71%	77	19	18	19	96	LP	SP	
M	PU	2	1	Columbia	2M535	Port of Columbia County	Port Westward Beaver Dock Modernization	\$ 10,150,000	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 7,650,000	75%	76	17	20	19	95	NP	SP	
R	PR	2	4	Benton	2R528	Philomath Sawmill, LLC	Philomath Planer Mill Phase 1	\$ 236,775	\$ 165,743	\$ 71,032	30%	74	15	16	16	90	LP	SP	
R	PR	2	4	Linn	2R540	CLTLab, LLC	Timberlab Connection to P&WR	\$ 4,336,074	\$ 3,035,252	\$ 1,300,822	30%	76	14	11	13	89	SP	SP	
R	PR	2	3	Marion	2R530	Portland & Western Railroad	Woodburn to Wilsonville Rail Modernization, Safety, and Capacity Improvement Project	\$ 698,855	\$ 349,428	\$ 349,428	50%	71	14	12	13	84	LP	LP	
M	PU	2	1	Clatsop	2M533	City of Warrenton	Warrenton Marina E Dock Replacement	\$ 2,800,000	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 300,000	11%	67		15	15	82	LP	LP	
M	PR	2	1	Clatsop	2M534	Pacific Seafood	Pacific Seafood - Warrenton - Fuel & Ice Dock Repair	\$ 2,116,230	\$ 1,481,361	\$ 634,869	30%	65	16	10	13	78	LP	LP	
M	PU	2	4	Lincoln	2M537	Port of Newport	Port of Newport International Terminal Dolphin Installation	\$ 1,625,929	\$ 1,138,150	\$ 487,779	30%	68	10	10	10	78	LP	LP	
A	PU	2	5	Lane	2A536	City of Eugene	Eugene Airport Concourse A Expansion and ADA Lift	\$ 17,457,830	\$ 3,897,360	\$ 13,560,470	78%	51	17	18	18	69	LP	LP	
A	PR	2	3	Marion	2A529	Aurora Airport Improvement Association	Aurora Airport - Secure Internal Circulation Road	\$ 1,380,190	\$ 966,133	\$ 414,057	30%	53	18	10	14	67	LP	LP	
M	PU	2	4	Lincoln	2M538	Port of Newport	Port of Newport South Beach Dredging	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 450,000	30%	57	9	10	10	67	SP	SP	
A	PR	2	3	Yamhill	2A531	Trimble Aviation	McMinnville Airport Terminal Construction and Quonset Hangar Remodel	\$ 750,000	\$ 525,000	\$ 225,000	30%	47	14	17	16	63	LP	LP	
A	PU	2	4	Benton	2A527	City of Corvallis	Corvallis Airport Hangar Taxilane Improvement	\$ 2,620,560	\$ 800,000	\$ 1,820,560	69%	51	3	11	7	58	LP	LP	
R	PU	2	4	Linn	2R541	City of Harrisburg	Harrisburg 4th St Corridor Railroad Rehabilitation and Grade Crossing Improvement Project	\$ 4,006,810	\$ 2,804,767	\$ 1,202,043	30%	45	5	9	7	52	LP	NP	
R	PU	2	4	Linn	2R539	Western University of Health Sciences (Lebanon)	WesternU Oregon Railroad Grade-Separated Undercrossing	\$ 5,668,000	\$ 3,967,600	\$ 1,700,400	30%	33	12	17	15	48	NP	NP	

Notes

1. This table shows all the Region 2 applications ranked by their total statutory consideration score (column 17). Refer to the notes below for additional explanation.
2. Key to modes (column 1): **A** – aviation. **M** – marine. **R** – rail
3. The scores in column 13 were assigned by one of the modal review committees (depending on the project) – OR Aviation Board, OR Freight Advisory Committee, Rail Advisory Committee, Marine Project and Planning Advisory Committee.
4. The scores shown in columns 14-15 were assigned by Connect Oregon staff (from ODOT and other state agencies). **RDO** refers to Regional Development Officer (from Business Oregon).
5. The average in column 16 is calculated as follows: (RDO score + ODOT economist score) ÷ 2. The total score in column 17 is calculated as follows: (modal committee statutory review) + (economic review average)
6. The maximum possible score is 110 points (not 100). The maximum "modal committee statutory review" score is 90 points. The maximum economic benefit score is 20 points. (90 + 20 = 110)
7. The projects are sorted in order based on their "total statutory consideration score" (column 17).
8. Key to Equity and Climate ratings: **NP** – No positive benefit. **LP** – Limited positive benefit. **SP** – Significant positive benefit. These are qualitative statutory review considerations. The ratings were assigned by Connect Oregon staff.
9. This worksheet was provided by Connect Oregon staff. It was reformatted and annotated (with notes) by Bill Johnston. Updated August 19, 2026

Attachment C.3 – Table 2: Preliminary evaluation of all applications (statewide)

Ranked by total statutory consideration score (column 17) (note 1)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Mode	Public/Private	Region	Area	County	Application No.	Applicant	Project name	Total project cost	CO grant funds requested	Total project match	% match	Modal Committee Statutory Review	RDO review score	ODOT economist score	Economic review average	Total score	Equity consideration	Climate consideration	Region 2 priority
note 2												(note 3)	(note 4)	(note 4)	(note 5)	(note 6-7)	(note 8)	(note 8)	
R	PR	3		Coos	3R546	Allweather Wood LLC	Allweather Wood Rail Spur	\$ 1,847,567	\$ 1,274,821	\$ 572,746	31%	81	17	16	17	98	LP	SP	
M	PR	1		Multnomah	1M521	Anchorage Launch Services, LLC	Anchorage Launch OX Truckable Tractor Tug Acquisition	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 2,100,000	\$ 900,000	30%	69	7	15	11	80	LP	SP	
M	PR	1		Multnomah	1M522	Diversified Marine, Inc	Diversified Marine Third Drydocking Berth	\$ 3,574,952	\$ 2,323,719	\$ 1,251,233	35%	62	12	16	14	76	LP	LP	
M	PR	1		Multnomah	1M523	Gunderson Marine & Iron	Gunderson Marine & Iron Pier Modernization Project	\$ 11,000,000	\$ 3,375,000	\$ 7,625,000	69%	69	16	15	16	85	SP	SP	
M	PU	1		Multnomah	1M525	Port of Portland	Port of Portland Auto Carrier Expansion and Safety Project	\$ 5,441,000	\$ 3,591,000	\$ 1,850,000	34%	73	17	17	17	90	LP	SP	
M	PU	2	1	Clatsop	2M532	Port of Astoria	Pier 2 West Rehabilitation	\$ 36,164,008	\$ 10,426,950	\$ 25,737,058	71%	77	19	18	19	96	LP	SP	
M	PR	1		Multnomah	1M526	Shaver Transportation Company	Oregon M-84 Grain Barge Expansion Project	\$ 6,499,588	\$ 2,924,815	\$ 3,574,773	55%	71	17	11	14	85	LP	SP	
M	PU	2	1	Columbia	2M535	Port of Columbia County	Port Westward Beaver Dock Modernization	\$ 10,150,000	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 7,650,000	75%	76	17	20	19	95	NP	SP	
R	PR	5		Umatilla	5R552	Columbia Rail	Weston Industrial Lead Rehabilitation Project	\$ 2,264,507	\$ 1,585,155	\$ 679,352	30%	73		15	15	88	SP	SP	
R	PR	2	4	Benton	2R528	Philomath Sawmill, LLC	Philomath Planer Mill Phase 1	\$ 236,775	\$ 165,743	\$ 71,032	30%	74	15	16	16	90	LP	SP	
R	PR	2	4	Linn	2R540	CLT Lab, LLC	Timberlab Connection to P&WR	\$ 4,336,074	\$ 3,035,252	\$ 1,300,822	30%	76	14	11	13	89	SP	SP	
R	PR	2	3	Marion	2R530	Portland & Western Railroad	Woodburn to Wilsonville Rail Modernization, Safety, and Capacity Improvement Project	\$ 698,855	\$ 349,428	\$ 349,428	50%	71	14	12	13	84	LP	LP	
A	PU	4		Klamath	4A548	City of Klamath Falls	Crater Lake - Klamath Regional Airport Taxiway F Reconstruction	\$ 12,196,656	\$ 880,747	\$ 11,315,908	93%	68	20	11	16	84	LP	LP	
M	PU	2	1	Clatsop	2M533	City of Warrenton	Warrenton Marina E Dock Replacement	\$ 2,800,000	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 300,000	11%	67		15	15	82	LP	LP	
A	PU	3		Jackson	3A542	Jackson County	MFR Terminal Expansion - Phase 1	#####	\$ 5,000,000	#####	96%	63	18	17	18	81	LP	LP	
M	PR	2	1	Clatsop	2M534	Pacific Seafood	Pacific Seafood - Warrenton - Fuel & Ice Dock Repair	\$ 2,116,230	\$ 1,481,361	\$ 634,869	30%	65	16	10	13	78	LP	LP	
M	PU	2	4	Lincoln	2M537	Port of Newport	Port of Newport International Terminal Dolphin Installation	\$ 1,625,929	\$ 1,138,150	\$ 487,779	30%	68	10	10	10	78	LP	LP	
A	PU	2	5	Lane	2A536	City of Eugene	Eugene Airport Concourse A Expansion and ADA Lift	\$ 17,457,830	\$ 3,897,360	\$ 13,560,470	78%	51	17	18	18	69	LP	LP	
M	PU	3		Coos	3M545	Port of Coos Bay	Charleston Shipyard Improvement Project - Phase 1, Marine Ways Replacement	\$ 3,333,333	\$ 2,333,333	\$ 1,000,000	30%	73	18	15	17	90	LP	SP	
A	PU	1		Hood River	1A520	Port of Hood River	Ken Jernstedt Airfield Terminal and Community Services Building	\$ 8,891,996	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 7,891,996	89%	59	17	17	17	76	LP	LP	
R	PR	5		Malheur	5R555	Oregon Eastern Railroad	Oregon Eastern Railroad Infrastructure Upgrade Phase 4	\$ 1,246,104	\$ 850,010	\$ 396,094	32%	57	20	14	17	74	SP	SP	
A	PU	4		Deschutes	4A547	City of Redmond	Redmond Airport Terminal Building Expansion Project Phase 2 - Inbound Baggage Improvements	\$ 22,265,552	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 16,265,552	73%	54	20	18	19	73	LP	LP	
A	PU	5		Umatilla	5A550	City of Pendleton	Eastern Oregon BVLOS Corridor	\$ 900,000	\$ 630,000	\$ 270,000	30%	57	16	15	16	73	LP	LP	
A	PR	2	3	Marion	2A529	Aurora Airport Improvement Association	Aurora Airport - Secure Internal Circulating Road	\$ 1,380,190	\$ 966,133	\$ 414,057	30%	53	18	10	14	67	LP	LP	
M	PU	2	4	Lincoln	2M538	Port of Newport	Port of Newport South Beach Dredging	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 450,000	30%	57	9	10	10	67	SP	SP	
A	PU	3		Coos	3A543	Coos County Airport District	Commercial Aircraft Apron Capacity Expansion Project	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 600,000	40%	56	13	9	11	67	LP	LP	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Mode	Public/Private	Region	Area	County	Application No.	Applicant	Project name	Total project cost	CO grant funds requested	Total project match	% match	Modal Committee Statutory Review	RDO review score	ODOT economist score	Economic review average	Total score	Equity consideration	Climate consideration	Region 2 priority
note 2												(note 3)	(note 4)	(note 4)	(note 5)	(note 6-7)	(note 8)	(note 8)	
M	PU	5		Morrow	5M551	Port of Morrow	Port of Morrow Terminal 3 Face Dock Rehabilitation	\$ 1,843,400	\$ 1,290,380	\$ 553,020	30%	75	15	15	15	90	LP	SP	
A	PU	5		Harney	5A554	City of Burns	Burns Municipal Airport Water Infrastructure & Fire Protection Compliance Project	\$ 7,800,000	\$ 7,410,000	\$ 390,000	5%	54	12	11	12	66	LP	LP	
R	PR	1		Multnomah	1R524	Oregon Rail Heritage Foundation	OPR East Portland Branch Acquisition and Improvement	\$ 3,655,636	\$ 2,558,945	\$ 1,096,691	30%	52	12	13	13	65	LP	LP	
A	PU	5		Grant	5A553	Grant County	Grant County Airport Helipads Construction	\$ 588,000	\$ 411,600	\$ 176,400	30%	53	11	11	11	64	LP	LP	
A	PR	2	3	Yamhill	2A531	Trimble Aviation	McMinnville Airport Terminal Construction and Quonset Hangar Remodel	\$ 750,000	\$ 525,000	\$ 225,000	30%	47	14	17	16	63	LP	LP	
A	PU	2	4	Benton	2A527	City of Corvallis	Corvallis Airport Hangar Taxilane Improvement	\$ 2,620,560	\$ 800,000	\$ 1,820,560	69%	51	3	11	7	58	LP	LP	
A	PU	5		Baker	5A549	City of Baker City	Baker City Airport Rehabilitate Runway 17-35	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 1,760,000	\$ 240,000	12%	46	5	11	8	54	LP	LP	
A	PU	3		Curry	3A544	Port of Gold Beach	Gold Beach Airport Fuel Storage and Dispensing System	\$ 375,000	\$ 262,500	\$ 112,500	30%	41	13	11	12	53	LP	LP	
R	PU	2	4	Linn	2R541	City of Harrisburg	Harrisburg 4th St Corridor Railroad Rehabilitation and Grade Crossing Improvement Project	\$ 4,006,810	\$ 2,804,767	\$ 1,202,043	30%	45	5	9	7	52	LP	NP	
R	PU	2	4	Linn	2R539	Western University of Health Sciences (Lebanon)	WesternU Oregon Railroad Grade-Separated Undercrossing	\$ 5,668,000	\$ 3,967,600	\$ 1,700,400	30%	33	12	17	15	48	NP	NP	
A	PR	1		Multnomah	1A527	Vertical Aviation International	Portland Downtown Heliport (61J) Upgrade	\$ 420,000	\$ 294,000	\$ 126,000	30%	40	2	8	5	45	LP	LP	

Notes

1. This table shows how the Region 2 applications compare to all applications (statewide) in terms of total statutory consideration score (column 17). It provides a preliminary indication of competitiveness.
2. Key to modes (column 1): **A** – aviation. **M** – marine. **R** – rail
3. The scores in column 13 were assigned by one of the modal review committees (depending on the project) – OR Aviation Board, OR Freight Advisory Committee, Rail Advisory Committee, Marine Project and Planning Advisory Committee.
4. The scores shown in columns 14-15 were assigned by Connect Oregon staff (from ODOT and other state agencies). **RDO** refers to Regional Development Officer (from Business Oregon).
5. The average in column 16 is calculated as follows: (RDO score + ODOT economist score) ÷ 2. The total score in column 17 is calculated as follows: (modal committee statutory review) + (economic review average)
6. The maximum possible score is 110 points (not 100). The maximum "modal committee statutory review" score is 90 points. The maximum economic benefit score is 20 points. (90 + 20 = 110)
7. The projects are sorted in order based on their "total statutory consideration score" (column 17).
8. Key to Equity and Climate ratings: **NP** – No positive benefit. **LP** – Limited positive benefit. **SP** – Significant positive benefit. These are qualitative statutory review considerations. The ratings were assigned by Connect Oregon staff.
9. This worksheet was provided by Connect Oregon staff. It was reformatted and annotated (with notes) by Bill Johnston. Updated August 19, 2026

Regional Solutions Team review

This document is a compilation of the comments provided by the Region Solutions Team (RST). There are actually two RSTs that provide services in Region 2. One covers the North Coast area. The other covers the South Valley Area.

The format of this document mirrors the format of the Region 2 project descriptions (Attachment B.1). The projects are grouped by area. Within each area, the projects are presented in the order they were ranked by the ACT.

The RSTs gave all the projects the highest rating, Tier 1. There are no Tier 2 ratings. However, the comments provided for a few projects indicate the RST thinks these projects have somewhat more or less benefit than the other projects.

In order to provide some differentiation between the projects, Region 2 staff modified the ratings. The two projects that have somewhat more benefit are identified as **Tier 1+**. (Refer to Projects 1.1 and 1.3.) The two projects that have somewhat less benefit are identified as **Tier 1-** (Refer to Projects 4.5 and 4.6.) These ratings are also noted in Attachment D.2 (Table 3).

Area 1 projects (Northwest ACT)

1.1 – Port of Astoria (applicant) **2M532** (application number)

Pier 2 West Rehabilitation

Description: Pier 2 West Rehabilitation will restore critical working waterfront infrastructure at the Port of Astoria. Pier 2 West supports the region's commercial fishing fleet, seafood processors, and related maritime businesses, but the structure has deteriorated significantly from age, exposure, piling damage, and seawall failure. ODOT imposed weight restrictions in 2017, limiting safe use of the pier and affecting seafood processing operations. The project will rehabilitate the pier to address structural deficiencies, restore safe and reliable access, and preserve an essential maritime asset for Clatsop County's seafood and blue economy sectors.

Comments: Pier 2 West is the top North Coast Regional Solutions priority among the Connect Oregon projects reviewed. The pier is core infrastructure for the Port of Astoria and supports commercial fishing, seafood processing, marine freight activity, and related traded-sector employment. Rehabilitation of the pier will address documented safety and operational constraints, including weight restrictions that have reduced seafood processing efficiency and limited the functionality of the pier. The project preserves working waterfront capacity, supports business retention and operational continuity for seafood processors, and maintains infrastructure needed for the North Coast's maritime and natural resource economy. The project also leverages substantial prior investment, including Business Oregon preconstruction funding and federal PIDP funding.

Rating: **Tier 1+**

1.2 – Port of Columbia County (applicant) **2M535** (application number)

Port Westward Beaver Dock Modernization

Description: The Port Westward Beaver Dock Modernization project will improve marine terminal infrastructure at Port Westward in Columbia County. The project is intended to support continued dock operations, improve safety and reliability, and preserve capacity for marine cargo and industrial users at the port. The work will help maintain a Columbia River port asset that supports freight movement and industrial activity in the region.

Comments: The project supports continued use of marine freight infrastructure on the Columbia River and helps preserve port capacity for industrial and cargo users. Improvements to the dock will support safe and reliable operations, maintain access to waterborne transportation, and contribute to the movement of goods through a regionally significant port facility. The project helps sustain infrastructure used by employers and industrial users while supporting continued economic activity along the river.

Rating: Tier 1

1.3 – City of Warrenton (applicant) **2M533** (application number)

Warrenton Marina E Dock Replacement

Description: The Warrenton Marina E Dock Replacement project will replace aging public marina infrastructure that supports commercial fishing, marine businesses, and working waterfront activity in Warrenton. E Dock provides moorage and access for vessels that depend on the marina for commercial operations. Replacement of the dock will improve safety, reliability, and continued access while preserving public marina capacity in Clatsop County.

Comments: The Warrenton Marina E Dock Replacement is a high-priority North Coast project. Warrenton's marina infrastructure supports commercial fishing activity, maritime businesses, and the broader working waterfront economy. Replacing E Dock will improve transportation safety, preserve marine access, and support the businesses and workforce that rely on dependable dock and moorage infrastructure. The project maintains local maritime capacity, supports the natural resource economy, and helps ensure that public waterfront infrastructure remains available for commercial and community use.

Rating: Tier 1+

1.4 – Pacific Seafood (applicant) **2M534** (application number)

Pacific Seafood - Warrenton - Fuel & Ice Dock Repair

Description: The Pacific Seafood Warrenton Fuel & Ice Dock Repair project will repair dock infrastructure that supports seafood processing, fishing fleet operations, and related marine activity in Warrenton. The project will improve the reliability of fuel and ice service for vessels and help maintain the operational capacity of an important seafood-sector facility. The project supports continued seafood landing, processing, and maritime employment in Clatsop County.

Comments: Reliable fuel, ice, and dock infrastructure are important to the commercial fishing and seafood processing supply chain. This project supports seafood-sector continuity, working waterfront operations, and maritime employment in Warrenton. By repairing infrastructure used by fishing vessels and seafood operations, the project helps maintain the region's natural resource economy, supports traded-sector activity, and strengthens the operational base for the North Coast seafood industry.

Rating: Tier 1

Area 3 projects (Mid-Willamette Valley ACT)

3.1 – Portland & Western Railroad (applicant) **2R530** (application number)

Woodburn to Wilsonville Rail Modernization, Safety, and Capacity Improvement Project

Description: Private project to remove bolted sections of rail between Woodburn and Wilsonville and replacing with Continuous Welded Rail to improve safety and performance, allowing for increased speed in this rail corridor

Comments: This project is in line with Natural Resource Stewardship as this project is intended to serve as an alternate to truck freight to improve the transportation of goods. The improved line will be able to move goods quicker than alternative roadways and the Continuous Welded Rail reduces maintenance costs and derailment risk which lessens the risk of spill cleanup while extending the projected lifespan by about 20 years.

This line transports more than 60,000 truckloads of material annually and the Association of American Railroads claims transportation by rail produces 75% reduced emissions compared to trucking. Using rail also reduces pressure on congested roadways.

This project is also in line with Economic Vitality as this route serves approximately 60 businesses with some major agriculture, construction, and manufacturing facilities relying on efficient delivery of materials on this railway. Letters were included with the application indicating the importance for dozens of businesses affected by the "slow order" that currently delays deliveries based on track construction and conditions.

With the improvements, the railway may be usable as a commuter line.

This project is ready to proceed and has scoping, planning, land acquisition, and permitting completed. Bidding documents are expected next year, 2027.

Rating: Tier 1

3.2 – Trimble Aviation (applicant) **2A531** (application number)

McMinnville Airport Terminal Construction and Quonset Hangar Remodel

Description: This project would construct a 1,300 square foot terminal and upgrade the McMinnville Municipal Airport to support the aviation sector. Improvements include ADA compliant access, parking, pathways, and rehabilitation of a WWII-era hangar. With 128 private aircraft based at the airport, the rehabilitation affects several traded-sector employers.

Comments: This project supports Economic Vitality by encouraging growth in regional aviation related businesses and improving private facilities currently used by traded sector employers such as: Precision, Trimble, and Weyerhaeuser. This could complement additional investments in the McMinnville and nearby economic growth planning.

Precision Helicopters was recently approved as an Airbus service and sales center; Weyerhaeuser recently acquired the largest on site hangar to base Blackhawk helicopters for forestry operations and wildfire sponse; Trimble Aviation is poised to invest \$225K in private dollars and add 10-15 new aviation positions. While the application indicates the creation of only 4 permanent jobs, there is potential for greater growth.

The placement of aircraft on site also supports Community Resilience by regionally locating firefighting equipment on site.

Rating: Tier 1

3.2 – Aurora Airport Improvement Association (applicant) **2A529** (application number)

Aurora Airport - Secure Internal Circulation Road

Description: This project creates a continuous interior road between the Yellow Gate and Stenbock Way to address the safety and operational gap for moving between areas at the Aurora State Airport.

Comments: This project supports Economic Vitality by making business activity easier and safer to conduct within the secured boundaries of the Aurora Airport. Current conditions can force users to leave the secured perimeter or operate in close proximity to aircraft movement areas, including delivery services and others who are less familiar with situational awareness in the footprint of an airport and are more likely to be involved in vehicle/aircraft conflicts. This change may encourage current commercial operators to grow and it invites more economic activity when the movement of vehicles is more practical.

This project also supports Infrastructure in Transportation Capacity as activity at Aurora is expected to grow and the internal circulation road would allow for more movement of more vehicles and goods. With the updated Master Plan including other elements of growth, including runway length, efficient paths will become more crucial. The proposal is also efficient since the proposed roadway utilizes many existing paved spaces to provide a direct, clear, and practical route, while updating signage to improve safety.

Investing in the airport internal circulation route may also keep emergency response and service business on site, connecting to the Community Resilience priority.

Less relevant regarding the priorities, but important to consider, is the frequent violations the FAA has issued with increasing severity, making this project an important compliance issue. This is also shared public infrastructure so the financial lift is a good fit for public investment.

Rating: Tier 1

Area 4 projects (Cascades West ACT)

4.1 – Philomath Sawmill, LLC (applicant) **2R528** (application number)

Philomath Planer Mill Phase 1

Description: The project will rehabilitate approximately 400 feet of existing rail spur at the Philomath Planer Mill to restore active rail service. Improvements include removal and replacement of failed rail sections, installation of ~25 new ties, sub-ballast and geotextile, gauge correction, removal/replacement of crossings, and track surfacing. The resulting asset will enable safe, functional short-line rail access for the phase 1 startup of the planer mill.

Comments: This project strongly supports regional priorities, including support for the existing business community, housing production, and community resilience.

Business community: Investment enables Timberlab to reinvigorate a shuttered mill in a rural community that will also serve as a critical link in the mass timber supply chain developing in the Willamette Valley. Timberlab has made significant investments in their Millersburg facility; build out of this mill supports success of the Millersburg facility.

Housing production: As wood fiber production capability diminishes in the Coast Range, the need to retain local supplies of building materials becomes critical to new housing production, particularly in coastal communities where housing need is high.

Community resilience: Maintaining mill capacity in the region helps ensure there are local outlets for wood products harvested through timber sales, thinning projects, etc. helping to improve forest health and reduce wildfire risk.

Project appears to have a significant return for relatively small public investment.

Rating: Tier 1

4.2 – CLT Lab, LLC (applicant) **2R540** (application number)

Timberlab Connection to P&WR

Description: Project will construct approximately 3,000 feet of new industrial rail track, including a rail spur, two industry tracks, turnouts, ballast, drainage, and related improvements connecting Timberlab's manufacturing facility to the Portland & Western Railroad. The project

will provide freight rail access enabling efficient inbound and outbound shipments while reducing truck traffic and improving freight system performance.

Comments: This project strongly supports the thriving business community priority. This investment provides freight rail access to Timberlab’s new CLT manufacturing facility helping ensure this facility operates and moves product to market efficiently. This supports the state’s growing advanced wood manufacturing sector.

Rating: Tier 1

4.3 – Port of Newport (applicant) **2M537** (application number)

Port of Newport International Terminal Dolphin Installation

Description: The Port of Newport proposes installation of a breasting dolphin at the Newport International Terminal, and replacement of a mooring dolphin with a breasting dolphin.

Comments: This project is aligned with the infrastructure and thriving business environment priorities. This goal of this investment is to increase mooring capacity allowing more and larger vessels (business activity) to utilize the Port of Newport.

Rating: Tier 1

4.4 – Port of Newport (applicant) **2M538** (application number)

Port of Newport South Beach Dredging

Description: Funds will be used to dredge the north end of the South Beach Marina (SBM) located along the south shore of Yaquina Bay in Newport, Oregon, which has not been dredged in almost 30 years.

Comments: This project is aligned with the infrastructure and thriving business environment priorities. Coastal communities including Newport rely on regular dredging (required to maintain access to infrastructure) to maintain economic activity generated by tourism and recreation.

Rating: Tier 1

4.5 – City of Corvallis (applicant) **2A527** (application number)

Corvallis Airport Hangar Taxilane Improvement

Description: Hangar Taxilane extension on west side of airfield to open new development areas for hangars.

Comments: This project is loosely aligned with the regional infrastructure priority (specifically assisting communities in updating aging infrastructure to support employment) and thriving business environment priority to the extent the hangar extension allows for additional leases which could include aviation businesses. The potential positive economic impact appears to be less significant than other proposals offer.

Rating: **Tier 1-**

4.6 – City of Harrisburg (applicant) **2R541** (application number)

Harrisburg 4th St Corridor Railroad Rehabilitation and Grade Crossing Improvement Project

Description: The project area is the railroad line that runs on 4th St between Smith St and LaSalle St in Harrisburg, OR. The project will daylight BNSF-owned train tracks embedded in the center of 4th St and rehabilitate them. It would separate overlapping motorized and non-motorized transportation facilities by isolating tracks with curbing and closing three at-grade crossings. The Project would improve safety, mobility, and state of good repair of the railroad in the project area.

Comments: This project is loosely aligned with the infrastructure priority in that it seeks to update and make more safe existing infrastructure in the city. The rail line is an important part of the transportation network moving goods through the region. **There appears to be less direct economic benefit to this project compared to other proposals.**

Rating: **Tier 1-**

4.7 – Western University of Health Sciences (applicant) **2R539** (application number)

WesternU Oregon Railroad Grade-Separated Undercrossing (Lebanon)

Description: Project Purpose: Western University of Health Sciences (WesternU Oregon) and City of Lebanon Partnership Expansion Phase 1: Rail Underpass Construction project will support the construction of a rail underpass and public street access at WesternU's second campus development in Lebanon, Oregon.

Comments: This project supports the infrastructure and business environment priorities. The proposed investment in an undercrossing and public street needed to provide access to a new university campus represents a significant investment in local infrastructure that both maintains existing commerce (rail) and supports future employment. The proposed university campus offers significant job growth potential in terms of staff onsite as well as the students who will become future health care providers in the region and state.

A relatively small investment by the state in this project helps unlock a significant private investment in this campus estimated by the applicant at \$242 million that will also help bolster the healthcare industry.

Rating: **Tier 1**

Area 5 projects (Lane ACT)

5.1 – City of Eugene (applicant) **2A536** (application number)

Eugene Airport Concourse A Expansion and ADA Lift

Description: This project will construct an additional 7,000 square foot of seating area in Concourse A and add an ADA emergency exit lift from the airside.

Comments: This project supports the infrastructure and thriving business community priorities. The Eugene Airport has a significant economic impact in the region and this project will enhance the airport's ability to continue to provide quality service. Airport expansion also has links to existing economic development strategies in the region including efforts to better capture economic output generated by two major research universities in the region.

The applicant is providing significant match for this request.

Rating: Tier 1

Region 2 evaluation

Included in this attachment are the following documents:

1. **Recommended method for ranking projects** – Four options are provided. (3 pages)
2. **Table 3: Region 2 evaluation worksheet** – Shows adjusted rankings, to account for ACT preferences. Identifies projects that deviate significantly from the rankings based on the statutory considerations scores, or the RST rankings. (1 page)

Recommended method for ranking projects

This document describes several different approaches (methods) the committee could use to rank the Region 2 projects. Staff recommends Method 1. For reference (for those who are interested), Attachment E describes the methods that previous Region 2 Review Committees used to evaluate the CO6, CO8 and CO9 applications in 2016, 2022 and 2024.

This discussion refers to Table 3, which is included in this attachment, immediately following this document. Before describing the different approaches for ranking the projects, an overview of Table 3 is provided (in the following section).

Table 3: Region 2 evaluation

Table 3 is a worksheet intended to assist the committee in evaluating and ranking the projects. It includes some, but not all, of the project information that was included in Table 1 and Table 2 (in Attachment C). It also includes the following additional information:

- **ACT rankings** – Column 12 indicates how each of the four Region 2 ACTs ranked the projects in their area.
- **Preliminary Region 2 ranking** – As a starting point (baseline) for discussion, the worksheet defines the “preliminary Region 2 ranking” as the priority order that would result if the projects were ranked based on their total statutory considerations score. Refer to columns 7 and 8.
- **Adjusted rankings** – Column 14 shows the adjusted ranking for all 15 projects, accounting for adjustments made by each ACT. (MWACT was the only ACT that made any adjustments.) This was done manually by reordering each ACT's projects, within the larger list of projects, to reflect the ACT's preferences. Reordering projects for one ACT did not affect the overall ranking of the other projects.
- **Deviation from other rankings** – Column 15 shows the difference (deviation), for each project, between the rank based on the statutory considerations score (column 8) and the adjusted Region 2 rank (column 14). Column 16 identifies projects that deviate from the rankings assigned by the Regional Solutions Team (RST). Projects with a large deviation are highlighted in yellow for the committee to discuss.

This is a complex table. There are many columns and numbers. Note that the columns are numbered (1-18) for reference. The information included in each column is explained in the footnotes (1-13). **It is not necessary to read all the footnotes.** Most of the column headings are self-explanatory.

Method 1 – Rank projects base on ACT preferences (recommended)

This was referred to above. Column 14 (in Table 3) shows the adjusted ranking for all 11 projects, accounting for adjustments made by each ACT.

Pros

- Acknowledges the preferences of each ACT.

Note that MWACT (Area 3) was the only ACT to deviate from the rankings based on statutory considerations scores. In their opinion, the number 3 ranked project was a better project than the number two ranked project.

- This is a relatively simple approach. The rankings based on this method have already been determined. Refer to column 14.
- This approach is “good enough.” Attempting to be more precise would require more discussion and may not affect the outcome. The Final Review Committee will consider the rankings of the Region Review Committees but will make their own determination.

Cons

- Could create some ranking "distortion." A lower ranked project moved to a higher position to reflect one ACT's preference could place that project higher on the list than other higher scoring projects. This may or may not be a concern to the other ACTs.
- The Final Review Committee or OTC might question why Region 2 deviated from the preliminary, score-based rankings. (This is a minor concern. The purpose of the ACT and Region review is to obtain a local perspective.)

Method 2 – Rank projects base on statutory considerations score

This was also referred to above. The committee could simply rank the projects based on their statutory consideration score (column 8).

Pros

- This is the simplest approach. The rankings using this method have already been determined.

Cons

- Does not acknowledge the local insight and preferences of each ACT, or other adjustments the committee may want to make.

Method 3 – Adjust the rankings to reflect some ACT preferences

This is a hybrid approach, combining methods 1 and 2. The committee could adjust the rankings by moving one or more projects higher or lower on the list. As a starting point for discussion, the committee could focus on those projects that deviate significantly from their

score-based rank (column 15) or from the RST ranking (column 16). The committee could make other adjustments based on the discussion that occurs at the meeting.

Pros

- Recognizes some (but not all) of the preferences indicated by each ACT.
- Enhances the credibility of the committee's rankings, if anyone were to question why they deviated from the score-based rankings or the RST rankings.

Cons

- May require over-ruling the preferences of some ACTs, which could create some dissent and discord among the committee members.
- Requires time and effort (at the meeting) to discuss and negotiate. It may not be worth the effort. The Final Review Committee and the OCT may not give that much weight to the regional review committee rankings. They may give more weight to the statutory consideration scores and the modal committee recommendations.

Method 4 – Adjust the rankings to include the largest number of projects

The committee could also make some adjustments to ensure that the largest number of projects within Region 2 are competitive when they are considered by the Final Review Committee. This would involve establishing a “budget” representing the amount of funding Region 2 is reasonably likely to receive, in terms of grant awards for projects within Region 2. The rankings would then be adjusted to maximize the number of projects that would fall within the budget.

The committee could assume Region 2 is likely to receive somewhere between one fifth (\$6 M) and one fourth (\$8 M) of the total funding available (\$30 M). Or they could assume more, considering that 15 of the 37 (40%) of the applications received are within Region 2. This (40%) would amount to \$12 M.

Pros

- This approach would increase the probability (likelihood) that more projects within Region 2 will be funded.

Cons

- Refer to the disadvantages described for Method 3.
- This approach disadvantages high-cost projects that might otherwise be considered favorably by the Final Review Committee, because the Region 2 Review Committee ranked them lower to accommodate more lower-cost projects.

Attachment D.2 – Table 3: Region 2 evaluation worksheet – adjusted rankings to account for ACT preferences (note 1)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Mode	County	Applicant	Project name	CO grant funds requested	Cumulative total	Total score	Rank based on score	RST rating	ODOT Area	ACT rank (based on score)	adjusted ACT rank	change in rank (within ACT area)	preliminary R2 rank (adjusted)	deviation from rank based on score	deviation from RST	Region 2 final rank	notes
				(note 2)	(note 3)	(note 4)	(note 4)	(note 5)		(note 6)	(note 7)	(note 8)	(note 9)	(note 10)	(note 11)	(note 12)	
M	Clatsop	Port of Astoria	Pier 2 West Rehabilitation	\$ 10,426,950	\$ 10,426,950	96	1	Tier 1+	1	1/4	1/4	0	1	0	OK as is		The RST likes this project. Can't move it any higher.
M	Columbia	Port of Columbia County	Port Westward Beaver Dock Modernization	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 12,926,950	95	2	Tier 1	1	2/4	2/4	0	2	0			
R	Benton	Philomath Sawmill, LLC	Philomath Planer Mill Phase 1	\$ 165,743	\$ 13,092,693	90	3	Tier 1	4	1/7	1/7	0	3	0			
R	Linn	CLT Lab, LLC	Timberlab Connection to P&WR	\$ 3,035,252	\$ 16,127,945	89	4	Tier 1	4	2/7	2/7	0	4	0			
R	Marion	Portland & Western Railroad	Woodburn to Wilsonville Rail Modernization, Safety, and Capacity Improvement Project	\$ 349,428	\$ 16,477,373	84	5	Tier 1	3	1/3	1/3	0	5	0			MWACT did not adjust the ranking of this project.
M	Clatsop	City of Warrenton	Warrenton Marina E Dock Replacement	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 18,977,373	82	6	Tier 1+	1	3/4	3/4	0	6	0	low?		The RST likes this project. Could move higher.
M	Clatsop	Pacific Seafood	Pacific Seafood - Warrenton - Fuel & Ice Dock Repair	\$ 1,481,361	\$ 20,458,734	78	7	Tier 1	1	4/4	4/4	0	7	0			
M	Lincoln	Port of Newport	Port of Newport International Terminal Dolphin Installation	\$ 1,138,150	\$ 21,596,884	78	8	Tier 1	4	3/7	3/7	0	8	0			
A	Lane	City of Eugene	Eugene Airport Concourse A Expansion and ADA Lift	\$ 3,897,360	\$ 25,494,244	69	9	Tier 1	5	1/1	1/1	0	9	0			
A	Yamhill	Trimble Aviation	McMinnville Airport Terminal Construction and Quonset Hangar Remodel	\$ 525,000	\$ 26,019,244	63	12	Tier 1	3	3/3	2/3	+1	10	-2			MWACT moved this project from position 2 to position 3 (among the three projects they ranked)
M	Lincoln	Port of Newport	Port of Newport South Beach Dredging	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 27,069,244	67	11	Tier 1	4	4/7	4/7	0	11	0			
A	Marion	Aurora Airport Improvement Association	Aurora Airport - Secure Internal Circulation Road	\$ 966,133	\$ 28,035,377	67	10	Tier 1	3	2/3	3/3	-1	12	+2			MWACT moved this project from position 3 to position 2 (among the three projects they ranked)
A	Benton	City of Corvallis	Corvallis Airport Hangar Taxilane Improvement	\$ 800,000	\$ 28,835,377	58	13	Tier 1-	4	5/7	5/7	0	13	0	high?		Already ranked at the low end. No need to move any lower
R	Linn	City of Harrisburg	Harrisburg 4th St Corridor Railroad Rehabilitation and Grade Crossing Improvement Project	\$ 2,804,767	\$ 31,640,144	52	14	Tier 1-	4	6/7	6/7	0	14	0	high?		Already ranked at the low end. No need to move any lower
R	Linn	Western University of Health Sciences (Lebanon)	WesternU Oregon Railroad Grade-Separated Undercrossing	\$ 3,967,600	\$ 35,607,744	48	15	Tier 1	4	7/7	7/7	0	15	0			

Notes

- In this table, the projects are ranked based on their statutory consideration score (column 7 and 8) and then adjusted to account for each ACT's preferences for the projects in their area (column 12). The adjusted preliminary rankings are shown in column 14. Columns 15 and 16 indicate the amount of deviation from other rankings. The committee may want to discuss any project with a significant deviation (highlighted in yellow). Refer to the notes below for additional explanation.
- This table only shows the amount of funding requested, in column 5. Table 1 and Table 2 (included in Attachment C) show the total project cost and the matching funds. There is other information (columns) shown in the other tables that is not shown here, to conserve space and to avoid confusing the committee with too much information.
- The cumulative total of the funds requested is shown in column 6, to assist the committee members in gaging the cost of the top ranked projects relative to the total funding available (\$46 M). Unlike previous funding cycles, there is no specific amount of funding allocated to each Region. To provide some "side boards" to guide the discussion, the committee could assume that Region 2 is likely to receive somewhere between one-fifth (\$6 M) and one-third (\$10 M) of the total funding available (\$30 M), in terms of grant awards for projects within Region 2.
- Column 7 shows the total statutory consideration score, which is described in more detail in Table 1 and Table 2 (included Attachment C). Column 8 shows how the projects would be ordered if they were ranked based on the score shown in column 7.
- Column 9 indicates the ratings assigned by the Regional Solutions Team (RST). For this Connect Oregon review, all the projects received the highest rating: Tier 1. However, the RST identified a few projects that have somewhat more (Tier 1+) or less (Tier 1-) benefit than the other projects. The RST comments are included in Attachment C.
- Column 11 (ACT rank based on score) shows how each of the four ACTs would have ranked the projects, within their area, if they had relied on the total statutory consideration score (column 7). For the CO9 funding cycle, there are four applications (projects) in Area 1 (NWACT), three applications in Area 4 (CWACT) and Area 5 (LaneACT), and one application in Area 3 (MWACT).
- Column 12 (adjusted ACT rank) shows how each ACT actually ranked the projects in their area. The MWACT was the only ACT that deviated from the preliminary ranking based on the statutory consideration score.
- Column 13 shows the change in rank for each project, within each ACT, with respect to the preliminary ranking (column 11). Mathematically, column 13 = column 11 – column 12.
- Column 14 shows the adjusted ranking for all 11 projects, accounting for adjustments made by each ACT. This was done manually by reordering each ACT's projects, within the larger list of projects, to reflect the ACT's preferences. Reordering projects for one ACT did not affect the overall ranking of the other projects. Staff did not make this adjustment to the worksheet that was used by the Region 2 Review Committee in 2022 to review the CO8 applications. Note that this method could create some ranking "distortion." A lower ranked project moved to a higher position to reflect one ACT's preference could place that project higher on the list than other higher scoring projects. This may or may not be a concern to the other ACTs, or the Final Review Committee.
- Column 15 shows the difference (deviation) between the rank based on the statutory considerations score (column 8) and the preliminary adjusted Region 2 rank (column 14). Mathematically, column 15 = column 8 – column 14. The committee may want to discuss any project with a significant deviation (highlighted in yellow).
- Column 16 identifies project rankings that may not be consistent with the ratings assigned by the Regional Solutions Team (RST), shown in column 9. Projects that should perhaps be ranked higher are noted as "low." Projects that should perhaps be ranked lower are noted as "high." The committee may want to discuss these projects (highlighted in yellow).
- Column 17 is reserved for the final rankings assigned by the Region 2 Review Committee when they meet on August 26. Options include: (1) Rank the projects consistent with the preliminary adjusted ranking (column 14). (2) Rank the projects consistent with the rankings based on the statutory consideration score (column 8). (3) Adjust the rankings by moving one or more projects higher or lower on the list. (4) Adjust the rankings to include the largest number of projects. Refer to Attachment D.1 for a more detailed discussion of these methods.
- This worksheet was prepared by Bill Johnston for the CO9 Region 2 Review Committee. Updated August 19, 2026

Previous Region 2 reviews

It may be helpful for the current committee members to understand how previous committees approached the task of ranking projects. Included in this attachment are the following documents:

1. **Connect Oregon 6** – Summary of the Region 2 Review Committee meeting that occurred on May 25, 2016. (2 pages)
2. **Connect Oregon 8** – Summary of the Region 2 Review Committee meeting that occurred on March 10, 2022. (2 pages)
3. **Changes for 2024** – Summary of the key changes to the Connect Oregon review process for funding cycle 9. (2 pages)
4. **Connect Oregon 9** – Summary of the Region 2 Review Committee meeting that occurred on July 10, 2024. (2 pages)

Note

The State Legislature allocated the Connect Oregon 7 funds themselves, in 2017, for four specific intermodal projects. Refer to HB 2017, Section 71f.

Connect Oregon 6

The following is a summary of the Region 2 Review Committee meeting that occurred on May 25, 2016.

At the start of the meeting, MWACT Chair Ken Woods (Dallas City Councilor) declared that he had a conflict of interest because the City of Dallas had an application being considered by the committee. The ODOT Freight Program Manager (who participated in the meeting) determined that Mr. Woods did not need to abstain from voting because he did not have a personal financial interest in the project.

There were 20 applications submitted for projects within Region 2. There were five applications in each of the four ACT areas. There were 78 applications statewide, in all 5 Regions. Total funding available: \$45 million.

The committee used the following approach to prioritize the projects. They compared the corresponding projects from each area. That is, they compared all the priority 1 projects, priority 2 projects, etc. They also considered the statutory consideration scores compiled by Connect Oregon staff, and the amount of funding available for projects in Region 2. (For the CO6 funding cycle, each Region was allocated a specific amount of funding.)

This method was more complicated than the method the committee used in 2022 to review the CO8 applications. A separate summary of that review is included in this attachment.

The final prioritized list of projects was similar to the list that would have resulted if the committee had simply ranked the projects in order of their statutory consideration scores, adjusted to account for each ACT's preferred ranking of the projects within their area. (This is one of the methods Region 2 staff is recommending for the current CO10 review.)

Only two projects were ranked more than one position lower than they would have been ranked if the preliminary R2 rankings (accounting for each ACT's preferences) had been used:

2A0410 – Brim Aviation (Astoria), air and marine facilities upgrade (Area 1). The NWACT previously downgraded this project from rank order 2/5 (overall R2 position 4) to 5/5 (overall R2 position 15). The committee moved it 2 positions lower (to 17). Note that the NWACT couldn't, by themselves, move it any lower on the overall R2 list. They were only responsible for ranking the projects within their area. Both the NWACT and the committee had concerns with this project. They didn't think it would be profitable, and it didn't have a clear public benefit. (The OTC did not select this project for funding.)

2M0375 – Port of Astoria, Pier 2 rehabilitation (Area 1). The NWACT previously upgraded this project from rank order 4/5 (overall R2 position 14) to 3/5 (overall R2 position 5). However, the committee moved it 7 positions lower (to 12). This was the most significant disagreement. The committee had concerns about the cost estimate. There were many unknowns, which the committee considered a project risk. (This project was eventually funded by the OTC.)

The other 18 projects moved less than 2 positions (1 or 0) up or down on the list. Some of the upward movement was the result of other projects (like the two described above) being downgraded. Other movement (up or down) reflected discussion about the merits or shortcomings of specific projects.

The Region 2 recommendations were forwarded to a higher-level Statewide Review Committee for their consideration in ranking all the projects. The OTC made the final funding decision. The Statewide Review Committee and the OTC did not rank the Region 2 projects in the same order as the Region 2 Review Committee. The top seven projects, as ranked by the Region 2 Review Committee, were funded. Projects 10 and 12 were also funded. Projects 8, 9 and 11 were not funded. Projects 13-20 were not funded either.

Connect Oregon 8

The following is a summary of the Region 2 Review Committee meeting that occurred on March 10, 2022.

There were 14 applications submitted for projects within Region 2. There were six projects in Area 1, four in Area 5, three in Area 4, and one in Area 3. There were 50 applications statewide, in all 5 Regions. Total funding available: \$46 million.

As a starting point for discussion, the Region 2 Review Committee (R2RC) referred to the list of projects within Region 2, ranked in order of their statutory and economic benefit scores. Region 2 staff did not provide an adjusted list that accounted for the ACTs' preferences. That is, the list didn't account for how each ACT ranked the projects within their area.

The R2 Review Committee (R2RC) adjusted the ranking of two projects:

2M0438 – Hyak Maritime (Astoria), heavy lift installation (Area 1). The committee moved this project from position 3 on the list to position 10. They were concerned about the \$13 million project cost, which was 30 percent of the total \$46 million available. They were concerned that Region 2 could be disadvantaged by ranking an expensive project so high. They thought it would be more strategic recommending less expensive projects that were more likely to be funded.

2A0443 – City of Eugene Airport, taxiway improvements (Area 5). The committee moved this project from position 2 on the list to position 1. The LaneACT representatives explained that this was their preference. (Both the number 1 and number 2 projects were within Area 5.) They also explained that there was an error in the scoring. The Airport project should have been ranked as the top Region 2 project anyway, based on scoring.

During the deliberations to determine the final rankings, the committee was not able to reach an informal consensus. The representative from Area 1 objected to moving the Hyak Maritime project in Astoria to a lower position on the list. To resolve the impasse, the committee agreed to have a formal up or down vote. The group voted 6-1 to approve the final rankings, with the adjustments that had been discussed.

All of the ACT representatives present were allowed to vote. Both the chair and vice chair from all the ACTs, except the NWACT (Area 1), were at the meeting. The vice chair of the NWACT did not attend. The Area 1 Manager, who is a voting member of the NWACT, was at the meeting and could have voted. The meeting facilitators should have but didn't explain this.

The Region 2 recommendations were forwarded to a higher-level Statewide Review Committee for their consideration in ranking all the projects. The OTC made the final funding decision. The

top five projects, as ranked by the Region 2 Review Committee, were funded. The Hyak Maritime project was also funded, even though the committee had moved it to position 10 on their list. (The modal review committee, Statewide Review Committee and OTC thought this was an important maritime-related project.) Projects 6-9 were not funded. Projects 11-14 were not funded either.

Changes for 2024

The most significant change in the review process for the Connect Oregon 9 funding cycle was that the “tiers” that were used in the past to distinguish the top ranked projects, based on scoring, were not used this time. The tiers are described in more detail below, for those who are interested.

There was also no predetermined allocation of funds for each Region. This was not actually new. There was no allocation for the CO8 funding cycle either, in 2022. There was an allocation for the previous CO6 funding cycle in 2016.

This detail is mentioned here because some committee members who participated in previous reviews may remember having a budget, which was convenient because it provided some limits (“side boards”) to guide the project selection (rankings). (The tiers referred to above also established some limits, in terms of how much change in ranking was allowed.)

The budget allocation provided for the CO6 funding cycle is described below. This may be more relevant to the committee members than the tiers. If the committee wanted to, they could establish their own budget, based on the funding the Region is reasonably likely to receive, to help guide the project selection (rankings). This is discussed in more detail below and in Attachment D.1.

Tiers

The procedures established by the Legislature for the Connect Oregon program require applications to be evaluated and scored. The scoring reflects the degree to which a proposed project meets certain criteria defined in state statutes and rules (OAR 731-035-0060). These criteria are referred to as “statutory review considerations.” Project scoring is described in more detail in Attachment C.1 of this meeting packet.

The procedure used for previous Connect Oregon funding cycles defined tiers, based on the scoring described above, to distinguish the top-ranked projects from other projects. **Tier 1:** 81-105 points. **Tier 2:** 51-80 points. **Tier 3:** 35-60 points. **Tier 4:** 0-34 points.

Connect Oregon staff provided the Region 2 Review Committee with a list of the projects within Region 2, ranked according to their total score. The list also indicated which tiers the projects were within. The Region 2 Review Committee was required to provide a justification for ranking a project higher or lower, if the change would result in the project moving into a different tier. That is, the project (in its new position) was clustered in a group of projects all within the same tier, based on their scores, different than the project’s original tier group.

This tiering system was used in all previous funding cycles. Tiers were not defined or considered for the CO9 review process.

Funding allocations

The Connect Oregon program is funded with lottery bonds. \$45 million was available for the CO6 funding cycle in 2016. 50% (\$22.5 M) was allocated for the 5 ODOT Regions to decide how to use. \$4.5 million was available for each Region. The other 50% (\$22.5 M) was allocated for projects of statewide significance within any Region.

Having a budget (for the Region) made it somewhat easier for the Region 2 Review Committee to decide how to rank the projects. Having a defined threshold allowed the committee to see more clearly the consequences of their rankings. They changed the rankings of some projects to ensure that the worthiest and largest number of projects would be considered for funding.

The CO8 grant program in 2022 did not allocate a certain amount of funding to each Region. Neither did the CO9 program (or the current CO10 program). However, the Region 2 Review Committee could, if they wanted to, define their own budget based on the funding the Region is reasonably likely to receive. (That is, grants awarded for projects within Region 2.)

For example (for CO9), the committee could have assumed that Region 2 is likely to receive somewhere between one-fifth (\$9 M) and one-fourth (\$12 M) of the total funding available (\$46 M). Or they could assume more, considering that 11 of the 34 (one-third) of the applications received are within Region 2. This approach is discussed in more detail in Attachment D.1.

Connect Oregon 9

The following is a summary of the Region 2 Review Committee meeting that occurred on July 10, 2024.

There were four 11 applications submitted for projects within Region 2. There were four projects in Area 1, three in Area 4, three in Area 5, and one in Area 3. There were 35 applications statewide, in all 5 Regions. Total funding available: \$46 million.

As a starting point for discussion, the Region 2 Review Committee (R2RC) referred to the list of projects within Region 2, ranked in order of their statutory and economic benefit scores. Region 2 staff provided an adjusted list that accounted for the ACTs' preferences. That is, the list accounted for how each ACT ranked the projects within their area.

The Northwest ACT (Area 1) was the only ACT that deviated from the preliminary rankings based on their benefit scores. The R2RC did not adjust any of the rankings. The final Region 2 rankings reflected the preferences of the NWACT, for the projects within their area.

Region 2 rankings (application number, applicant, project name)

1. **2M0494:** Port of Newport – Port of Newport Dock 7 and Commercial Marina Modernization and Rebuild
2. **2M0489:** Columbia River Bar Pilots, LLC – Columbia River Bar and Coastal Wave Safety Technology
3. **2M0495:** Port of Columbia County – Port Westward Beaver Dock Modernization Project
4. **2R0497:** Portland & Western RR – Salem to Woodburn Rail Modernization, Safety, and Capacity Improvement
5. 2M0491: Pacific Seafood Warrenton, LLC – Pacific Seafood (Warrenton) Fuel and Ice Dock Repair
6. **2A0488:** Oregon Department of Aviation – Oakridge Airport Runway Rehabilitation
7. **2R0496:** Green Hill Reload – Greenhill Reload Multi-Modal Center Rail Improvement
8. 2M0490: Pacific Seafood Newport LLC – Pacific Seafood (Newport) dock pilings
9. 2A0487: City of Eugene (airport) – Terminal Concourse A Seating Expansion
10. 2M0492: Port of Astoria – Pier 2 West Rehabilitation & Lift Replacement
11. 2A0486: City of Corvallis (airport) – Construct Hangar Taxilanes and Taxiway B and C Seal Coat

(continued)

The Region 2 recommendations were forwarded to a higher-level Statewide Review Committee for their consideration in ranking all the projects. The Statewide Review Committee rearranged the rank order of some Region 2 projects.

The OTC made the final funding decision. Six of the 11 applications in Region 2 were funded. The funded projects are highlighted in blue on the previous page.

Conflicts of interest

At the start of the meeting, committee members will be asked to disclose any conflicts of interest relating to any of the projects being considered.

There are two types. An actual conflict of interest exists when an individual has a financial interest in the project. A potential conflict of interest exists when an individual's relatives or business they are associated with has a financial interest in the project. This is also referred to as "the appearance of a conflict of interest."

Committee members who have a potential conflict of interest may participate in the evaluation, provided they disclose the conflict. Members who have an actual conflict of interest must refrain from discussion, debate or voting on the project of concern.

Two of the CO10 applications were submitted by local governments (Corvallis and Eugene) who have representatives that serve on an ACT (CWACT and LaneACT). Three of the applications were submitted by special districts (ports) who may have representatives on an ACT.

If these representatives are participating in the Region 2 Review Committee meeting, they would need to disclose that they have a potential conflict of interest. However, they are not prohibited from participating in the discussion or voting.

A more detailed explanation of these rules is provided in the 3-page document included in this attachment, on the following page.

Connect Oregon Ethics Review

Preface

This document is an ethics review for those who will be involved in the application review process including modal committee members, regional committee members and final review committee members.

Connect Oregon

The Connect Oregon selection process is a rigorous review process that involves review from modal committees, regional committees and a final review committee in addition to staff review.

Public Official

According to ORS 244.020(14), “Public Official” means any person who, when an alleged violation of this chapter occurs, is serving the State of Oregon or any of its political subdivisions or any other public body as defined in ORS 174.109 as an elected official, appointed official, employee or agent, irrespective of whether the person is compensated for the services.

This includes:

- Public Employees
- Elected Officials
- Members of Boards and Commissions
- Volunteers
- Relative:
 - ORS 244.020(15) “Relative” means:
 - (a) The spouse, parent, stepparent, child, sibling, stepsibling, son-in-law or daughter-in-law of the public official or candidate;
 - (b) The parent, stepparent, child, sibling, stepsibling, son-in-law or daughter-in-law of the spouse of the public official or candidate;
 - (c) Any individual for whom the public official or candidate has a legal support obligation;
 - (d) Any individual for whom the public official provides benefits arising from the public official’s public employment or from whom the public official receives benefits arising from that individual’s employment; or
 - (e) Any individual from whom the candidate receives benefits arising from that individual’s employment.

Safeguard of the Public Trust

“The Legislative Assembly declares that service as a public official is a public trust, and that as one safeguard for that trust, the people require all public officials to comply with the applicable provisions of this chapter.” ORS 244.010 (1)

Conflict of Interest

In brief, a public official is met with a conflict of interest when participating in an official action could result in a financial effect to the public official, a relative of the public official or a business with which either are associated.

Statutory conflicts of interest have three components:

1. An **“action”**, **“decision”**, or **“recommendation”** made in an **“official capacity”**, which causes;
2. A private pecuniary benefit or detriment, for;
3. The **“public official”**, the public officials **“relative”**(s), or a **“business associated with which the person is associated”**, the public official or the public official’s relative.

Types of Conflict of Interest

Oregon Government Ethics law identifies and defines two types of conflicts of interest. An actual conflict of interest is defined in ORS 244.020(1) and a potential conflict of interest is defined in ORS 244.020(12).

Actual Conflict of Interest

- Any action or any decision or recommendation by a person acting in a capacity as a public official, the effect of which would be to the private pecuniary benefit or detriment of the person or the persons relative or any business with which the person or a relative of the person is associated unless the pecuniary benefit or detriment arises out of circumstances described in subsection (12) of this section.
- *If the financial effect of an action is both **specific** and **certain**, then that action presents an actual conflict of interest.*

Potential Conflict of Interest

- Any action or any decision or recommendation by a person acting in a capacity as a public official, the effect of which could be to the private pecuniary benefit or detriment of the person or the persons relative, or a business with which the person or the persons relative is associated, unless the pecuniary benefit or detriment arises out of the following:
 - (a) An interest or membership in a particular business, industry, occupation or other class required by law as a prerequisite to the holding by the person of the office or position.
 - (b) Any action in the persons official capacity which would affect to the same degree a class consisting of all inhabitants of the state, or a smaller class consisting of an industry, occupation or other group including one of which or in which the person, or the persons relative or business with which the person or the persons relative is associated, is a member or is engaged.
 - (c) Membership in or membership on the board of directors of a nonprofit corporation that is tax-exempt under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code.

When to Declare a Conflict of Interest

Officials on Boards or Commissions and Elected Officials ORS 244.120(2)

- When any action or any decision or recommendation by a person acting in a capacity as a public official, the effect of which **would** be to the private pecuniary benefit or detriment of the person or the person's relative or any business with which the person or the person's relative or any business with which the person or a relative of the person is associated.
- When any action or any decision or recommendation by a person acting in the capacity as a public official, the effect of which **could** be to the private pecuniary benefit or detriment of the person or the person's relative, or a business with which the person or the person's relative is associated
- Disclosure must occur when appointed officials are met with a conflict of interest, regardless whether the conflict is actual or potential.

How to Declare a Conflict of Interest

Officials on Boards or Commissions & Elected Officials ORS 244.120(2)

- Must publicly announce the nature of the conflict of interest on each occasion the conflict arises.
- Must publicly announce **potential** conflicts of interest, on each occasion **before taking action**.
- Must publicly announce **actual** conflicts of interest, on each occasion, and **refrain** from participating in **discussion**, **debate**, or **voting** on the issue out of which the actual conflict arises.

For more information

Oregon Government Ethics Commission

<http://www.oregon.gov/OGEC/Pages/generalinfo.aspx>