Review Process

October 22, 2018
Review Process for Connect Oregon VI

- Received, eligibility determined
- Modal Staff Review
  - Regional Solutions Team
  - Modal Committees
- Area Commissions on Transportation
- Final Review Committee
- Oregon Transportation Commission

Timeline:
- February
- March
- May
- June
- July - August
What’s required per statute

- Statute requires soliciting recommendations from certain committees prior to going to OTC
  - State Aviation Board
  - Freight Advisory Committee
  - Rail Advisory Committee
  - Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee
  - Applicable Area Commission on Transportation
  - Regional Solutions Teams

- Does not specify the following
  - Timelines for each review
  - Sequence of the reviews
Potential change w/in the statute’s parameters

• More concurrent reviews to streamline the process
  – Time savings of approximately 1-2 months

• Different review process for Part 2 projects
  – Will want reviewers to take look at the projects from a more macroscopic standpoint
  – Fewer, but more complex projects
  – Potential for utilizing committees in a different fashion
Concurrent approach - minimal changes
Draft review process approach
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Part 2 specific process
Draft review process approach
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Technical Review

Strategic Review
Part 2 specific process highlights

• Technical review
  – Modal staff and modal committees focus on function of larger scale projects
  – Examining more of the nuts and bolts of feasibility

• Strategic review
  – Goal of this group is to look at these projects with a broader view, which are in the best interest of the state as a whole in conjunction with other goals and strategies
  – A Final Review Committee with minimum allocations of members from RSTs and ACTs
    • RST and ACT reps provide their perspectives, but in the context of a group making a statewide decision
Aspirational changes to process

• Acknowledging that some desired changes may require legislative action
• What does a more streamlined, yet sufficiently thorough process look like?
• Potential for:
  – Addition or subtraction of committees within the review pipeline
  – Changing the focus area of a given review group
  – Similar or much different process for Part 2 projects as compared to Part 1 projects