

## TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #9 - DRAFT

**DATE:** May 5, 2015

**TO:** Columbia County TSP Project Management Team

**FROM:** John Bosket, DKS Associates  
Kevin Chewuk, DKS Associates  
Edith Lopez Victoria, DKS Associates

**SUBJECT: Columbia County Transportation System Plan Update**  
Technical Memorandum #9: Transportation Solutions Identification Process

P11086-022

This memorandum describes the recommended process for creating a prioritized list of transportation improvements that best achieves Columbia County's objectives with the funding that is expected to be available. The outcome of this process will result in "Aspirational" and "Financially Constrained" lists of projects. The Aspirational list includes all projects that the county would implement if funding was not a constraint. The Financially Constrained list is a subset of the Aspirational list including high-priority projects that fit within the level of anticipated funding.

### Developing the Financially Constrained Plan

The following process will be utilized to develop the Financially Constrained Transportation System Plan:

- Step 1. Identify Expected Funding:** The first step is to identify the expected amount of funding the county will have available through 2035 to build transportation system improvements. The estimates will be broken out by expected primary funding responsibility (county, state, or developer) and will be based on historic revenue and expenditure data and an assumption that past trends will continue into the future. State funding estimates will be determined in coordination with ODOT Region 2 staff.
- Step 2. Develop Set of Aspirational Projects:** This step involves developing an Aspirational list of projects to address the needs of the future transportation system for all modes, as identified in Technical Memorandum #8. At this point, the list of projects will not be constrained by funding.

The recommended approach for identifying solutions considers four tiers of priorities that put an emphasis on improving system efficiency and management over adding capacity, which often requires greater property impacts and expense. The four priority tiers include:

1. Highest Priority – preserve the function of the system through management practices such as improved traffic signal operations, encouraging alternative modes of travel, and implementation of new policies and standards.
2. High Priority – improve existing facility efficiency through minor enhancement projects that upgrade roads to desired standards, fill important system connectivity gaps, or include safety improvements to intersections and corridors.
3. Moderate Priority – add capacity to the system by widening, constructing major improvements to existing roadways, or extending existing roadways to create parallel routes to congested corridors.
4. Lowest Priority – add capacity to the system by constructing new facilities.

The project team will recommend higher priority solution types to address identified needs unless a lower priority solution is clearly more cost-effective or better supports the goals and objectives of the community.

**Step 3. Develop Cost Estimates:** Cost estimates will be developed for each Aspirational project and compared to expected funding for projects through 2035 (from Step 1). Each project will be assigned a primary funding responsibility (county, state, or developer).

**Step 4. Alternatives Evaluation:** Each project from the Aspirational project list will be scored based on the evaluation criteria that was developed in Technical Memorandum #5. In situations where multiple project alternatives are available to address the same or conflicting transportation system needs, the evaluation criteria will be used to identify the project that will best meet the goals of the TSP. The project scoring highest will be retained on the Aspirational project list.

**Step 5. Group Projects into Reasonably Fundable Packages:** Projects will then be grouped into packages of solutions that could reasonably be expected to be funded and implemented through 2035. The packages will include a prioritized list of county responsible projects, and a prioritized list of state responsible projects that the county could use to make decisions for applying for grants or other funding mechanisms. Developer responsible projects will be built in coordination with land use actions and future development. Only projects associated with new development on vacant parcels will be assumed to occur within the planning horizon of the TSP. While projects related to property re-development may occur within the TSP planning horizon, no funding will be assumed.

**Step 6. Develop Hybrid Package of Solutions:** The packages will be compared and discussed, which may lead to further refinement of the evaluation criteria or the emergence of a hybrid package to be included as the “Financially Constrained Transportation System.” Projects that do not make the Financially Constrained list will be assigned a priority for implementation beyond the funded list of projects based on individual project scores.