Final Recommendation Report

ConnectOregon II Final Review Committee

April 30, 2008

Introduction **1**
1 C*onnect*Oregon II Program Development **1**
1.1 Technical and Policy Team Development 1
1.2 Feasibility Consultant 1
1.3 Administrative Rule Development 1
1.4 Application Procedures Development 1
2 C*onnect*Oregon II Review Prior to the Final Review Committee **2**
2.1 Completeness, Eligibility and Feasibility Review 2
2.2 Instructions to Reviewers 3
2.3 Committee Review 4
2.4 Staff Coordination for Final Review Committee 5
3 C*onnect*Oregon II Final Review Committee **5**
3.1 Committee Membership 5
3.2 Meeting Facilitator 5
3.3 Memorandum of Collaboration 6
3.4 Conflict of Interest 6
3.5 Final Review Process 6
3.6 Committee Member Comments 6
3.7 Final Review Committee Prioritization 7
4 Transmittal and Signatures **12**
Appendix 1 Committee Member Comments **17**
Appendix 2 Modal Committee Report Matrices **23**
Appendix 3 Regional Committee Matrices **30**
Appendix 4 Memorandum of Collaboration **35**
Appendix 5 Staff presentation *Connect* Oregon II Final Review Committee Projects for Review (5/24/08) **48**

Introduction

This report summarizes the C*onnect*Oregon II Program development and project selection process from June 2007 through April 30, 2008. This document is organized in three sections, Section 1 documents the development of the ConnectOregon II program, Section 2 documents the application review by the modal and regional committees, and section 3 documents the actions of the Final Review Committee.

1 C*onnect*Oregon II Program Development

Prior to the review by the Modal and Regional Committees, ODOT developed the organizational structure, administrative rules, application process and review processes, to implement the C*onnect*Oregon program.

1.1 Technical and Policy Team Development

In July of 2007, ODOT formed a Connect Oregon II Policy Team similar to CO I's Steering Committee. The CO II Policy Team was chaired by Jerri Bohard and included the ODOT Chief of Staff, Rail Administrator, Public Transit Administrator, Director of Communications, Government Relations Manager, an ODOT Legislative Liaison, and the Region 3 Manager. The Policy Team provided executive level direction during the ConnectOregon II program development and project selection.

Also in July of 2007, the ODOT Freight Mobility Section (FMS) formed a Technical Team managed by the Freight Mobility Manager that was composed of FMS staff; an Oregon Department of Aviation (ODA) designee; an OECDD designee; the ODOT Administrative Rules Coordinator; an ODOT Communications Division designee; an ODOT Transit Division designee; an ODOT Rail Division designee; and an ODOT Highway Division (Local Government Section) designee. This technical team provided technical support of the CO II program development and project selection.

1.2 Feasibility Consultant

In November of 2007, ODOT signed a contract with the Sorin Garber Consulting Group to provide *Connect*Oregon II Application Feasibility Reviews. The consultant feasibility reviews included a review of technical aspects of assigned CO II applications for project feasibility.

1.3 Administrative Rule Development

By July of 2007, a draft amended Administrative Rule was prepared that updated the implementing rule for ConnectOregon to reflect Oregon House Bill 2278 (2007). The amended Administrative Rule was adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission on November 14, 2007.

1.4 Application Procedures Development

Because *Connect*Oregon II differed slightly from *Connect*Oregon I, including revised review considerations, the *Connect*Oregon application was redesigned. Application

changes included a more structured format that targeted answers that applicants could provide, a completely rewritten set of “Application Instructions” to guide in the completion of the application; and the inclusion of a Draft Agreement that the applicants would sign when selected. The application was published on September 4, 2007, with a due date of November 21, 2007.

2 C*onnect*Oregon II Review Prior to the Final Review Committee

This section summarizes the project review process prior to the final review committee; Project applications were due on November 21, 2007. By the application Due Date, ODOT had received 78 CO II project applications.

2.1 Completeness, Eligibility and Feasibility Review

ODOT staff reviewed all applications for completeness and administrative eligibility. The Sorin Garber Consulting Group worked with ODOT staff to review the technical information contained in the applications. During this period, staff communicated with applicants to clarify specific information contained in the applications. In addition to technical staff and consultant review, the CO II policy team reviewed projects that were identified as ineligible for the ConnectOregon program.

The Completeness, Eligibility, and Feasibility Review ended on February 12, 2007 and resulted in the elimination of seven projects from the program, and the re-scoping of one project to eliminate ineligible elements of the project. (A total of 71 projects continued to be reviewed at this point.) All of the eliminated projects had failed to meet one or more of the requirements of the administrative rule for C*onnect*Oregon.

2.1.1 Economic Benefit Review

An economic benefit review was completed by ODOT and OECDD staff as a distinct subset of the feasibility review. A brief economic benefit review form was developed by ODOT staff that identified the relevant CO II application questions and provided a way for both ODOT and OECDD reviewers to provide their evaluations in one place.

Applications were divided amongst three ODOT economists who were asked to provide a critical review of the applicants answer to each of the relevant questions and indicate whether the intent of the question (as indicated in the application instructions) was met by the applicant’s response.” Similarly the applications and reviews provided by ODOT economists were divided between a number of Oregon Department or Economic and Community Development (OECDD) Business Development Officers who were asked to review the assessments. Based on their review of application materials both the ODOT economists and OECDD Business Development Officers were asked to select a statement that most clearly describes the economic benefit to the state of the proposed project. The options included "The project will...clearly, likely, has the potential, unlikely, would not result in an economic benefit to the state

A complete economic benefit review form was included with the project applications for the use of subsequent reviewers.

2.2 Instructions to Reviewers

A detailed set of "Instructions to Reviewers" was published on December 20, 2007, for review committee members and the staff supporting review committees. The Instructions provided for a three-phase review process that provided for a review of the project considerations identified in House Bill 2278, a ranking of the technical or regional importance of projects, and finely a ranked prioritization of each project.

2.2.1 Project Committee Review (Sorting, Ranking, and Prioritizing)

A set of three review terms are specifically defined for the purposes of CO II Project review:

Sorting into Tiers:

A set of five considerations are specifically identified in HB2278 that the OTC must consider when selecting projects. To demonstrate this consideration, projects were sorted into "Tiers" by committee support staff to indicate how many HB2278 considerations are met by a given application.

The OTC requested the review committees treat the first three considerations listed in HB 566 as strategic considerations.

The tiers include:

Tier 1 (Meets all considerations **thoroughly**)

Tier 2 (Meets all 3 of the **Strategic** considerations **thoroughly**)

Tier 3 (Meets 1 or 2 of the **Strategic** considerations **thoroughly**)

Tier 4 (Does not meet any of the of the **Strategic** considerations **thoroughly**)

Review committees were given limited authority to have staff members change tier assignments.

Rank:

High, Medium, or Low rank was assigned to projects by reviewing committees to indicate the relative rank of the given project. The rank assignment was based on the potential for the project to improve the transportation system by mode or in a given region.

Priority:

Project priority numbers were assigned to projects by review committees to indicate the preference of the committee in relation to other projects.

2.2.2 Instructions to Reviewers Updates

The “Instructions to Reviewers” document was supplemented throughout the review period with refinements and clarifications that were intended to provide specific direction on the interpretation of the project application.

Three specific updates provided prior to the end of the modal review period included:

- Direction on how to apply the economic benefit review during the tiering process (If one or both the OECDD and ODOT economic reviewers selected statements that fell into the "clearly" or "likely" category of the economic review form, the project was determined to have met the economic benefit consideration.);
- Direction defining that “construction readiness” for the purposes of tiering is a project that can begin construction by June 30, 2009); and
- Direction defining that if a project provides additional matching funds beyond the minimum required 20%, it should receive credit during the tiering process for the consideration. “How much of the cost of a proposed transportation project can be borne by the applicant for the grant or loan from any source other than the Multimodal Transportation Fund”.

The modal review committees received these updates during the second half of the modal review period. The regional committees worked from these updates for the complete regional review period.

2.3 Committee Review

Ten review committees provided a comprehensive technical and regional review of project applications. The review committees were divided into two groups; committees that have a defined transportation mode or technical area of expertise (Modal Committees), and committees that correspond to the C*onnect*Oregon regions defined in HB 2278 (Regional Committees)

2.3.1 Modal Committees Review

Five modal review committees reviewed the projects between January 20 and March 10. 2008. Modal review committees that were identified in House Bill 2278 include the State Aviation Board, the Oregon Freight Advisory Committee (OFAC), the Marine Project and Planning Advisory Committee, the Public Transit Advisory Committee (PTAC) and the Rail Advisory Committee (RAC).

The modal review committees produced a report and ranking of projects for the regional review committees, and the FRC.

2.3.2 Regional Committees Review (“SuperACTs”)

After Modal Committee review applications were provided to the ODOT regions. Throughout the state, the Area Commissions on Transportation (ACTs) met to review the projects. In order to allow for the use of the local established processes for each ACT, each Region’s ACTs and SuperAct were permitted leeway regarding process and format. In Region 1, a special C*onnect*Oregon Committee was formed in the absence of an

established ACT. The Acts provided input to each Region's "SuperACT regional committee" which was tasked with identifying the region's priorities. During the regional review period, one project application was withdrawn by one of the applicants.

2.4 Staff Coordination for Final Review Committee

Prior to the FRC meeting, ODOT Staff compiled the reports and prioritizations received from the Modal and Regional Committees into complete project binders for reference by members of the FRC. ODOT Staff also prepared the presentation material used at the FRC. Detailed application packages were prepared for the seventy active applications.

3 C*onnect*Oregon II Final Review Committee

The C*onnect*Oregon II (CO II) Final Review Committee (FRC) met on April 29 and 30, 2008. Through the process identified in Section 3.4, the FRC prioritized the 70 projects with the goal of selecting the best projects throughout the state that benefit air, marine, public transit, rail, and freight transportation. This prioritization is recorded in Section 3.7. This report meets the requirements of a "Final Review Report" identified in ORS 731-035-0060. The Director's office will transmit the Final Recommendation Report to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC). The OTC will hold a public hearing on the recommended project list in May and make its project selection decision in June 2008.

3.1 Committee Membership

The FRC is made up of 25 members (listed below), with representatives from each of the modal and regional committees. The members of the FRC have served the State of Oregon in a variety of capacities including the ConnectOregon I consensus committee. Pat Egan is the Chair of the FRC. Pat was formally a member of Governor Kulongoski's staff and is currently with Pacific Corp.

Committee Members

Pat Egan, Chair	Larry Gescher	Terry Parker
Richard Bjelland	Gayle Harley	Lynn Peterson
Dee Burch	Shirley Kalkhoven	Claire Potter
Michael Burrill, Sr.	Susie Lahsene	Bob Russell
Bruce Carswell	Paul Langner	Al Switzer
Dan Clem	Craig Levie	Terry Tallman
Scott Cooper	Don Lindly	Gary Thompson
Tammy Dennee	Don Mann	Mark Webb
Lylla Gaebel	Jim McClellan	

3.2 Meeting Facilitator

ODOT selected Alison Kelley of Conflict Management Strategies, LLC, to facilitate the FRC.

3.3 Memorandum of Collaboration

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

3.4 Conflict of Interest

At the start of each Session, the Committee Chair required committee members to disclose all conflict of interests regarding any projects being discussed. A conflict of interest means the member is an applicant, or a consultant to the applicant, or is a committee or board that has assisted the applicant, or has a financial benefit in the project.

3.5 Final Review Process

The committee used a Single Text Process to accomplish its work. A Single Text Process provides an opportunity for many parties to collaborate in drafting a single document. Alison Kelley facilitated the committee discussion assisting in the preliminary phases of formulating recommendations, and in determining the format of recommendations. Throughout the work sessions, committee members had the opportunity to respond the Discussion Draft of the project prioritization documents including this report with the goal of achieving consensus on proposed recommendations.

Project Matrix

To present the previous reviews to the committee, a matrix was prepared that recorded the reviews of the modal and regional committees. (See Appendix 5) This matrix displayed the work of the previous committees, demonstrated agreement between committees, and placed the projects in approximately rank order. (See Section 2.2 above for a discussion of the previous committees' review processes, including Sorting into tiers, Ranking, and Prioritizing)

The order of project presentation was established by converting committee priorities to a ratio, and then calculating the project's average of all committees' ratio priorities. The highest average priority score (lowest number) was placed at the top of the list, and subsequent projects are listed in rank order. Color was used to indicate if the given project is in the top, middle, or lowest third of a given committee's prioritization. In addition to prioritization color coding, the tier, rank, and priority assigned by a modal or regional committee was recorded. Agreement in committee priority was demonstrated by comparing the priority colors across a row.

3.6 Committee Member Comments

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

3.7 Final Review Committee Prioritization

The table below represents the project prioritization and recommendation of the C*onnect*Oregon II Final Review Committee:

Connect *Oregon* Region	Application Number	Applicant Name	Project Name	Total Connect Oregon Funds Requested	Final Review Priority Number
1	R10026	Portland & Western Railroad	Columbia River Rail Corridor Improvement	$ 6,300,000	1
1	A10040	Port of Portland	PDX North Runway Extension	$ 6,000,000	2
2	M20042	Port of Astoria	Pier 2 North Face Upgrade	$ 973,920	3
1	R10066	Port of Portland	South Rivergate Yard Expansion (LOAN/GRANT)	$ 8,942,200	4
1	R10047	BNSF	East St. Johns Siding Extension	$ 5,221,405	5
2	R20025	Portland & Western Railroad, Inc.	Albany Rail Corridor Improvement Project	$ 6,990,516	6
4	T40010	City of Bend	Central Oregon Intermodal Transit Center	$ 2,800,000	7
1	T10076	Gresham Redevelopment Commission and TriMet	188th St. Light Rail Stn Reconstruction	$ 3,000,000	8
2	A20021	City of Salem - McNary Field	Passenger Terminal Expansion	$ 1,200,000	9
5	A50045	Grant County	Airport Terminal Building	$ 4,064,167	10
1	R10072	Union Pacific Railroad Company	St. Johns Lead Improvements	$ 6,995,221	11
5	R50007	Union County Economic Development Corp. and Pendleton Grain Growers	Alicel Intermodal Transportation Project	$ 2,723,688	12
4	R40005	City of Prineville	Prineville Railroad / Freight Depot	$ 3,520,000	13

Connect *Oregon* Region	Application Number	Applicant Name	Project Name	Total Connect Oregon Funds Requested	Final Review Priority Number
2	T20024	Lane Transit District and City of Veneta	Veneta Transit Center - Eugene	$ 656,000	14
4	R40043	Modoc Northern Railroad Company	Lakeview Branch Improvement	$ 648,000	15
5	R50044	Port of Morrow	Morrow Multimodal Rail Logistics Center	$ 7,926,626	16
4	A40075	City of Madras	Heavy Aircraft and Engine Maintenance Facility	$ 2,157,749	17
2	R20051	Albany and Eastern RR	Mill City Branch Bridge Rehab and 286k Rail Upgrade	$ 3,777,280	18
3	A30001	Coos County Airport District	Air Traffic Control Tower- Southwest Oregon Regional Airport (North Bend)	$ 624,000	19
1	T10038	Columbia County	Public Transit Facility	$ 1,600,000	20
1	R10048	BNSF	Astoria Wye	$ 2,040,158	21
2	A20030	City of Newport-Port of Astoria	Coastal Oregon Air Service	$ 3,600,000	22
2	T20035	Salem-Keizer Transit District	Keizer Transit Ctr.	$ 2,516,000	23
1	R10016	Port of St. Helens	Port Westward Railroad System Wye	$ 840,000	24
2	A20022	City of Salem / McNary Field	Runway / Safety Area Extension - McNary Field	$ 2,600,000	25
1	M10029	Port of Portland	Terminal 4 Pipeline Infrastructure	$ 4,507,760	26
4	A40031	Redmond Airport - City of Redmond	North Side Cargo Ramp & Development	$ 1,500,000	27
5	A50020	City of Vale	Miller Memorial Airport	$ 400,000	28

Connect *Oregon* Region	Application Number	Applicant Name	Project Name	Total Connect Oregon Funds Requested	Final Review Priority Number
3	A30061	Rogue Valley International-Medford Sky Air Cargo, LLC	Medford - Multi-Modal Express Air Cargo Expansion	$ 4,760,000	29
1	R10004	Mt. Hood Railroad	Repair Flood Damaged Track	$ 700,000	30
4	R40032	Klamath Northern Railway Company and Interfor Pacific Inc	KNOR 286k Upgrade - Light Weight Rail	$ 720,000	31
5	A50009	City of Ontario	Ontario Airport Pavement Improvement Project	$ 3,257,036	32
1	X10041	Port of Portland	Terminal 2 Rail Extension	$ 1,228,490	33
2	T20036	Salem-Keizer Transit District	So. Salem Transit Ctr	$ 2,520,000	34
2	R20052	Albany and Eastern RR	Mill City Rail and Tie Upgrade	$ 4,054,400	35
5	R50070	Union Pacific Railroad Company	Construct Yard Connections - Hinkle Yard Hermiston	$ 1,929,186	36
2	A20054	City of Creswell Hobby Field Airport	Creswell Airport Fire Suppression Project	$ 743,440	37
4	A40003	City of Klamath Falls Airport	New Terminal Bldg. - Klamath Falls Airport	$ 6,360,000	38
1	R10058	Northwest Container Services	NWCS Portland Expansion	$ 1,120,000	39
1	R10039	Vigor Industries LCC	Shipyard Commerce Ctr Siding Track	$ 149,600	40
5	R50015	City of Baker City	Elkhorn View Industrial Park Rail Spur	$ 360,000	41
2	M20065	Port of Siuslaw	Maple Street Landing & Transient Dock	$ 378,000	42
5	X50018	Port of Umatilla	Upland Distribution Center - Port of Umatilla	$ 5,000,000	43

Connect *Oregon* Region	Application Number	Applicant Name	Project Name	Total Connect Oregon Funds Requested	Final Review Priority Number
2	X20060	Sunset Empire Transportation District and Sundial Travel and Cruise Center	SETD-Sundial Charter Bus/Maint / ~~Rail and~~ Transit Project Only	$ 2,080,000	44
2	R20071	Union Pacific Railroad Company	Install Yard Crossover - Eugene	$ 384,477	45
2	M20019	City of Astoria	17th Street Dock Construction Project - Astoria	$ 2,000,000	46
5	A50014	City of Baker City	Baker City Municipal Airport Improvements	$ 572,000	47
1	T10056	City of Oregon City	City Trolley Acquisitions	$ 356,408	48
2	A20046	Whitney Family Properties, LP and City of Newberg	Airport Runway Improvements	$ 747,300	49
1	X10068	City of Wilsonville SMART Transit	SMART Multi-Modal Center (Admin/Fleet) ~~Rail and~~ Transit Only	$ 7,660,000	50
5	M50050	Tidewater Barge Co.	Boardman Barge Terminal	$ 1,202,400	51
2	X20064	City of Eugene	Eugene Depot Transit Access Improvements	$ 408,000	52
2	R20013	Albany and Eastern Railroad	Sweethome Branch	$ 3,367,220	53
2	A20055	Port of Tillamook Bay	Intermodal Freight Station (Air Cargo Apron for Aircraft and Reloading Terminal)	$ 640,000	54
4	M40027	City of the Dalles	Dock for Cruise Boat	$ 2,000,000	55
2	R20062	City of Lebanon and Albany and Eastern RR Co.	Santiam Spur Upgrade/Bridge Replacement	$ 2,264,400	56
4	T40011	City of Bend	City of Bend Transit Stops	$ 184,000	57

Connect *Oregon* Region	Application Number	Applicant Name	Project Name	Total Connect Oregon Funds Requested	Final Review Priority Number
2	X20063	Saddle Mountain, Inc. and Columbia River Bar Pilots LLC	Bar Pilot Helicopter Project (Marine Only)	$ 5,736,640	58
5	A50008	VanArsdale Air Service, LLC	Aviation Expansion Project	$ 496,000	59
4	A40002	City of Klamath Falls Airport	Aviation Maintenance Tech. Ctr - Klamath Falls Airport	$ 11,150,000	60
1	A10067	Port of Portland	Mulino Airport Development Improvements	$ 800,000	61
4	T40006	Kah-Nee-Ta Resort and Mt. Hood Meadows Ski Resort	Partnership for Full Employment	$ 71,979	62
2	R20057	Willamette Valley Railway Company	Upgrade Railroad - Phase II	$ 1,020,000	63
4	R40037	Klamath County	Chemult Train Stn Welcome Ctr	$ 160,000	64
2	R20078	Port of Tillamook Bay	RR Metal Bridge and Tunnel No. 32 Enhancement	$ 4,442,312	65
1	T10074	TriMet and City of Milwaukie	Milwaukie Transit Layover Facility - North Milwaukie	$ 510,604	66
4	A40023	Wheeler County	Wheeler County Airport Project	$ 900,328	67
2	A20053	TTI Wireless	Visual Advantage	$ 396,000	68
5	R50012	Sumpter Valley Railroad Restoration Inc	Machine shop expansion and rebuild program	$ 760,000	69
1	X10073	Regional Maritime Security Coalition (RMSC)	Intermodal - Expansion of Information Sharing System (CSTS-Net) Throughout Columbia-Snake Transportation Corridor	$ 800,000	70

4 Transmittal and Signatures

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

April 30, 2008

Director Matthew Garrett
Oregon Department of Transportation.
355 Capitol St. N.E.
Salem, OR 97301-3871

Dear Director Garrett:

ConnectOregon II Final Review Committee Project Recommendations

On April 30, 2008, the ConnectOregon II Final Review Committee completed the list of our project recommendations. This Final Review Report documents the review of projects by this committee, and provides the background of the ConnectOregon II program development and project selection prior to the meeting of this committee.

The ConnectOregon II Final Review Recommendation List included in this report records our recommendation to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) for consideration at the Commission's public hearing in Salem on May 13, 2008.

Sincerely,

The ConnectOregon II Final Review Committee

Richard Bjelland

Richard Bjelland 4/30/08

(Signature) Date

Dee Burch

Dee Burch 4/30/08

(Signature) Date

Michael Burrill, Sr.

4/30/08

(Signature) Date

Bruce Carswell

(Signature) Date 4/30/2008

Dan Clem

(Signature) Date 4/30/2008

Scott Cooper

(Signature) Date 4/30/2008

Tammy Dennee

(Signature) Date 4/30/2008

Pat Egan

(Signature) Date 4/30/08

Lylla Gaebel

(Signature) Date 4-30-08

Larry Gescher

(Signature) Date 4-30-08

Gayle Harley

(Signature) Date 4/30/08

Shirley Kalkhoven

(Signature) Date 4-30-08

Susie Lahsene

(Signature) April 30 2008
Date

Paul Langner

(Signature) 30 April 2008
Date

Craig Levie

(Signature) APRIL 30, 08
Date

Don Lindy

(Signature) APRIL 30, 08
Date

Don Mann

(Signature) 30 April '08
Date

Jim McClellan

(Signature) 30 April 2008
Date

Terry Parker

(Signature) 30 April 2008
Date

Lynn Peterson

(Signature) April 30 2008
Date

Claire Ruth April 30, 2008

Bob Russell

(Signature) Date 4/30/08

Al Switzer

(Signature) Date 4-30-2008

Gary Thompson

(Signature) Date 4/30/08

Terry Tallman

(Signature) Date 4/30/08

Mark Webb

(Signature) Date 4-30-08

Appendix 1 Committee Member Comments

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

Richard Bjelland
It was very helpful to have the modal recommendations prior to regional reviews. Two of the modes had statewide rankings – OFAC and Aviation. Statewide rankings by all committees would improve the blending process.

The tiering process needs to be analyzed if it will be used in future funding decisions. Of the 70 projects that were tiered by the regions and the modal committees, only 35 projects were assigned to the same tier by the region and modes. So, in 50% of the projects there was no consensus on what tier the project was in. If tiering is to be used in the future, better instructions are needed so that there is not the significant variation in assigning tier levels. Only when this inconsistency is eliminated can tiering factors be a valid consideration in selecting projects.

Michael Burrill, Sr.
The *Connect*Oregon II Final Review went well. Big job, great people who were committed to the end. Hope to see *Connect*Oregon III.

Bruce Carswell
I was very pleased with the results and felt that the process was fair. I served on the *Connect*Oregon I Consensus Committee and felt that this committee process was greatly improved. There were wholesale changes since *Connect*Oregon I when we spent the first day and a half trying to decide which list to use. ODOT staff did a great job supporting us.

In the next round I would like to see better clarity on how to treat loans in the considerations. Additionally the tiering process needs to be more consistent with some way to treat problems. Loans need to be addressed in the process. There must be advantages for applicants applying for loans that will be repaid. This item needs to be addressed.

Dan Clem
The blending process worked well. Include that in the instructions. Modes and regions got an even shake.

1. The "tiering" prioritization process was well thought out but not followed or used by three of the five ODOT Super ACTS. Our modal review committee gave it strong importance as the tiering criteria best represented legislative intent in HB2278.

However, due to very subjective application of the tiering criteria checklist items (d) and (e), regional review committees evaluated "match" on a sliding or variable basis, not a yes/no basis like the modal committees did.

2. OTC should make the call/evaluate "statewide" at the end of the process. Instructions to reviewers should have told modal and regional reviewers to not try to determine or define "statewide". Some regions did this and as a result came to FRC with a skewed or partial priority list.
3. Consensus process was very effective.
4. *Connect*Oregon II – ODOT got it right.
5. Invent a process or allocation for small (<$500K) projects.

Good job!

Scott Cooper

After two rounds of *Connect*Oregon, confusion remains about how to manage the allocation of regional monies versus projects of statewide significance. Guidance on this issue was presented between the time regions met but before the Consensus Committee met leading to a "disconnect" between regional recommendations and Consensus Committee consideration. It is critical in the event of any future *Connect*Oregon rounds that the issue of how to handle these two pots of funding be explained early and clearly to all applicants, regions, modes and higher ranking committees.

Throughout the *Connect*Oregon I and *Connect*Oregon II processes, it has been clear that the nature and level of input from ODOT regional staff has significant influence on the quality of applications, consistency of regional ACT review and ability of the Consensus Committee to fairly evaluate project submissions. Because of this critical linkage, it would be helpful to the process if regional ODOT staff were required to attend the Consensus Committee meetings in order to learn how their advice has been useful (or detrimental) to the process.

Tammy Dennee

Until recently I participated on the Governor's Rural Policy Committee. One of the common denominators that we discussed throughout the state was transportation and connectivity. We need to listen to those issues in the most rural communities. It doesn't matter what we produce in the rural part of Oregon if we can't transport it to market. I am very hopeful that there will be a *Connect*Oregon III.

I really appreciated the modal and regional rankings being factored into the overall ranking. It would have been very helpful for the regional staff directive to have been consistent.

Pat Egan and Alison Kelley did an excellent job.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this vitally important process!

Pat Egan
Staff and Alison were fantastic. The subcommittees did a fantastic job in bringing us to this point.

Lylla Gaebel
Pat Egan and Alison Kelley were excellent in their respective roles. There have been so many improvements in the process since *Connect*Oregon I.

There still needs to be some work to assure all modes and regions are applying the rules in a consistent manner. Region 4 did theirs differently than all others. I would also suggest a bit more follow-up on applicant questions to assure they are complete and accurate. During this process information came out that some projects contained wrong information and regions and modes would have ranked them differently. I support the process.

I certainly hope there is a *Connect*Oregon III.

Larry Gescher
This has been a great experience to be a part of. Everyone did a great job of leaving their hats at the door.

Gayle Harley
I would have preferred a method of project selection that would have prevented revisiting decisions on project selection (such as the $83M from the first day's vote and acceptance).

Shirley Kalkhoven
I don't think the conflict, if you want to call it that, that exists between modal ranking and regional rankings is one that can be resolved without eliminating one or the other.

My perspective is regional – we began at the local level, considered the input from the modes, and then made decisions based on all the factors we felt to be important. The same process occurred at the regional meetings. In my view that is a more inclusive, wide-angle view of the projects. Modes look at these lists form their own singular view.

I can't speak to what occurred two years ago, but there is still constraint and "push back" that has us doing a back and forth between lists that is confusing. At times it's been a surprise to see a project rank very high due to a mode recommendation, whereas regionally it was a very low priority and vice versa.

Susie Lahsene
- Very good process
- Liked the blending of modal and regional priorities
- Good work on the subcommittee process
- Would suggest that future bills clarify how the criteria will be applied
- Good at outcome

Paul Langner
I had the privilege to participate in the Rail mode, Marine mode and Final Review. As a cynic of government, I must say that *Connect*Oregon has restored my faith in government.

All committees received the same charge and they delivered a quality project. *Connect*Oregon II applications that may not meet the spirit and goal of *Connect*Oregon II, all seemed to fall off.

The quality and professionalism of ODOT staff (and OECDD) made this the success it will become. Of particular note, Kelly Taylor, ODOT Rail, is the epitome of professionalism, integrity and intelligence in a public servant.

I believe the projects advanced in *Connect*Oregon II are indeed the best of the best – meeting the goals of the enabling legislation.

I do suggest to improve the process, that tier scoring be clarified. A project can move from tier 2 to tier 1 by an applicant adding $1 over the 20% match. I believe this needs to be reviewed. Second, some modes (Marine) are hamstrung with additional federal and state permitting for in-water work. Permit ready is tough for these types of projects.

*Connect*Oregon II, to date, is an historical program. Historical in the sense that we (Oregonians) are making real infrastructure improvements that will benefit all Oregonians for many generations.

Craig Levie
This process has been the best organized and focused as any I've seen. The ODOT staff was simply fantastic. Their hard work and dedication provided the committee with all the information and help necessary to produce a comprehensive and 100% supportable list of projects for OTC review!

Don Lindly
Decentralization of capital project expenses for ODOT has been delegated to ACTS by the OTC. The next level at the region has been done by what is referred to as "Super ACT".

At both the ACT and region level, in regards to *Connect*Oregon, a total "system" review was considered. More "weight" should be placed on these regional, system-wide priorities. In the final review process, too much weight was given to the modal committees.

The process for *Connect*Oregon II was that the modes met first, and that information was used by the ACTS/Super ACTS. The regional priorities should be used in any future *Connect*Oregon funding.

Don Mann
Regarding the Port of Umatilla, Upland Distribution Center project, X50018; the Marine Modal Committee ranked this project one of the highest projects given the information we had with the application. Further review discussion and comments from regional and other modes lead to the consensus to drop this project to a lower priority on the funding list for further consideration. ODOT staff was asked by the FRC Chair to clarify several questions relating to grade crossings, permits and rights of ways. However this project was ranked below the $100M cut off line relating to its ranking by the Region and other modes.

Overall process and work, including all committee work and staff, was excellent. One suggestion: next round should include set aside for projects less than $500K up to say $3M.

Comment: Also included in my comments in the FR Report:

There should be consideration given by ODOT/Legislation/or by Rule that there is a set-a-side of funds for smaller projects that may fall into the Tier 1-2 category up to $500K for a total commitment of small projects up to $3M. Loans could be considered. Need a larger pot of money $150-$200M and 20% matching fund requirement needs to be clarified.

Jim McClellan
1. Add list of problems projects ranked low had to future applications.
2. Include portion of $100M for projects less than $1M.
3. Thanks for paying for the motel room.
4. Include who participant represents on name tags around neck.

Terry Parker
Job – Transit Connection?
Where does passenger rail get addressed?

Comments: The CO II process and Final Review has vastly improved over CO I. There is more clarity and recognition of both regional and modal priorities.

Future improvement suggestions:
1. Be clear and instructive about not allowing a separate regional and "statewide" review that prioritizes projects without funding them (improve consistency).
2. Examine the impact of transit (bus and rail) on job development and getting workers moved to and from employment centers in addition to job creation.
3. Re-examine TIER rankings and their significance.

Lynn Peterson
Overall: Great Process.

Specifics: Small projects under $500,000 are difficult to get funded through this process and should be considered through a grant process separate (say $2-$3M off the top).

Claire Potter
Great process.
Concerned about economic reviews which had an impact on tiers. Only 23% of transit projects were deemed to fall in the clearly or likely categories. Contrast that with other modes – 74% - 90% were in the clearly or likely "to have an economic benefit to Oregon". This poor showing for transit contrasts with the high rankings of the regional committees for transit. We need an education session, perhaps, with the economists.

Bob Russell
The process was much improved compared to Connect I, as a result of beginning our discussion with a list of projects that reflected a cross section of support. Staff did an outstanding job throughout the entire process.

Terry Tallman
Process was better for *Connect*Oregon II. Michael Bufalino did a highly efficient and commendable job with the excel spreadsheet. Michael made the "blending" part work. Pat Egan as Chair did a great job. Alison as facilitator kept the focus where it needed to be.

Mark Webb
Generally speaking I think the process worked well and the results were fair.

I think allowing the regions to first prioritize their projects informed by modal rankings followed by comments from the modal members proved effective and fair to both parties and the regions.

I appreciate that the same projects will cost more in some regions than others; and that this provides some expectation that such regions should get more funds. However, I think it would be helpful to find some way to evaluate the actual economic impact or return on a dollar spent in (e.g.) Region 1 vs. Region 5.

This info would better enable one to more fairly evaluate the funding other regions get compared to ours.

Appendix 2 Modal Committee Report Matrices

AVIATION MODAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MATRIX

*Connect*Oregon II Modal Committee Review Matrix

Application Number	Applicant Name	Project Name / Description	Total ConnectOregon Funds Requested ($)	(a) Project reduces transportation costs for Oregon businesses or improves access to jobs and sources of labor	(b) Project results in an economic benefit to this state	(c) Project is a critical link in Oregon's transportation system that will measurably improve utilization and efficiency	(d) Ability of the applicant to fund the project from any source other than the Multimodal Transportation Fund	(e) Construction Readiness	Tier	Rank (High - Medium - Low)	Priority	**Final Review Report**
				Staff has placed an "X" for each Consideration that is " thoroughly" met by the project						Committee Only	Committee Only	
A10040	Port of Portland	PDX North Runway extension	6,000,000	X	X	X	X	X	1	H	1	**Tier 1 H 1**
A10067	Port of Portland	Mulino Airport Development Improvements	800,000		X	X	X	X	3	M	17	**Tier 3 M 17**
A20021	City of Salem-McNary Field	Passenger Terminal Expansion	1,200,000	X	X	X	X	X	1	H	4	**Tier 1 H 4**
A20022	City of Salem-McNary Field	Runway/ Safety Area Extension	2,600,000	X	X	X	X	X	1	H	3	**Tier 1 H 3**
A20030	City of Newport-Port of Astoria	Coastal Oregon Air Service	3,600,000	X	X	X	X	X	1	M	13	**Tier 1 M 13**
A20046	Whitney Family Properties, LP and City of Newburg	Airport Runway Improvements	747,300	X	X	X			2	M	14	**Tier 2 M 14**
A20053	TTI Wireless	Visual Advantage	396,000			X			3	L	20	**Tier 3 L 20**
A20054	City of Creswell Hobby Field Airport	Creswell Airport Fire Suppression Project	743,440	X	X	X	X	X	1	H	10	**Tier 1 H 10**
A20055	Port of Tillamook Bay	Apron for Aircraft and Reloading Terminal	640,000	X	X	X		X	2	L	15	**Tier 2 L 15**
A30001	Coos County Airport District	Air Traffic Control Tower-Southwest Oregon Regional Airport (North Bend)	624,000	X	X	X	X	X	1	H	2	**Tier 1 H 2**
A30061	Rogue Valley International-Medford Sky Air Cargo , LLC	Medford – Multi-Modal Express Air cargo Expansion	4,760,000	X	X	X	X	X	1	H	8	**Tier 1 H 8**
A40002	City of Klamath Falls Airport	Aviation Maintenance Tech Ctr – Klamath Falls Airport	11,150,000				X		4	L	21	**Tier 4 L 21**
A40003	City of Klamath Falls Airport	New Terminal Bldg. – Klamath Falls Airport	6,360,000	X	X	X	X	X	1	M	12	**Tier 1 M 12**
A40023	Wheeler County	Wheeler County Airport Project	900,328		X	X	X		3	L	18	**Tier 3 L 18**
A40031	Redmond Airport – City of Redmond	North Side Cargo Ramp & Development	1,500,000	X	X	X	X	X	1	H	7	**Tier 1 H 7**
A40075	City of Madras	Heavy Aircraft and Engine Maintenance Facility	2,157,748.80	X	X	X	X	X	1	H	5	**Tier 1 H 5**
A50008	VanArsdale Air Service , LLC	Aviation Expansion Project	496,000		X			X	3	L	19	**Tier 3 L 19**
A50009	City of Ontario	Ontario Airport Pavement Improvement Project	3,257,036	X	X	X	X	X	1	H	9	**Tier 1 H 9**
A50014	City of Baker City	Baker City Municipal Airport Improvements	572,000		X	X	X	X	3	H	16	**Tier 3 H 16**
A50020	City of Vale	Miller Memorial Airport	400,000	X	X	X	X	X	1	H	11	**Tier 1 H 11**
A50045	Grant County	Airport Terminal Building	4,064,167.20	X	X	X	X	X	1	H	6	**Tier 1 H 6**

MARINE MODAL MATRIX TEMPLATE

The table below is a draft of the fields that will be used on the review matrix provided to the modal review committees. The final version will be a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet.

*Connect*Oregon II Modal Committee Review Matrix

Application Number	Applicant Name	Project Name / Description	Total ConnectOregon Funds Requested ($)	(a) Project reduces transportation costs for Oregon businesses or improves access to jobs and sources of labor	(b) Project results in an economic benefit to this state	(c) Project is a critical link in Oregon's transportation system that will measurably improve utilization and efficiency	(d) Ability of the applicant to fund the project from any source other than the Multimodal Transportation Fund	(e) Construction Readiness	Tier	Rank (High - Medium - Low)	Priority	**Final Review Report**
				Staff has placed an "X" for each Consideration that is " thoroughly" met by the project						Committee Only	Committee Only	
M10019	City of Astoria	17th Street Dock Construction Project	2,000,000						4	M	1	**Tier 4 M 1**
M10029	Port of Portland	Terminal 4 Pipeline Infrastructure	4,507,760	X	X	X		X	2	H	2	**Tier 2 H 2**
M20042	Port of Astoria	Pier 2 North Face Upgrade	973,920	X	X	X			2	H	1	**Tier 2 H 1**
M20065	Port of Siuslaw	Maple Street Landing & Transient Dock	378,000	X	X	X		X	2	M	3	**Tier 2 M 3**
M40027	City of the Dalles	Dock for Cruise Boat	2,000,000				X		4	L	3	**Tier 4 L 3**
M50050	Tidewater Barge Co,	Boardman Barge Terminal	1,202,400	X	X	X		X	2	L	5	**Tier 2 L 5**
X10041	Port of Portland	Terminal 2 Rail Extension	1,228,490.40	X	X	X		X	2	M	4	**Tier 2 M 4**
X10073	Regional Maritime Security Coalition (RMSC)	Intermodal-Expansion of Information Sharing System (CSTS-Net) Throughout Columbia-snake Transportation Corridor	800,000						4	L	4	**Tier 4 L 4**
X20063	Saddle Mountain, Inc. and Columbia River Bar Pilots LLC	Bar Pilot Helicopter Project	5,736,640		X			X	3	L	2	**Tier 3 L 2**
X50018	Port of Umatilla	Upland Distribution Center – Port of Umatilla	5,000,000	X	X	X		X	2	H	1	**Tier 2 H 1**

X50018 tied with Port of Astoria Pier 2 North Face - Upgrade for top ranking from the review committee. Potential for immediate job creation at the distribution center.

*Connect*Oregon II OFAC Review Matrix

Application Number	Applicant Name	Project Name / Description	Total ConnectOregon Funds Requested ($)	(a) Project reduces transportation costs for Oregon businesses or improves access to jobs and sources of labor	(b) Project results in an economic benefit to this state (x = higher two classifications in Item 4 of form. If there is a split in #'s – use higher number)	(c) Project is a critical link in Oregon's transportation system that will measurably improve utilization and efficiency	(d) Ability of the applicant to fund the project from any source other than the Multimodal Transportation Fund	(e) Construction Readiness (Ready to construct by 6-30-09)	Tier	Rank (High - Medium - Low)	Priority	Final Review Report
R10026	Portland & Western Railroad	Columbia River Rail Corridor Improvement	6,300,000	X	X	X	X	X	1	H	**1**	**Tier 1 H 1**
R10047	BNSF	East St. John's Siding Extension	5,221,404.80	X	X	X		X	2	H	**2**	**Tier 2 H 2**
A10040	Port of Portland	PDX North Runway extension	6,000,000	X	X	X	X	X	1	H	**3**	**Tier 1 H 3**
R10066	Port of Portland	South Rivergate Yard Expansion	8,942,200	X	X	X	X	X	1	H	**4**	**Tier 1 H 4**
R10072	Union Pacific Railroad Company	St. Johns Lead Improvements	6,995,220.80	X	X	X		X	2	H	**5**	**Tier 2 H 5**
R50044	Port of Morrow	Morrow Multimodal Rail Logistics Center	7,926,626.40	X	X	X	X	X	1	H	**6**	**Tier 1 H 6**
R50007	Union County Economic Development Corp. and Pendleton Grain Growers	Alicel Intermodal Transportation Project	3,404,610	X	X	X	X	X	1	H	**7**	**Tier 1 H 7**
R40005	City of Prineville	Prineville Railroad / Freight Depot	3,520,000	X	X	X		X	2	H	**8**	**Tier 2 H 8**
R20025	Portland & Western Railroad, Inc.	Albany Rail Corridor Improvement Project	6,990,516	X	X	X		X	2	H	**8**	**Tier 2 H 8**
R10048	BNSF	Astoria Wye	2,040,158.40	X	X	X		X	2	H	**9**	**Tier 2 H 9**
R50070	Union Pacific Railroad Company	Hermiston	1,929,185.60			X		X	3	H	**10**	**Tier 3 H 10**
R10016	Port of St. Helens	Port Westward Railroad System Wye	840,000	X	X	X		X	2	H	**11**	**Tier 2 H 11**
R10058	Northwest Container Services	NWCS Portland Expansion	1,120,000	X		X		X	3	H	**12**	**Tier 3 H 12**
R20051	Albany and Eastern RR	Mill City Branch Bridge Rehab and 286l Rail Upgrade	3,777,280	X	X	X	X	X	1	M	**13**	**Tier 1 M 13**
R20052	Albany and Eastern RR	Mill City Rail and Tie Upgrade	4,054,400	X	X	X		X	2	M	**14**	**Tier 2 M 14**
A30001	Coos County Airport District	Air Traffic Control Tower-Southwest Oregon Regional Airport (North Bend)	624,000	X	X	X	X	X	1	M	**15**	**Tier 1 M 15**
X10041	Port of Portland	Terminal 2 Rail Extension	1,228,490.40	X	X	X		X	2	M	**16**	**Tier 2 M 16**
R10039	Vigor Industries LCC	Shipyard Commerce Ctr Siding Track	149,600	X	X	X		X	2	M	**17**	**Tier 2 M 17**
M10029	Port of Portland	Terminal 4 Pipeline Infrastructure	4,507,760	X	X	X			2	M	**18**	**Tier 2 M 18**
R40043	Modoc Northern Railroad Company	Lakeview Branch Improvement	648,000		X	X		X	3	M	**19**	**Tier 3 M 19**
M20042	Port of Astoria	Pier 2 North Face Upgrade	973,920	X	X	X		X	2	M	**20**	**Tier 2 M 20**
A30061	Rogue Valley International-Medford Sky Air Cargo , LLC	Medford – Multi-Modal Express Air cargo Expansion	4,760,000	X	X	X		X	2	M	**21**	**Tier 2 M 21**
R40032	Klamath Northern Railway Company and Interfor Pacific Inc	KNOR 286k Upgrade – Light Weight Rail	720,000		X		X	X	3	M	**22**	**Tier 3 M 22**
A40031	Redmond Airport – City of Redmond	North Side Cargo Ramp & Development	1,500,000		X	X			3	M	**23**	**Tier 3 M 23**
M20065	Port of Siuslaw	Maple Street Landing & Transient Dock	378,000		X	X	X	X	3	M	**24**	**Tier 3 M 24**
X50018	Port of Umatilla	Upland Distribution Center – Port of Umatilla	5,000,000	X	X		X	X	3	L	**25**	**Tier 3 L 25**
R10004	Mt. Hood Railroad	Repair Flood Damaged Track	700,000		X	X	X	X	3	L	**26**	**Tier 3 L 26**
R20062	City of Lebanon and Albany and Eastern RR Co.	Sanitam Spur Upgrade/Bridge Replacement	2,264,000.00	X	X	X			2	L	**27**	**Tier 2 L 27**
R20013	Albany and Eastern Railroad	Sweethome Branch	3,367,220	X		X		X	3	L	**27**	**Tier 3 L 27**
R20071	Union Pacific Railroad Company	Install Yard Crossover – Eugene	384,476.80		X	X		X	3	L	**28**	**Tier 3 L 28**
R40069	Union Pacific Railroad Company	Install Centralized Traffic Control System – Klamath Falls	6,125,378.80					X	4	L	**29**	**Tier 4 L 29**
M50050	Tidewater Barge Co,	Boardman Barge Terminal	1,202,400	X	X	X		*	2	L	**30**	**Tier 2 L 30**
R20057	Willamette Valley Railway Company	Upgrade Railroad – Phase II	1,020,000					X	4	L	**31**	**Tier 4 L 31**

*Connect*Oregon II OFAC Review Matrix

Application Number	Applicant Name	Project Name / Description	Total ConnectOregon Funds Requested ($)	(a) Project reduces transportation costs for Oregon businesses or improves access to jobs and sources of labor	(b) Project results in an economic benefit to this state (x = higher two classifications in Item 4 of form. If there is a split in #'s – use higher number)	(c) Project is a critical link in Oregon's transportation system that will measurably improve utilization and efficiency	(d) Ability of the applicant to fund the project from any source other than the Multimodal Transportation Fund	(e) Construction Readiness (Ready to construct by 6-30-09)	Tier	Rank (High - Medium - Low)	Priority	**Final Review Report**
R50015	City of Baker City	Elkhorn View Industrial Park Rail Spur	360,000	X	X	X		X	2	L	**32**	**Tier 2 L 32**
R20078	Port of Tillamook Bay	Enhancement	4,442,312	X	X	X			2	L	**32**	**Tier 2 L 32**
A20022	City of Salem-McNary Field	Runway/ Safety Area Extension	2,600,000	X		X		X	3	L	**33**	**Tier 3 L 33**
X10073	Regional Maritime Security Coalition (RMSC)	Intermodal-Expansion of Information Sharing System (CSTS-Net) Throughout Columbia-snake Transportation Corridor	800,000	X		X		X	3	L	**34**	**Tier 3 L 34**
A20055	Port of Tillamook Bay	Apron for Aircraft and Reloading Terminal	640,000		X	X		X	3	L	**34**	**Tier 3 L 34**
X20063	Saddle Mountain, Inc. and Columbia River Bar Pilots LLC	Bar Pilot Helicopter Project	5,736,640		X	X			3	L	**35**	**Tier 3 L 35**
A40002	City of Klamath Falls Airport	Aviation Maintenance Tech Ctr – Klamath Falls Airport	11,150,000	X		X		x	3	L	**36**	**Tier 3 L 36**

*Connect*Oregon II RAIL Committee Review Matrix

Application Number	Applicant Name	Project Name / Description	Total ConnectOregon Funds Requested ($)	(a) Project reduces transportation costs for Oregon businesses or improves access to jobs and sources of labor	(b) Project results in an economic benefit to this state	(c) Project is a critical link in Oregon's transportation system that will measurably improve utilization and efficiency	(d) Ability of the applicant to fund the project from any source other than the Multimodal Transportation Fund	(e) Construction Readiness	Tier	Rank (High - Medium - Low)	Priority	**Final Review Report**
				Staff has placed an "X" for each Consideration that is " thoroughly" met by the project						Committee Only	Committee Only	
R10026	Portland & Western Railroad	Columbia River Rail Corridor Improvement	$ 6,300,000	X	X	X	X	X	1	H	1	**Tier 1 H 1**
R10066	Port of Portland	South Rivergate Yard Expansion	$ 8,942,200	X	X	X	X	X	1	H	2	**Tier 1 H 2**
R20025	Portland & Western Railroad	Albany Rail Corridor Improvement Project	$ 6,990,516	X	X	X		X	2	H	1	**Tier 2 H 1**
R10047	BNSF Railway	East St. Johns Siding Extension	$ 5,221,405	X	X	X		X	2	H	2	**Tier 2 H 2**
R10072	Union Pacific Railroad Company	St. Johns Lead Improvements	$ 6,995,221	X	X	X		X	2	H	3	**Tier 2 H 3**
R40005	City of Prineville Railroad	Prineville Freight Depot - Phase 2	$ 3,520,000	X	X	X		X	2	H	4	**Tier 2 H 4**
R40043	Modoc Northern Railroad Company	Lakeview Branch Improvement	$ 648,000	X	X	X		X	2	H	5	**Tier 2 H 5**
R50044	Port of Morrow	Morrow Multimodal Rail Logistics Center	$ 7,926,626	X	X	X			2	H	6	**Tier 2 H 6**
R10048	BNSF Railway	Power the North Leg of the Astoria Wye	$ 2,040,158	X	X	X		X	2	M	1	**Tier 2 M 1**
R20051	Albany & Eastern Railroad Company	Mill City Branch Bridge Rehab & 286k Upgrade	$ 4,054,400	X	X		X	X	3	H	1	**Tier 3 H 1**
R50007	Union County Economic Dev. Corp.	Alicel Intermodal Transportation Project	$ 2,723,688	X	X		X	X	3	H	2	**Tier 3 H 2**
R40032	Klamath Northern Railway Company	KNOR 286k Upgrade	$ 720,000	X	X		X	X	3	H	3	**Tier 3 H 3**
R10004	Mt. Hood Railroad	Mile Post 15 Flood-Damaged Track Repair	$ 700,000		X		X	X	3	H	4	**Tier 3 H 4**
R50070	Union Pacific Railroad Company	Construct Hinkle Yard Connections	$ 1,929,186			X		X	3	H	5	**Tier 3 H 5**
R20052	Albany & Eastern Railroad Company	Mill City Branch Rail & Tie Upgrade 286k	$ 3,777,280	X	X			X	3	M	1	**Tier 3 M 1**
R10016	Port of St. Helens	Port Westward Railroad System Wye	$ 840,000		X			X	3	M	2	**Tier 3 M 2**
R20071	Union Pacific Railroad Company	Install Eugene Yard Crossover	$ 384,477		X			X	3	M	3	**Tier 3 M 3**
R10058	Northwest Container Services, Inc.	NWCS Portland Expansion	$ 1,120,000	X				X	3	M	4	**Tier 3 M 4**
R50015	City of Baker City	Elkhorn View Industrial Park Rail Spur II	$ 360,000		X			X	3	L	1	**Tier 3 L 1**
R10039	Vigor Industrial, LLC	Shipyard Commerce Center Siding Track	$ 149,600	X	X			X	3	L	2	**Tier 3 L 2**

*Connect*Oregon II RAIL Committee Review Matrix

Application Number	Applicant Name	Project Name / Description	Total ConnectOregon Funds Requested ($)	(a) Project reduces transportation costs for Oregon businesses or improves access to jobs and sources of labor	(b) Project results in an economic benefit to this state	(c) Project is a critical link in Oregon's transportation system that will measurably improve utilization and efficiency	(d) Ability of the applicant to fund the project from any source other than the Multimodal Transportation Fund	(e) Construction Readiness	Tier	Rank (High - Medium - Low)	Priority	**Final Review Report**
				Staff has placed an "X" for each Consideration that is " thoroughly" met by the project						Committee Only	Committee Only	
R20013	Albany & Eastern Railroad Company	Sweet Home Branch Rail & Tie Rehab - 286k	$ 3,367,220	X				X	3	L	3	**Tier 3 L 3**
X50018	Port of Umatilla	Upland Distribution Center	$ 5,000,000		X		X		3	L	4	**Tier 3 L 4**
R20057	Willamette Valley Railway Company	286k Upgrade Railroad - Phase 2	$ 1,020,000	X				X	3	L	5	**Tier 3 L 5**
R40037	Klamath County	Chemult Train Station (Phase 2)	$ 160,000						4	L	1	**Tier 4 L 1**
R20062	City of Lebanon	Santiam Spur Upgrade/Bridge Replacement	$ 2,264,000						4	L	2	**Tier 4 L 2**
R50012	Sumpter Valley Railroad Restoration	Machine Shop Expansion & Locomotive Rebuild	$ 760,000						4	L	3	**Tier 4 L 3**
R20078	Port of Tillamook Bay Railroad	Port of Tillamook Bay Bridge & Tunnel Project	$ 4,442,312		X				3	Ineligible		
R40069	Union Pacific Railroad Company	Install Centralized Traffic Control System	$ 6,125,377			X		X	3	Withdrawn		

*Connect*Oregon II Transit Committee Review Matrix

Application Number	Applicant Name	Project Name / Description	Total ConnectOregon Funds Requested ($)	(a) Project reduces transportation costs for Oregon businesses or improves access to jobs and sources of labor	(b) Project results in an economic benefit to this state	(c) Project is a critical link in Oregon's transportation system that will measurably improve utilization and efficiency	(d) Ability of the applicant to fund the project from any source other than the Multimodal Transportation Fund	(e) Construction Readiness	Tier	Rank (High - Medium - Low)	Priority	**Final Review Report**
				Staff has placed an "X" for each Consideration that is " thoroughly" met by the project						Committee Only	Committee Only	
T10076	Gresham Redevelopment Commission and TriMet	188th St. Light Rail Station Reconstruction	$3,000,000	x	*	x	x	x	3	H	1	Tier 3 H 1
T10038	Columbia County	Public Transit Facility	$1,600,000	x	X	x		x	2	H	2	Tier 2 H 2
T40010	City of Bend	Central Oregon Intermodal Transit Center	$2,800,000	x	*	x		x	3	H	3	Tier 3 H 3
T20024	Lane Transit District and City of Veneta	Veneta Transit Center – Eugene	$656,000	x	X	x		x	2	H	4	Tier 2 H 4
T20035	Salem-Keizer Transit District	Keizer Transit Ctr.	$2,516,000	x	*	x	x		3	H	5	Tier 3 H 5
T20036	Salem-Keizer Transit District	South Salem Transit Center	$2,520,000	x	*	x	x		3	H	6	Tier 3 H 6
T10056	City of Oregon City	City Trolley Acquisitions	$356,408	x	X	x		x	2	M	7	Tier 2 M 7
X10068	City of Wilsonville SMART Transit	SMART Multi-Modal Center (Admin/Fleet) Transit	$7,660,000	x	*	x	x		3	M	8	Tier 3 M 8
X20060	Sunset Empire Transportation District and Sundial Travel and Cruise Center	SETD-Sundial Charter Bus/Maint/Rail Project	$2,080,000	x	*	x		x	3	M	9	Tier 3 M 9
X20064	City of Eugene	Eugene Depot Transit Access Improvements	$408,000	x		x	x	x	3	H	10	Tier 3 H 10
T40011	City of Bend	City of Bend Transit Stops	$184,000	x		x	x	x	3	H	11	Tier 3 H 11
T10074	TriMet and City of Milwaukie	Milwaukie Transit Layover Facility – North Milwaukie	$510,604		*			x	4	M	12	Tier 4 M 12
T40006	Ka-Nee-Ta Resort and Mt. Hood Meadows Ski Resort	Partnership for Full Employment	$71,979.20	x	x		x	x	3	M	13	Tier 3 M 13

*Economist recommendations for consideration (b) economic benefit. Committee did not agree with these recommendations.

Appendix 3 Regional Committee Matrices

*Connect*Oregon II Region 1 Committee Review Matrix

Application Number	Applicant Name	Project Name / Description	Total ConnectOregon Funds Requested ($)	(a) Whether a proposed transportation project reduces transportation costs for Oregon businesses or improves access to jobs and sources of labor	(b) Whether a proposed transportation project results in an economic benefit to this state	(c) Whether a proposed transportation project is a critical link connecting elements of Oregon's transportation system that will measurably improve utilization and efficiency of the system	(d) How much of the cost of a proposed transportation project can be borne by the applicant for the grant or loan from any source other than the Multimodal Transportation Fund; and	(e) Whether a proposed transportation project is ready for construction	Tier	Rank (High - Medium - Low)	Priority	Final Review Report
				Staff has placed an "X" for each Consideration that is " thoroughly" met by the project						Committee Only	Committee Only	
A10040	Port of Portland	PDX North Runway Extension	6,000,000	X	X	X	X	X	1	H	1	Tier 1 H1
A10067	Port of Portland	Mulino Airport Development Improvement	800,000		X	X	X	X	3	L	18	Tier 3 L1
M10029	Port of Portland	Port of Portland –Terminal Pipeline	4,507,760	X	X	X		X	2	M	9	Tier 2 M1
R10004	Mt. Hood Railroad	Repair of Flood Damaged Rail	700,000		X	X	X	X	3	M	12	Tier 3 M2
R10016	Port of St. Helens	Port Westward Railroad System Wye	840,000	X	X	X		X	2	H	5	Tier 2 H2
R10026	Portland & Western Railroad	Columbia River Rail Corridor Improvement	6,300,000	X	X	X	X	X	1	H	2	Tier 1 H2
R10039	Vigor Industries	Shipyard Commerce Siding Track	149,600	X	X	X		X	2	M	13	Tier 2 M4
R10047	BNSF	East St. John's Siding Extension	5,221,405	X	X	X		X	2	H	4	Tier 2 H1
R10048	BNSF	Astoria Wye	2,040,158	X	X	X		X	2	H	8	Tier 2 H4
R10058	Northwest Container Services	NWCS Portland Expansion	1,120,000	X		X		X	3	M	16	Tier 3 M4
R10066	Port of Portland	South Rivergate Yard Expansion	8,942,200	X	X	X	X	X	1	H	3	Tier 1 H3
R10072	Union Pacific Railroad Company	St. John's Lead Improvements	6,995,221	X	X	X		X	2	H	7	Tier 2 H3
T10038	Columbia County	Public Transit Facility	1,600,000	X	X	X		X	2	M	10	Tier 2 M2
T10056	City of Oregon City	City Trolley Acquisitions	356,408	X	X	X		X	2	M	14	Tier 2 M5
T10074	TriMet and City of Milwaukie	Milwaukie Transit Layout Facility – North Milwaukie	510,604					X	4	L	17	Tier 4 L1
T10076	Gresham Redevelopment Commission and TriMet	188th St. Light Rail Station Reconstruction	3,000,000	X		X	X	X	3	M	6	Tier 3 M1
X10041	Port of Portland	Terminal 2 Rail Extension	1,228,490	X	X	X		X	2	M	11	Tier 2 M3
X10068	City of Wilsonville SMART Transit	SMART Multi-Modal Center (Admin/Fleet)	7,660,000	X		X	X		3	M	15	Tier 3 M3
X10073	Regional Maritime Security Coalition	Expansion of Information Sharing System (CSTS-Net)	800,000	X		X		X	3	L	19	Tier 3 L2
		REGION 1 TOTAL	58,771,846									

*Connect*Oregon II Region 2 Committee Review Matrix

Application Number	Applicant Name	Project Name / Description	Total ConnectOregon Funds Requested ($)	(a) Whether a proposed transportation project reduces transportation costs for Oregon businesses or improves access to jobs and sources of labor	(b) Whether a proposed transportation project results in an economic benefit to this state	(c) Whether a proposed transportation project is a critical link connecting elements of Oregon's transportation system that will measurably improve utilization and efficiency of the system	(d) How much of the cost of a proposed transportation project can be borne by the applicant for the grant or loan from any source other than the Multimodal Transportation Fund; and	(e) Whether a proposed transportation project is ready for construction	Tier	Rank (High - Medium - Low)	Priority	Final Review Report
				Staff has placed an "X" for each Consideration that is " thoroughly" met by the project						Committee Only	Committee Only	
A20021	City of Salem - McNary Field	Passenger Terminal Expansion	$ 1,200,000.00	x	x	x	x	X	1	H	6	Tier 1 H 6
A20022	City of Salem / McNary Field	Runway / Safety Area Extension - McNary Field	$ 2,600,000.00	x	x	x	x	X	1	H	3	Tier 1 H 3
A20030	City of Newport-Port of Astoria	Coastal Oregon Air Service	$ 3,600,000.00	x	x	x		X	2	H	2	Tier 2 H 2
A20046	Whitney Family Properties, LP and City of Newberg	Airport Runway Improvements	$ 747,300.00	x	x	x	x	X	1	H	15	Tier 1 H 15
A20053	TTI Wireless	Visual Advantage	$ 396,000.00	x				X	3	L	23	Tier 3 T 23
A20054	City of Creswell Hobby Field Airport	Creswell Airport Fire Suppression Project	$ 743,440.00	x	x	x	x	X	1	H	13	Tier 1 H 13
A20055	Port of Tillamook Bay	Intermodal Freight Station (Air Cargo Apron for Aircraft and Reloading Terminal)	$ 640,000.00		x	x		X	3	M	17	Tier 3 M 17
M20019	City of Astoria	17th. Street Dock Construction Project	2,000,000			X			3	M	12	Tier 3 M 12
M20065	Port of Siuslaw	Maple Street Landing & Transient Dock	$ 378,000.00	x	x	x	x		2	M	21	Tier 2 M 21
M20042	Port of Astoria	Pier 2 North Face Rehab	$973,920.00	x	x	x		x	2	H	1	Tier 2 H 1
R20013	Albany and Eastern Railroad	Sweet Home Branch	$ 3,367,220.00					x	4	M	18	Tier 4 M 18
R20025	Portland & Western Railroad, Inc.	Albany Rail Corridor Improvement Project	$ 6,990,516.00	x	x	x		X	2	H	4	Tier 2 H 4
R20051	Albany and Eastern RR	Mill City Branch Bridge Rehab and 286k Rail Upgrade	$ 3,777,280.00		X				3	H	7	Tier 3 H 7
R20052	Albany and Eastern RR	Mill City Rail and Tie Upgrade	$ 4,054,400.00		x				3	H	14	Tier 3 H 14
R20057	Willamette Valley Railway Company	Upgrade Railroad - Phase II	$ 1,020,000.00			x		X	3	L	24	Tier 3 L 13
R20062	City of Lebanon and Albany and Eastern RR Co.	Santiam Spur Upgrade/Bridge Replacement	$ 2,264,000.00		x				3	M	19	Tier 3 M 19
R20071	Union Pacific Railroad Company	Install Yard Crossover - Eugene	$ 384,476.80	x	x		x	X	3	M	8	Tier 3 M 8
R20078	Port of Tillamook Bay	RR Metal Bridge and Tunnel No. 32 Enhancement	$ 4,442,312.00		x	x		X	3	H	20	Tier T 3H 20
T20024	Lane Transit District and City of Veneta	Veneta Transit Center - Eugene	$ 656,000.00	x	x	x	x	X	1	H	5	Tier 1 H 5
T20035	Salem-Keizer Transit District	Keizer Transit Ctr.	$ 2,516,000.00	x		x	X		3	H	9	Tier 3 H 9
T20036	Salem-Keizer Transit District	So. Salem Transit Ctr	$ 2,520,000.00	x		x	X		3	H	11	Tier 3 H 11
X20060	Sunset Empire Transportation District and Sundial Travel and Cruise Center	SETD-Sundial Charter Bus/Maint / Transit Project Only	$ 2,080,000.00	x	x	x		X	2	M	10	Tier 2 M 10
X20063	Saddle Mountain, Inc. and Columbia River Bar Pilots LLC	Bar Pilot Helicopter Project (Marine Only)	$ 5,736,640.00			x			3	L	22	Tier 3 L 22
X20064	City of Eugene	Eugene Depot Transit Access Improvements	$ 408,000.00	x		x	x	X	3	H	16	Tier 3 H 16

*Connect*Oregon II Region 3 Committee Review Matrix

Application Number	Applicant Name	Project Name / Description	Total ConnectOregon Funds Requested ($)	(a) Whether a proposed transportation project reduces transportation costs for Oregon businesses or improves access to jobs and sources of labor	(b) Whether a proposed transportation project results in an economic benefit to this state	(c) Whether a proposed transportation project is a critical link connecting elements of Oregon's transportation system that will measurably improve utilization and efficiency of the system	(d) How much of the cost of a proposed transportation project can be borne by the applicant for the grant or loan from any source other than the Multimodal Transportation Fund; and	(e) Whether a proposed transportation project is ready for construction	Tier	Rank (High - Medium - Low)	Priority	**Final Review Report**
				Staff has placed an "X" for each Consideration that is " thoroughly" met by the project						Committee Only	Committee Only	
A30001	**Coos County Airport District**	**Air Traffic Control Tower- Southwest Oregon Regional Airport (North Bend)**	624,000	X	X	X	X	X	1	H	1	**Tier 1 H 1**
A30061	**Rogue Valley International-Medford Sky Air Cargo, LLC**	**Medford - Multi-Modal Express Air Cargo Expansion**	4,760,000	X	X	X	X	X	1	H	2	**Tier 1 H 2**

*Connect*Oregon II Region 4 Committee Review Matrix

Application Number	Applicant Name	Project Name / Description	Total ConnectOregon Funds Requested ($)	(a) Whether a proposed transportation project reduces transportation costs for Oregon businesses or improves access to jobs and sources of labor	(b) Whether a proposed transportation project results in an economic benefit to this state	(c) Whether a proposed transportation project is a critical link connecting elements of Oregon's transportation system that will measurably improve utilization and efficiency of the system	(d) How much of the cost of a proposed transportation project can be borne by the applicant for the grant or loan from any source other than the Multimodal Transportation Fund; and	(e) Whether a proposed transportation project is ready for construction	Tier	Rank (High - Medium - Low)	Priority	**Final Review Report**
				Staff has placed an "X" for each Consideration that is " thoroughly" met by the project						Committee Only	Committee Only	
R40043	**Modoc Northern Railroad Company**	**Lakeview Branch Improvement**	**$ 648,000**	x	x	X	x	x	**1**	**H**	1	Tier 1 H 1
T40010	**City of Bend**	**Central Oregon Intermodal Transit Center**	**$ 2,800,000**	x	x	x	x	x	**1**	**H**	2	Tier 1 H 2
A40031	**Redmond Airport - City of Redmond**	**North Side Cargo Ramp & Development**	**$ 1,500,000**	X	x	x	x	x	**1**	**H**	3	Tier 1 H 3
R40005	**City of Prineville**	**Prineville Railroad / Freight Depot**	**$ 3,520,000**	x	x	x		x	**2**	**H**	4	Tier 2 H 4
A40075	**City of Madras**	**Heavy Aircraft and Engine Maintenance Facility**	**$ 2,157,749**	x	x		x	x	**3**	**H**	5	Tier 3 H 5
R40032	**Klamath Northern Railway Company and Interfor Pacific Inc**	**KNOR 286k Upgrade - Light Weight Rail**	**$ 720,000**	x	x		x	x	**3**	**H**	6	Tier 3 H 6
A40003	**City of Klamath Falls Airport**	**New Terminal Bldg. - Klamath Falls Airport**	**$ 6,360,000**	x	x	x	x	x	**1**	**M**	7	Tier 1 M 7
A40002	**City of Klamath Falls Airport**	**Aviation Maintenance Tech. Ctr - Klamath Falls Airport**	**$ 11,150,000**	x	X		x	x	**3**	**M**	8	Tier 3 M 8
M40027	**City of The Dalles**	**Dock for Cruise Boat**	**$ 2,000,000**	X	x		x		**3**	**M**	9	Tier 3 M 9
T40006	**Kah-Nee-Ta Resort and Mt. Hood Meadows Ski Resort**	**Partnership for Full Employment**	**$ 71,979**	x			x	x	**3**	**M**	10	Tier 3 M 10
T40011	**City of Bend**	**City of Bend Transit Stops**	**$ 230,000**	x			x	x	**3**	**M**	11	Tier 3 M 11
R40037	**Klamath County**	**Chemult Train Stn Welcome Ctr**	**$ 160,000**			x		x	**3**	**M**	12	Tier 3 M 12
A40023	**Wheeler County**	**Wheeler County Airport Project**	**$ 900,328**				x	X	**4**	**M**	13	Tier 4 M 13
R40043	**Modoc Northern Railroad Company**	**Lakeview Branch Improvement**	**$ 648,000**	x	x	X	x	x	**1**	**H**	1	Tier 1 H 1

*Connect*Oregon II Region 5 Committee Review Matrix

Application Number	Applicant Name	Project Name / Description	Total ConnectOregon Funds Requested ($)	(a) Whether a proposed transportation project reduces transportation costs for Oregon businesses or improves access to jobs and sources of labor	(b) Whether a proposed transportation project results in an economic benefit to this state	(c) Whether a proposed transportation project is a critical link connecting elements of Oregon's transportation system that will measurably improve utilization and efficiency of the system	(d) How much of the cost of a proposed transportation project can be borne by the applicant for the grant or loan from any source other than the Multimodal Transportation Fund; and	(e) Whether a proposed transportation project is ready for construction	Tier	Rank (High - Medium - Low)	Priority	**Final Review Report**
				Staff has placed an "X" for each Consideration that is " thoroughly" met by the project						Committee Only	Committee Only	
R50007	**Union County Economic Development Corp. and Pendleton Grain Growers**	**Alicel Intermodal Transportation Project**	**$ 2,723,688**	x	x	x	x	x	**1**	**H**	**1**	**Tier 1 H 1**
A50045	**Grant County**	**Airport Terminal Building**	**$ 4,064,167**	x	x	x		x	**2**	**H**	**2**	**Tier 2 H 2**
R50015	**City of Baker City**	**Elkhorn View Industrial Park Rail Spur**	**$ 360,000**	X	x	x		x	**2**	**H**	**3**	**Tier 2 H 3**
A50020	**City of Vale**	**Miller Memorial Airport**	**$ 400,000**	x	x	x		x	**2**	**H**	**4**	**Tier 2 H 4**
R50044	**Port of Morrow**	**Morrow Multimodal Rail Logistics Center**	**$ 7,926,626**	x	x	x		x	**2**	**H**	**5**	**Tier 2 H 5**
A50014	**City of Baker City**	**Baker City Municipal Airport Improvements**	**$ 572,000**		x	x	x	x	**3**	**H**	**6**	**Tier 3 H 6**
A50009	**City of Ontario**	**Ontario Airport Pavement Improvement Project**	**$ 3,257,036**	x	x	x		x	**2**	**H**	**7**	**Tier 2 H 7**
X50018	**Port of Umatilla and Port of Portland**	**Upland Distribution Center - Port of Umatilla**	**$ 5,000,000**	x	x	x	x		**2**	**L**	**8**	**Tier 2 L 8**
M50050	**Tidewater Barge Co.**	**Boardman Barge Terminal**	**$ 1,202,400**	x	x	x		x	**2**	**L**	**9**	**Tier 2 L 9**
A50008	**VanArsdale Air Service, LLC**	**Aviation Expansion Project**	**$ 496,000**		x			x	**3**	**L**	**10**	**Tier 3 L 10**
R50070	**Union Pacific Railroad Company**	**Construct Yard Connections - Hinkle Yard Hermiston**	**$ 1,929,186**			x		x	**3**	**L**	**11**	**Tier 3 L 11**
R50012	**Sumpter Valley Railroad Restoration Inc**	**Machine shop expansion and rebuild program**	**$ 760,000**						**4**	**L**	**12**	**Tier 4 L 12**

Appendix 4 Memorandum of Collaboration

Oregon
Department of Transportation

*Connect*Oregon II Final Review Committee

MEMORANDUM OF COLLABORATION

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

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

The Charge to the *Connect*Oregon II Final Review Committee. The Director charges FRC with the responsibility of developing recommendations regarding which projects should be funded under the *Connect*Oregon II program. The goal is to select the best projects across the board to benefit air, marine, public transit, rail and freight transportation throughout Oregon.

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

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

(1) To attend committee meetings and work sessions;
(2) To study the available information relevant to the charge;
(3) To participate in developing sound, written recommendations to the OTC;
(4) Except as otherwise provided in Section IV(A)(4) below, to inform, and to make a good faith effort to seek support from and gain the ratification of their represented groups for the work and the work product of FRC;
(5) To promptly advise the Director of any information that would affect the work of the committee; and
(6) To declare actual or likely conflicts of interest at the start of each meeting session. A conflict of interest means the member is an applicant, or a consultant to an applicant, or is a member of a committee or board that has assisted an applicant, or could receive a financial benefit from a project. For purposes of this FRC, members who have declared actual or likely conflicts of interest will be able to fully participate in the committee work as long as the committee is working toward building consensus. If the committee's work involves a majority/minority vote, the member with the declared conflict of interest will be precluded from participating in any vote involving the project causing the conflict.

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

C. The Members of the *Connect*Oregon II Final Review Committee. The FRC includes representatives from five regional and four modal review committees and individuals from the transportation industry. The committee members are named on pp. 9-13 of this Memorandum.

D. Term of Existence. The work of FRC will commence prior to the first meeting on April 29, 2008 and will conclude following submission of its recommendations to the Director; or at such time ODOT determines it is not reasonable to expect that the committee will be able to fulfill its charge.

II. The Role of ODOT.

A. Assistance to the Committee. ODOT will provide technical support, substantive expertise, logistical assistance, administrative assistance, and advice to the committee, but will not have a vote at committee meetings. Teddie Baker will be the principal ODOT staff member assigned to the committee.

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

III. The Role of the Facilitator.

A. ODOT has contracted with Alison S. Kelley, J.D. by and through Conflict Management Strategies, LLC (CMS). CMS is an independent, neutral third party whose role is to facilitate the committee meetings, help develop committee recommendations, and produce a final report. CMS may offer recommendations to ODOT relating to the committee process.

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

C. CMS may propose substantive suggestions for the committee's consideration and will provide procedures to help guide the committee in its work.

D. CMS will advise ODOT if it appears that the committee will be unable to fulfill its charge.

E. CMS will work collaboratively with all ODOT staff and executive team members to assist the committee in its work. CMS and ODOT designees may meet individually with FRC members to develop understanding of issues, resolve questions or apparent conflicts, or as otherwise needed to assist FRC in fulfilling its charge.

F. CMS is a single-member limited liability company owned by Alison S. Kelley, J.D., who is an attorney in a solo private practice limited to mediation, facilitation, and collaborative dispute resolution. Ms. Kelley is not an employee of ODOT or of any of the FRC members. As a neutral collaborative process provider, CMS will not act as an advocate on any issue for ODOT, any interest group, or any member of the committee. While CMS may make recommendations regarding the committee process, CMS will not make any substantive decisions. CMS is being compensated by ODOT pursuant to a contract that is available for review.

G. Communication with CMS: CMS encourages FRC members to communicate information or concerns to it regarding the process for developing recommendations, the recommendations, or other substantive issues. FRC members are encouraged to

communicate with ODOT regarding technical, logistical and administrative support issues.

IV. Operating Procedures of FRC.

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

1. Voting: During the consensus decision-making process, each member of the committee will have one equal vote except for the non-voting Chair.
2. Decision Rules: The committee will discuss the decision rules prior to beginning the formulation of recommendations. The decision rules include the consensus decision-making procedure and the single-text process. Questions relating to the process will be assessed by CMS, and the recommendation submitted by CMS to the committee will be decided by majority vote of those committee members present if a quorum is in attendance.
3. Organization and Conduct of Meetings. The Members of the committee agree to:
   (a) Participate fully and in good faith,
   (b) Comment constructively and specifically, making points concisely to ensure sufficient opportunities for all members to be heard,
   (c) Allow one person to speak at a time,
   (d) Address the issues in neutral terms without personal criticism of individuals,
   (e) Explore all options, and
   (f) Keep an open mind.
4. Good Faith Participation. Each member of FRC agrees to participate in good faith. For purposes of this committee, "good faith" means honesty in fact and conduct. This does not preclude FRC members from taking inconsistent or opposing positions with or from those taken by FRC, and does not preclude the participation of members or their constituents in other forums, such as a legislative session, administrative hearing, or judicial proceeding. Members of FRC undertake a commitment to act in the best interests of the committee, and to refrain from activity that would undermine its ability to fulfill its charge.
5. CMS will address any situation where it appears a member is not acting in good faith. CMS will provide impartial guidance to the committee regarding these ground rules.

B. Development of Recommendations. CMS will explain to the committee the process for developing recommendations. CMS will assist the committee in identifying objectives, addressing diversity of perspectives, and developing substantive, practical recommendations to implement identified objectives. CMS will use a *Consensus Decision-Making* discussion model to facilitate committee decision-making, and to ensure that the committee receives the collective benefit of the individual views, experience, background, training and expertise of its members. CMS will use a *Single Text Process* to assist the committee in drafting, editing and refining its recommendations.

C. Consensus Decision-Making.

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

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

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

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

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

In most cases, groups achieve consensus through this process. However, if the group is unable to reach consensus, the facilitator will call for a traditional vote to determine the majority view. For some issues, participants voting in the minority may have an opportunity to submit a minority report to accompany the majority recommendation.

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

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

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

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

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

CMS recommends the use of Microsoft Word Processing system as the most expeditious method of making suggested changes to the discussion draft between

meetings. Prior to the conclusion of each work session, CMS will identify tasks for committee members to complete in advance of the next meeting.

E. Public Status of FRC Meetings and Records. FRC meetings are open to the public. ODOT will provide notice to the public regarding the dates, times and locations of meetings. FRC meetings are committee work sessions and may not necessarily allocate time for public testimony. Records of FRC such as formal documents, discussion drafts, minutes and exhibits are public records.

F. Confidentiality of Communications.

(1) "Communications" refers to all statements and votes made during committee meetings, memoranda, work projects, records, documents or materials developed to fulfill the charge, including electronic mail correspondence to ODOT or to CMS.

(2) Communications of the committee are not confidential because the meetings and records of the committee are open to the public.

(3) The personal, private notes of individual committee members might be considered to be public to the extent they "relate to the conduct of the public's business," (ORS 192.410(4)).

G. Communication with the Media. While free to communicate with the media, the members of FRC agree not to negotiate through the media, or to use the media to undermine the work of FRC. FRC members agree to raise all of their concerns, especially those being raised for the first time, at a FRC meeting and not in or through the media.

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

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

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

VI. **Timeline.** The work of FRC will include prioritizing tasks and developing timelines to fulfill its charge to deliver recommendations to the Oregon Transportation Commission. Subject to additional meetings if necessary to complete its work, the committee anticipates the following schedule: meeting from 8:00 – 5:00 on Tuesday, April 29, 2008 and Wednesday, April 30, 2008.

VII. **Interpretation of the Memorandum of Collaboration.** CMS shall interpret the ground rules of this Memorandum pursuant to its position as the neutral facilitator.

*CONNECT*OREGON II FINAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

MEMORANDUM OF COLLABORATON

*This Memorandum of Collaboration sets forth the operating agreements and expectations of the Connect*Oregon II *Final Review Committee and the Oregon Department of Transportation and is not intended to create binding legal obligations among members or between members and ODOT.*

Signatures of *Connect*Oregon II Final Review Committee Members
(Members listed alphabetically)

Richard Bjelland

(Signature) Date 4/29/2008

Dee Burch

(Signature) Date 4/29/2008

Michael Burrill, Sr.

(Signature) Date 4/29/2008

Bruce Carswell

(Signature) Date 4/29/2008

Dan Clem

(Signature) Date 04/29/2008

Scott Cooper

(Signature) Date 4/29/08

Tammy Dennee

(Signature) Date 4/29/08

Pat Egan

(Signature) Date 4/29/08

Lylla Gaebel

(Signature) Date 4-29-08

Larry Gesher

(Signature) Date 4-29-08

Gayle Harley

(Signature) Date 4/29/08

Shirley Kalkhoven

(Signature) April 29, 2008
Date

Susie Lahsene

(Signature) April 29, 2008
Date

Paul Langner

(Signature) 29 April 2008
Date

Craig Levie

(Signature) APRIL 29, 2008
Date

Don Lindly

(Signature) 4-29-08
Date

Don Mann

(Signature) 4-29-08
Date

Jim McClellan

(Signature) 4/29/08 Date

Terry Parker

(Signature) 4.29.08 Date

Lynn Peterson

(Signature) 4-29-08 Date

Claire Potter

(Signature) 4.29.08 Date

Bob Russell

(Signature) 4/29/08 Date

Al Switzer

(Signature) 4-29-2008 Date

Gary Thompson

(Signature) 4/29/08 Date

Terry Tallman

Terry Tallman
(Signature)

4/29/08
Date

Mark Webb

Mark R Webb
(Signature)

4-29-08
Date

Jack Evans
ODOT Legislative Liaison

4/29/08
Date

Alison Kelley
Alison S. Kelley J.D
Conflict Management Strategies, LLC

April 29, 2008
Date

Appendix 5 Staff Presentation *of* Projects for Review (5/24/08)

Final Review Committee Review Matrix

This matrix brings forward the work of the previous committees, demonstrates agreement between committees, and places the projects in approximately rank order.

KEY

To provide for a common comparison between previous committees, projects are represented by a color code based on a given committee's prioritization number. Agreement in committee priority is demonstrated by comparing the priority colors across a row.

	Projects in the top third of the respective review committee's prioritization
	Projects in the middle third of the respective review committee's prioritization
	Projects in the bottom third of the respective review committee's prioritization

For each committee projects that fall on the boundary between classifications are paced in the next higher category.

Tier # R P

In addition to the color key, the committee assigned Tier, Rank and Prioritization are noted by review committee, to provide reference to the final review committee.

Full project details, including review committee summary sheets, are contained in the application binders.

ORDER

The order of project presentation is established by converting committee priorities to a ratio, and then calculating the project's average of all committees' ratio priorities. The highest average priority score (lowest number) is placed at the top of the list, and subsequent projects are listed in rank order.

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

APP. #	APPLICANT	PROJECT NAME	Aviation	OFAC	Transit	Rail	Marine	Region	Fund? (Y/N)
	This document is a Discussion Draft for use of FRC. This Discussion Draft is a Work in Progress and does not reflect the final recommendations of the committee. This Discussion Draft was prepared by ODOT only as a discussion aid, and does not necessarily reflect the individual views of any members of FRC or ODOT. At its final meeting, FRC will have the opportunity to suggest changes for its final recommendations to ODOT.								Y or N
R10026	Portland & Western Railroad	Columbia River Rail Corridor Improvement		Tier 1 H 1		Tier 1 H 1		Tier 1 H 2	
A10040	Port of Portland	PDX North Runway Extension	Tier 1 H 1	Tier 1 H 3				Tier 1 H 1	
M20042	Port of Astoria	Pier 2 North Face Upgrade					Tier 2 H 1	Tier 2 H 1	
R10066	Port of Portland	South Rivergate Yard Expansion		Tier 1 H 4		Tier 1 H 2		Tier 1 H 3	
R10047	BNSF	East St. Johns Siding Extension		Tier 2 H 2		Tier 2 H 2		Tier 2 H 4	
R20025	Portland & Western Railroad, Inc.	Albany Rail Corridor Improvement Project		Tier 2 H 8		Tier 2 H 1		Tier 2 H 4	
T40010	City of Bend	Central Oregon Intermodal Transit Center			Tier 3 H 3			Tier 1 H 2	
T10076	Gresham Redevelopment Commission and TriMet	188th St. Light Rail Stn Reconstruction			Tier 3 H 1			Tier 3 M 6	
A20021	City of Salem - McNary Field	Passenger Terminal Expansion	Tier 1 H 4					Tier 1 H 6	
A50045	Grant County	Airport Terminal Building	Tier 1 H 6					Tier 2 H 2	
R10072	Union Pacific Railroad Company	St. Johns Lead Improvements		Tier 1 H 5		Tier 2 H 3		Tier 2 M 7	
R50007	Union County Economic Development Corp. and Pendleton Grain Growers	Alicel Intermodal Transportation Project		Tier 1 H 7		Tier 3 H 2		Tier 1 H 1	
R40005	City of Prineville	Prineville Railroad / Freight Depot		Tier 2 H 8		Tier 2 H 4		Tier 2 H 4	
T20024	Lane Transit District and City of Veneta	Veneta Transit Center - Eugene			Tier 2 H 4			Tier 1 H 5	
R40043	Modoc Northern Railroad Company	Lakeview Branch Improvement		Tier 3 M 19		Tier 2 H 5		Tier 1 H 1	
R50044	Port of Morrow	Morrow Multimodal Rail Logistics Center		Tier 1 H 6		Tier 2 H 6		Tier 2 H 5	
A40075	City of Madras	Heavy Aircraft and Engine Maintenance Facility	Tier 1 H 5					Tier 3 H 5	
R20051	Albany and Eastern RR	Mill City Branch Bridge Rehab and 286k Rail Upgrade		Tier 1 M 13		Tier 3 H 1		Tier 3 H 7	
A30001	Coos County Airport District	Air Traffic Control Tower-Southwest Oregon Regional Airport (North Bend)	Tier 1 H 2	Tier 1 M 15				Tier 1 M 1	
T10038	Columbia County	Public Transit Facility			Tier 2 H 2			Tier 2 M 10	
R10048	BNSF	Astoria Wye		Tier 2 H 9		Tier 2 M 1		Tier 2 M 8	
A20030	City of Newport-Port of Astoria	Coastal Oregon Air Service	Tier 1 M 13					Tier 2 H 2	
R10016	Port of St. Helens	Port Westward Railroad System Wye		Tier 2 H 11		Tier 3 M 4		Tier 2 H 5	
T20035	Salem-Keizer Transit District	Keizer Transit Ctr.			Tier 3 H 5			Tier 3 H 9	
A50009	City of Ontario	Ontario Airport Pavement Improvement Project	Tier 1 H 9					Tier 2 H 4	
A20022	City of Salem / McNary Field	Runway / Safety Area Extension - McNary Field	Tier 1 H 3	Tier 3 L 33				Tier 1 H 3	
M10029	Port of Portland	Terminal 4 Pipeline Infrastructure		Tier 2 M 18			Tier 2 H 2	Tier 2 M 9	
A40031	Redmond Airport - City of Redmond	North Side Cargo Ramp & Development	Tier 1 H 7	Tier 3 M 23				Tier 1 H 3	
T20036	Salem-Keizer Transit District	So. Salem Transit Ctr			Tier 3 H 6			Tier 3 H 11	
X10041	Port of Portland	Terminal 2 Rail Extension		Tier 2 M 16			Tier 2 M 4	Tier 2 M 11	
R40032	Klamath Northern Railway Company and Interfor Pacific Inc	KNOR 286k Upgrade - Light Weight Rail		Tier 3 M 22		Tier 3 H 3		Tier 3 H 6	
A20054	City of Creswell Hobby Field Airport	Creswell Airport Fire Suppression Project	Tier 1 H 10					Tier 1 H 13	
R20052	Albany and Eastern RR	Mill City Rail and Tie Upgrade		Tier 2 M 14		Tier 3 M 1		Tier 3 H 14	
R20071	Union Pacific Railroad Company	Install Yard Crossover - Eugene		Tier 3 L 28		Tier 3 M 3		Tier 3 M 8	
A50020	City of Vale	Miller Memorial Airport	Tier 1 H 11					Tier 2 H 7	
X20060	Sunset Empire Transportation District and Sundial Travel and Cruise	SETD-Sundial Charter Bus/Maint / Rail and Transit Project Only			Tier 3 M 9			Tier 2 M 10	
A40003	City of Klamath Falls Airport	New Terminal Bldg. - Klamath Falls Airport	Tier 1 M 12					Tier 1 M 7	

APP. #	APPLICANT	PROJECT NAME	Aviation	OFAC	Transit	Rail	Marine	Region	Fund? (Y/N)
	This document is a Discussion Draft for use of FRC. This Discussion Draft is a Work in Progress and does not reflect the final recommendations of the committee. This Discussion Draft was prepared by ODOT only as a discussion aid, and does not necessarily reflect the individual views of any members of FRC or ODOT. At its final meeting, FRC will have the opportunity to suggest changes for its final recommendations to ODOT.								Y or N
R50070	Union Pacific Railroad Company	Construct Yard Connections - Hinkle Yard Hermiston		Tier 3 H 10		Tier 3 H 5		Tier 3 L 11	
X50018	Port of Umatilla	Upland Distribution Center - Port of Umatilla		Tier 3 L 25		Tier 3 L 4	Tier 2 H 1	Tier 2 L 8	
R10058	Northwest Container Services	NWCS Portland Expansion		Tier 2 H 12		Tier 3 M 4		Tier 3 M 16	
R10039	Vigor Industries LCC	Shipyard Commerce Ctr Siding Track		Tier 2 M 17		Tier 3 L 2		Tier 2 M 13	
R10004	Mt. Hood Railroad	Repair Flood Damaged Track		Tier 3 L 26		Tier 3 H 4		Tier 3 M 12	
M20019	City of Astoria	17th Street Dock Construction Project - Astoria		Tier 2 M 20			Tier 4 M 1	Tier 3 M 12	
R50015	City of Baker City	Elkhorn View Industrial Park Rail Spur		Tier 2 L 32		Tier 3 L 1		Tier 2 H 3	
M20065	Port of Siuslaw	Maple Street Landing & Transient Dock		Tier 3 M 24			Tier 2 M 3	Tier 2 M 21	
A50014	City of Baker City	Baker City Municipal Airport Improvements	Tier 3 H 16					Tier 3 H 6	
T10056	City of Oregon City	City Trolley Acquisitions			Tier 2 M 7			Tier 2 M 14	
A20046	Whitney Family Properties, LP and City of Newberg	Airport Runway Improvements	Tier 2 M 14					Tier 1 H 15	
A30061	Rogue Valley International-Medford Sky Air Cargo, LLC	Medford - Multi-Modal Express Air Cargo Expansion	Tier 1 H 8	Tier 2 M 21				Tier 2 M 2	
X10068	City of Wilsonville SMART Transit	SMART Multi-Modal Center (Admin/Fleet) Rail and Transit Only			Tier 3 M 8			Tier 3 M 15	
M50050	Tidewater Barge Co.	Boardman Barge Terminal		Tier 2 L 30			Tier 2 L 5	Tier 2 L 9	
X20064	City of Eugene	Eugene Depot Transit Access Improvements			Tier 3 H 10			Tier 3 H 16	
R20013	Albany and Eastern Railroad	Sweethome Branch		Tier 3 L 27		Tier 3 L 3		Tier 4 M 18	
A20055	Port of Tillamook Bay	Intermodal Freight Station (Air Cargo Apron for Aircraft and Reloading Terminal)	Tier 2 L 15	Tier 3 L 34				Tier 3 M 17	
M40027	City of the Dalles	Dock for Cruise Boat					Tier 4 L 3	Tier 3 M 9	
R20062	City of Lebanon and Albany and Eastern RR Co.	Santiam Spur Upgrade/Bridge Replacement		Tier 2 L 27		Tier 4 L 2		Tier 3 mM 19	
T40011	City of Bend	City of Bend Transit Stops			Tier 3 H 11			Tier 3 M 11	
X20063	Saddle Mountain, Inc. and Columbia River Bar Pilots LLC	Bar Pilot Helicopter Project (Marine Only)		Tier 3 L 35			Tier 3 L 2	Tier 3 L 22	
A50008	VanArsdale Air Service, LLC	Aviation Expansion Project	Tier 3 L 19					Tier 3 L 10	
A40002	City of Klamath Falls Airport	Aviation Maintenance Tech. Ctr Klamath Falls Airport	Tier 4 L 21	Tier 3 L 36				Tier 3 M 8	
A10067	Port of Portland	Mulino Airport Development Improvements	Tier 3 M 17					Tier 3 L 18	
T40006	Kah-Nee-Ta Resort and Mt. Hood Meadows Ski Resort	Partnership for Full Employment			Tier 3 M 13			Tier 3 M 10	
R20057	Willamette Valley Railway Company	Upgrade Railroad - Phase II		Tier 4 L 31		Tier 3 L 5		Tier 3 L 24	
R40037	Klamath County	Chemult Train Stn Welcome Ctr				Tier 4 L 1		Tier 3 M 12	
R20078	Port of Tillamook Bay	RR Metal Bridge and Tunnel No. 32 Enhancement		Tier 2 L 32		Ineligible		Tier 3 H 20	
T10074	TriMet and City of Milwaukie	Milwaukie Transit Layover Facility - North Milwaukie			Tier 4 M 12			Tier 4 L 17	
A40023	Wheeler County	Wheeler County Airport Project	Tier 3 L 18					Tier 4 M 13	
A20053	TTI Wireless	Visual Advantage	Tier 3 L 20					Tier 3 L 23	
R50012	Sumpter Valley Railroad Restoration Inc	Machine shop expansion and rebuild program				Tier 4 L 3		Tier 4 L 12	
X10073	Regional Maritime Security Coalition (RMSC)	Intermodal - Expansion of Information Sharing System (CSTS-Net) Throughout		Tier 3 L 34			Tier 4 L 4	Tier 3 L 19	