#### 2022-2024 Regional Flexible Funds Project Application

#### INTRODUCTION

This application is organized to consider, assess, screen, and select Regional Flexible Fund Allocation (RFFA) projects. The assessment is focused on first determining a candidate project's applicability to the RFFA program and their technical feasibility. Upon that assessment, promising projects will be assessed on the merits of their intended project outcomes that will be used for project scoring.

To be applicable to the RFFA program, a project must be at least one of the following project types:

- Active Transportation and Complete Streets, or
- Freight and Economic Development Initiatives

Each project should demonstrably support the four 2018 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) investment priorities:

- Advancing Equity
- Improving Safety
- Implementing the region's Climate Smart Strategy
- Managing Congestion

Although information from the entire application may be used to inform project scoring, the questions presented in the section, "Project Outcomes" are directly related to scoring and evaluation criteria and the answers to these questions will directly inform the project scoring.

After all relevant questions are completed, please secure the required signatures as indicated at the end of this application form, and email it, along with other required information and supporting documentation to rffa@oregonmetro.gov. Applications MUST be received by 4:00 p.m. on Friday, June 21, 2019 in order to be considered.

#### APPLICANT INFORMATION

- 1. Jurisdiction name: City of Portland
- 2. Contact info: Mark Lear, 503-823-7604, Mark.Lear@portlandoregon.gov
- 3. Funding category (check one): ⊠ Active Transportation □ Freight □ Both
- 4. Project name: NE MLK Jr Blvd Safety and Access to Transit
- 5. Describe the project purpose. What problems or issues is the project intended to address?

NE MLK Jr Blvd already has one of Portland's highest concentrations of affordable housing, and a great deal more is in the pipeline. As more and more people live on this corridor, pedestrian and commercial activity will increase, leading to conflicts with the high volume of high-speed traffic on this major thoroughfare. The PBOT Safe Routes to School Plan also identified several crossing needs along the corridor. This project will focus on providing enhanced pedestrian crossings at regular spacing along MLK Jr Blvd to ensure safety and access to transit. NE MLK Jr Blvd is a

major destination and business hub for Black Portlanders. This project would not only seek to direct investments in crossing and transit amenities, it would also include streetscape improvements such as pedestrian-scale lighting and a community-driven process to further develop the corridor's identity to celebrate NE MLK Jr Blvd as a vibrant business district.

#### PROJECT READINESS

The following questions intend to gather information about how developed the project is and the steps that will still be required to complete the project. This section will be used for screening project feasibility.

#### Project Detail

6. Is this project on the 2018 RTP Constrained list?  $\square$  Yes  $\square$  No

7. What is the RTP Project ID #? 10302

8. In which RTP network and policy map(s) is the project included? Check all that apply, indicate specific functional classification.

High Injury Corridor (or ODOT ARTS Hotspot map) This is a regional high injury corridor.

□ Bicycle: Click here to enter text.

Pedestrian: Pedestrian Parkway

□ Freight Click here to enter text.

⊠ Transit: Frequent Bus

9. List the project beginning and ending points. What specific streets/intersections are included in the project area?

NE Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.: NE Cook St. – NE Highland St. Planned crossing improvements: NE Cook, NE Beech, NE Failing, NE Mason, NE Emerson, NE Highland. Planned signal upgrades: NE Fremont, NE Killingsworth.

10. Is the project included in an adopted local transportation safety plan or audit?  $\boxtimes$  Yes  $\Box$  No Please describe.

This project is part of PBOT's Vision Zero project list, included under the Transportation System Plan (TSP) as project #40058.

11. Describe the non-RFFA funding sources available and amounts necessary for the project to be completed. How secured is the funding for each funding source (Certain, Probable, or Competitive?)

The total project cost estimate is \$4,723,000. Local match in the amount of \$600,000 will be provided by system development charge revenue and/or other discretionary local funding sources. The local match funding is Certain. The RFFA grant request is for the remaining \$4,123,000.

12. Which Project Development Stages are to be considered for RFFA funding?

We are requesting RFFA funding for Alternatives Identification and Evaluation, Preliminary Design, Final Design, Right of Way, Utilities, and Construction

13. If your project is found to not be as far along as indicated or has specific challenges that need to be (re)addressed to improved technical feasibility, are you interested in RFFA funding for project development activities?  $\checkmark$  Yes  $\Box$  No

14. Attach or describe the project schedule and include information about important schedule considerations or drivers.

Early 2022—Alternatives Identification and Evaluation; Late 2022--Preliminary Design and Final Design; 2023—Right-of-Way; 2024--Construction

#### Project Completeness

15. At what stage of the project development process is the project, and what is the status of each project stage (refer to Defining Project Development Stages above)?

This project has gone through the Planning stage and a portion of the Alternatives Identification and Evaluation stages and has a signed engineer cost estimate and a defined scope. We have not done any survey or preliminary engineering. We will need to undertake some project development before project design to verify scope, including data collection and analysis as well as public involvement. While key leaders in the Black community in inner NE Portland support this project in principle, they have been clear that additional public engagement will be needed as part of this project to ensure that all voices are heard in decisions about the location and design of these crossing and signal improvements.

16. Is right of way (ROW) acquisition likely? Will the project need any unique ROW requirements such as temporary easements, special coordination with other agencies? What is the status of the ROW acquisition task of the project?

This project will require temporary construction easements. Significant acquisitions are not likely to be necessary. Right of way acquisition will be completed by the City of Portland following all federal processes during the Right of Way phase for each project.

17. What project development (project study reports, transportation safety plan, safety audit, feasibility studies) has been completed? How recent are these reports or this project development, and are they still relevant? Are they in digital format for possible transfer?

Imagine a Great Street: NE MLK Jr Blvd Transportation Project (1998). This effort worked with community members to identify a preferred cross section, streetscape features, crossings, and plan to gradually remove the median. This is the most recent project development work that looked at MLK Jr Blvd in its entirety. This is available in digital format.

NE MLK Blvd Pedestrian Improvement Project (2019) was an effort to identify pedestrian crossings and visibility improvements to address safety concerns. The final proposal developed several crossings and spot treatments to build, which have since been funded by the City of Portland's Fixing Our Streets measure. Reports and designs are available in digital format.

18. Does the project area intersect with Title 13 resource areas , wetlands, cemeteries, railroad tracks, Native American burial grounds, protected species habitat, or any other qualifiers that would require permitting?

The project area does not intersect with Title 13 resource areas, wetlands, cemeteries, or railroad tracks.

19. To what extent has environmental permitting been scoped or completed?

Environmental permitting for the project is unlikely as the project does not impact an environmental resource area.

**Community Support** 

20. What needs expressed by community members (e.g., unsafe crossing; egregiously long red lights) does the project address?

Community members described a stressful and unpleasant experience walking and driving along or across MLK Jr. Blvd. There is a general feeling that the street environment is not pedestrian friendly or conducive to street-level business and that affordable housing, retirement homes, and the highest activity commercial areas along MLK Jr. Blvd are not served well by existing crossings. There were also concerns that the increased and increasing traffic is resulting in poor air quality, the burden of which is falling on the many existing and coming affordable housing residents along the street. The City has worked to address these concerns by prioritizing crossing and safety improvements nearest affordable housing, retirement homes, and the most focused commercial areas on MLK Jr. Blvd. By adding these safer crossings and traffic access improvements, the City is creating an incrementally more pleasant place to walk and be, creating alternatives to driving to or along the corridor.

21. Which community partners are involved?

Thus far, the City has formally engaged with the Soul District Business Association, the business association for North and Northeast Portland. However, community interest in MLK Jr. Blvd in general and these improvements in particular grew out of another project development process on an adjacent street. Through that process, City staff came to understand that much of the resistance to changes on the adjacent street were related to challenges the community faced on MLK Jr. Blvd. The communities and organizations engaged as a part of that process were Soul District Business Association, Portland Community Reinvestment Initiatives (PCRI), Self Enhancement, Inc. (SEI), Albina Head Start, and residents, neighborhood associations, and businesses of the surrounding communities.

22. Describe the agency and community support (and any opposition) for the project. Discuss the focus on equity and stakeholder engagement process.

In the community, there has long been interest in improving safety and accessibility for people visiting and moving through the MLK Jr. Blvd communities. As the City has grown and traffic has increased on other adjacent routes (I-5, Interstate, Williams/Vancouver, MLK Jr. Blvd has increasingly become a throughway for traffic. The additional traffic has led to congestion and a feeling that MLK Jr. Blvd is a high stress street for people walking, biking, and driving. This is

borne out in the City's Vision Zero crash data, with MLK Jr. Blvd identified as a High Crash Corridor for both people walking and riding bicycles. Improving safety at key crossing locations for pedestrians on MLK Jr. Blvd is consistent with City and Bureau policy and is consistent with the approach PBOT has taken internally; another batch of similar crossing improvements are coming to MLK Jr. Blvd in summer 2019. The proposition of new and enhanced crossings at several key points along the street to improve safety and signal upgrades to improve accessibility was generated in part by the community and has been well-received by them. Some feel this project does not go far enough in the pursuit of safety and accessibility and would like to see the removal of the median in key places to improve access to businesses, the addition of parking to provide additional business access and insulate the pedestrian realm from moving traffic, as well as the addition of pedestrian-scale lighting and place-making elements to improve visibility and sense of place.

#### **Interagency Connections**

23. Are TriMet, SMART, or adjacent or overlapping jurisdictions (counties, cities) involved in and supportive of the project?

TriMet has been briefed on this project and is generally supportive. They will coordinate with PBOT on project design and construction if the project is funded. PBOT has agreed to include in project design and construction the costs associated with necessary transit stop improvements.

24. Is the project on or does it connect with a separate agency facility? Indicate all potentially involved agencies' awareness of and cooperation with the project. Potential agencies include Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) (Highway, Rail divisions and others as required), railroads, utilities, Bonneville Power Administration, or Port of Portland.

This project does not impact any other agency facilities.

25. Will utilities need to be relocated? Who owns the utilities and what is their level of awareness and support for the utility relocation?

Utilities in the City of Portland located within the right of way are subject to the franchise agreements which require the utility to move at their own expense on a timeline dictated by the project. The City of Portland has an established utility relocation process to notify utilities of relocation requirements. City owned utilities will be relocated during the utility phase through an agreement with the ODOT Utilities section.

26. Do you have design control consistently across the project area? If other agencies are affected by this project, do you have the necessary documentation of agreement regarding design elements reflected within this project? (Please obtain signatures as indicated on the Signature Page of this application.)

PBOT has design control over this project, as it is entirely within PBOT right-of-way and does not impact other agency facilities.

#### **PROJECT RISKS**

The following questions intend to identify potential risks to project completion.

27. Has a person(s) with the proper authority reviewed and agreed to the project design, and signed off on this application?  $\square$  Yes  $\square$  No

28. Are there any anticipated risks for the following:

a. Right of way (ROW)

i. Are ROW acquisition costs included in the cost estimate? Right of way costs are included.

ii. Were the federal Right of Way Uniform Act's acquisition and negotiation processes performed during the ROW acquisition stage or considered in the schedule and budget, for those projects which have not yet performed ROW acquisition? Yes.

b. Utility Relocation

i. Are utility relocation costs included in the cost estimate? Utility relocation costs for eligible utilities are included in the cost estimate.

c. Stormwater considerations

i. Water quantity Preliminary costs for stormwater disposal and treatment are included in the estimate.

ii. Water quality Preliminary costs for stormwater disposal and treatment are included in the estimate.

d. Environmental and Permitting

i. Have potential State environmental (SEPA)/ National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) impacts been identified? All projects are likely to meet the requirements for a Categorical Exclusion, documentation will be prepared during project design.

e. Schedule Applicant General Schedule: 22 Planning and PE 23 Right of way 24 Construction

f. Budget We have included large contingencies at several levels in the cost estimate.

g. Staff availability

i. Does the agency have sufficient and qualified staffing resources to lead, manage, and deliver the project? Please describe. The agency has a robust project management staff with extensive experience managing federally funded capital projects.

#### **PROJECT DESIGN**

Project designs will be scored on the level of safety and environmental improvements they can provide. A project that includes as many safety and environmental mitigation elements as feasible will more completely meet the criteria.

29. Describe the project elements and countermeasures that address safety.

Each element of this project is designed to improve safety. New enhanced crossings will improve pedestrian safety along the corridor. These enhanced crossings improve safety by heightening driver awareness that a pedestrian would like to cross the street or providing a red light condition so that drivers are required to stop to allow pedestrians to cross. The project would also include protected left turn phases for vehicles, separating a conflicting movement between vehicles and pedestrians. Today, the corridor at night is poorly lit in certain sections. Pedestrianscale lighting would not only help visibility for road users to see and safely navigate around one another when natural light conditions are poor, lighting would improve the sense of personal security along the street, creating a condition where people would feel more comfortable walking along the street at night.

30. What countermeasures are included that reduce conflicts between modes (vehicles, pedestrians, bicycles, railroad crossings) and improve safety? (Use Appendix C design checklist, check all that apply)

Enhanced crossings at the specified locations along the corridor help reduce conflict between vehicles and pedestrians/bikes by using a stop-controlled treatment. The proposed Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons give a red signal indication, requiring vehicles to stop at an intersection with a pedestrian crossing so that they may cross. In this situation, the conflict between vehicles and pedestrians is eliminated. Today, crossings at these locations do not meet City of Portland safety standards given the number of lanes and high volume of speed and traffic throughout much of the day. The project also includes protected signal phases for crossing pedestrians and left-turning vehicles at two intersections, Fremont St and Killingsworth St. By separating this conflicting movement between modes, this project is improving safety.

31. What specific project design elements are aimed at reducing environmental impacts (street trees, bioswales, etc.)? See question 48.

32. Are there additional design elements or countermeasures not on the checklist that are included in the project design that will improve safety and environmental outcomes?

Project includes upgrading signals with dedicated left turn phases for vehicles, which separates a conflicting movement between vehicles and pedestrians.

#### **PROJECT OUTCOMES**

Projects will be scored in terms of their ability to create positive outcomes that align with RFFA priorities and regional goals. The following questions aim to gather details directly related to those potential outcomes. Please provide all relevant data to support your response, using Metro-provided data or additional sources. Metro staff will provide data to the scoring committee to confirm

#### Affordability/Equity

- 33. Is the project in an Equity Focus Area? ⊠ Yes □ No Please indicate which Focus Area.People of Color and/or Limited English Proficiency
- 34. List the community places , affordable housing, and Title 1 schools within ¼ mile of project.

Irving Park, Albina Head Start, Grace City Portland church, Planned Parenthood NE Portland, Community Warehouse, Two Plum Park, Irvington Covenant Church, Providence Elder Place Irvington Village, Church of God in Christ, Allen Temple CME Church, Allen Temple Food Pantry, Powerhouse Temple Church, Mama Pauline's African Market, King School Park, Portland Farmers Market – King, Going Street Market, Martin Luther King, Jr. School, St. Andrew Legal Clinic, Blazers Boys and Girls Club, Portland Police Bureau: North Precinct, Multnomah County Health Department, Mallory Meadows City Park, Magnolia apartments, Allen-Fremont Plaza, Beech Street apartments, LifeWorks, Sabin affordable housing, Shaver Green apartments, McCoy Village apartments, Garfield Gardens, MLK Wygant apartments, Walnut Park apartments, Killingsworth Court, Unthank Plaza, Dawson Park apartments, Eliot Square townhomes, Maple Mallory apartments

35. What are the estimated totals of low-income, low-English proficiency, non-white, seniors and youth, and persons with disabilities who will benefit from this project?

a. Low-Income Population: 4,042 (PBOT Equity Matrix, nearby areas scoring 4 or 5 with annual household incomes < 54,000)

b. Households with Limited-English Proficiency: 139 (per PBOT Equity Matrix)

c. Non-White Population: 14,292 (2010 Percent Communities of Color Census Data, per the census blocks within 1 mile of the project area)

d. Senior Population: 6,466 ; Youth Population: 9939 (2017 ACS, per census blocks within 1 mile of the project area)

e. Persons with Disabilities: 8,338 (2017 ACS, per census tracts within 1 mile of the project area)

36. What are the barriers faced by these communities that the project addresses or overcomes, and how will these populations benefit from this project?

For people with low incomes, who are differently abled, are advanced in age, or children, transportation options are often more limited. Owning and operating a vehicle can be beyond the financial, physical, or legal ability of these populations. Additionally, recent research shows lower driver yielding rates for pedestrians of color showing intent to cross the street. This project will improve non-driving access and safety along MLK Jr. Blvd for these populations specifically, which are concentrated along MLK Jr. Blvd, by providing more frequent and safe opportunities to cross the street to access businesses and transit. To address the lower rates of drivers yielding to pedestrians of color, this project will use a higher level intensity of crossing treatment than exists today to encourage or require drivers to yield more readily. We have scoped the project to provide crossings in the area of highest concentrations of subsidized

affordable housing, and in several cases the crossings directly serve an affordable housing development, for example a recent building at Cook St and a building currently under construction at Highland St.

37. What contracting opportunities are available to Office for Business Inclusion and Diversity (COBID) firms through this project? What is your agency's policy, history, or removing of barriers to hire and advance COBID firms in infrastructure projects?

The City of Portland's Certification Agreement stipulates that all projects follow the requirements of the ODOT Office of Civil rights for federally funded projects.

Safety

38. How many fatal or serious injury crashes have occurred in the project area in the last 5 years (or most recent 5 years of available crash data)?

Fatal Crashes: 3. Injurious Crashes: 48. (Per ODOT 2012-2016 Crash Data)

39. How does the project aim to reduce the number of fatal or serious injury crashes?

This project aims to reduce the number of fatal and serious injury crashes by improving the visibility of pedestrians crossing MLK Jr. Blvd with lighting, by increasing driver yielding rates at the enhanced crossing locations, and by removing conflicts between drivers and pedestrians where drivers are permitted to take unprotected left turns at Fremont St and Killingsworth St.

40. How does the project remove or mitigate conflicts, with (including) active transportation, railroad crossings, turning movements, and others? (Use Appendix C design checklist, indicate all that apply)

This project will remove conflicts between drivers and pedestrians at two major intersections by separating the vehicle left turn phase from the pedestrian walk phase parallel to the street from which vehicles are turning left from. The project also upgrades crossings with shorter crossing distance, median refuges, high-visibility marked crosswalks, and pedestrian hybrid beacons.

#### System Completion

41. What network gap(s) will be completed by this project? How will system connectivity or network deficiencies be improved?

PedPDX, Portland's Citywide Pedestrian Master Plan identified many crossings on MLK Jr. Blvd potentially deficient; given the context of four lanes, high speeds, and high volumes, MLK Jr. Blvd's crossings should be active (something of a higher intensity than a marked and signed crosswalk). The City of Portland's 2016 Vision Zero report and action plan identified MLK Jr. Blvd as a high crash corridor for pedestrians and bikes. This project will address both deficiencies and improve connectivity by removing conflict points between people walking and driving at two major intersections and upgrading some of the deficient crossings on MLK Jr. Blvd that were identified through the PedPDX process.

42. How will access to active transportation be improved? What specific barriers in addition to the network gaps identified above will the project eliminate?

This project will improve access to active transportation by creating a safer pedestrian and bicycle network. Today, unsafe crossings of this fast arterial make MLK Jr. Blvd a significant barrier for people walking and biking along and across the street. Additional barriers to walking include poor lighting conditions at night and early in the morning. Additional pedestrian-scale lighting will help people feel safer and more secure walking around at night and early in the morning.

Multimodal Travel, Mode Share, and Congestion

43. How will the project reduce transit delay and improve transit reliability?

Providing protected left turns at Killingsworth St and Fremont St & MLK Jr. Blvd will keep the queue for left turns shorter, which today backs up into the through traffic, delaying transit and general traffic trying to get through the intersection. Additionally, the signal upgrades and new detection at those locations will enable those intersections to function with the latest regional transit signal priority systems.

44. How does the project improve connections to transit and employment or residential sites/areas?

The crossing locations were selected based on their proximity to transit stops, affordable housing, and retirement homes. It is these locations that will see the largest increase in safety and accessibility along and across the corridor.

45. How will the project reduce vehicle trips or VMT (other than freight-related trips)?

This project will reduce vehicle trips by providing more attractive alternatives to driving. The project will improve alternatives to driving by making it safer and more convenient to walk and bike across MLK Jr. Blvd as well as to access transit to downtown.

46. How does the project reduce the need for throughway expansion?

This project will reduce the need for throughway expansion by providing more attractive alternatives to driving along the I-5 mobility corridor. Namely, this project will improve safety conditions for people walking and biking, specifically those looking to cross MLK Jr. Blvd. MLK Jr. Blvd is a significant barrier to cross for bicyclists, so improving some of the Neighborhood Greenway crossing of MLK Jr. Blvd will go a long way toward making bicycling a safer and more attractive option for people. It will also make the Line 6 bus a more attractive option by providing more safe crossings to bus stops.

Climate Change and Environmental Impact

47. Describe the measures included to specifically mitigate the project's greenhouse gas emissions and environmental impact.

PBOT endeavors to limit and mitigate the environmental impact of all our projects. Measures we take include erosion control plans, control of discharge, responsible excess materials disposal,

limited footprint of construction staging, powering down vehicles and equipment when not in use, use of warm mix instead of hot mix, compliance with forestry requirements, traffic control plans to reduce air quality impact from congestion, enforcement of permit requirements, dust control, noise prohibitions, and electronic submittals and payment processing of contractor submittals. This project will also reduce greenhouse gas emissions by giving people more options to travel by walking, biking, or public transit, rather than driving for all trips.

48. What specific project design elements are aimed at reducing environmental impacts (street trees, bioswales, etc.)?

Street trees are included in the project to conform to the Portland Tree Code, or in some cases where trees are infeasible the City may pay a fee to plant trees in other areas. Bioswales are included to manage stormwater in cases where the Bureau of Environment Services finds that they would provide a clear benefit to the stormwater system.

#### Freight Related Impact

49. How does the project address freight travel time reliability and reoccurring or nonrecurring congestion affecting freight goods movement?

This project does not significantly address freight travel time reliability or nonrecurring congestion. That said, the pedestrian hybrid beacons will be able to be coordinated with the rest of the traffic signal system, ensuring good traffic flow even with the additional beacons.

50. Is this project on a "Reduction Review Route" (defined and stipulated by statute; OAR 731-012 and ORS 366.215) and to what extent has coordination occurred with the freight industry?

Not on a Reduction Review Route, per ODOT TransGIS. The Portland Freight Committee has been briefed on all RFFA grant applications.

51. If there is freight delay along the corridor, when does this delay occur, to what extent is there delay, and how does this project address that delay?

This project is not intended to address freight transportation delay. The City of Portland classifies MLK Jr. Blvd as a major truck street, which is intended to provide truck mobility within a Transportation District and access to commercial and employment uses along the corridor, but not specifically to hasten freight movement through the corridor. General traffic delay occurs during weekday peak commuting hours (7-9AM and 4-6PM), especially approaching the intersection of MLK Jr. Blvd and Fremont St. At its worst, queuing/stop and go traffic can back up from Fremont to NE Tillamook St, about 2/3 miles.

#### Employment/Economic Development

52. Describe the employment area(s) served by this project. What is the number of current and projected jobs in traded sectors?

This project serves the Eliot, Irvington, King, Alberta, Vernon, and Sabin neighborhoods in North and Northeast Portland. Transit service on Line 6, 24, and 72 ultimately serves multiple employment areas including Swan Island, 82<sup>nd</sup> Ave, NW Portland, and the Central City.

Area Jobs in Target Industries:

- Athletic & Outdoor Jobs: 101
- Clean Tech Jobs: 131
- Computer & Electronics Jobs: 1
- Health Science & Technology Jobs: 0
- Metals & Machinery Jobs: 40
- Software & Media Jobs: 77
- Total: 350

53. Describe how the project supports and catalyzes low-carbon and resource efficient economic sectors. This project supports 131 Clean Tech jobs.

#### **Project Leverage**

54. How does this project leverage other funding sources?

This project leverages local funding sources include system development charges and/or general transportation revenue to provide the local match.

55. Will the receipt of RFFA funding position the region to take advantage of federal and state funding opportunities as they arise? If so, explain.

Yes, in the case that RFFA funds are used for project development, this funding will advance these projects to the point where they would be more competitive for state and federal funding opportunities.

56. Will this help advance any Transportation Systems Management and Operations (TSMO) goals and strategies?

This project will increase the efficiency of the traffic signal system by installing Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons in several locations, which can be coordinated with the existing signal system, leading to a signal progression that produces smoother traffic flow while providing safer crossings for pedestrians. Additionally, the two signalized intersections receiving upgrades will have the latest software and hardware that is compatible with regional transit signal priority systems.

57. Is this project on the Regional Emergency Transportation Network? Will this project help improve resiliency of the transportation network? If so, describe how.

Yes, this project is on the Regional Emergency Transportation Network. To the extent that active transportation modes are the most resilient ways to get around (they are the least infrastructure- and fossil fuel-dependent/intensive (both of which will likely be scarce in an emergency which tests the transportation network's resiliency) and to the extent that the improvements in this project will help others feel more comfortable walking and biking on a regular basis, this project will increase the resiliency of the transportation network by helping

community members become less reliant on driving and its attendant infrastructure and fuel needs.

#### PROJECT COST ESTIMATE

58. What is the source of the project cost estimate?

□ Conceptual: These cost estimates are used where a significant need has been identified but a detailed project scope has not been developed. These cost estimates have the potential to change significantly as the project scope becomes more defined.

☑ Planning level: These cost estimates are based on a generally defined scope. Cost estimates are usually based on limited field-work and general cost assumptions. No actual design work has been done prior to the development of these cost estimates. The cost estimate could still change significantly as design work begins, but the estimate is more reliable than the conceptual estimates. (e.g., comprehensive plan, TSP, Metro cost estimate worksheet, corridor plan).

□ Engineering level: These cost estimates are based on actual preliminary design work. If done for all facets of the project and there are no further additions to the project scope, these estimates should represent a fairly accurate cost for the project. (e.g. detailed planning report, preliminary engineering, final design, NEPA documentation, etc.)

59. During what project development stage (refer to page 9 of the RFFA application guidebook) was the cost estimate created?

□ Planning

☑ Alternatives Identification and Evaluation

□ Preliminary Design

□ Final Design

60. What year was the cost estimate created? Does it include any escalation factors and to what year?

The cost estimate was created in 2019 and is signed by a senior civil engineer. The estimate includes five years of construction and personnel escalation, and large contingencies for unexpected increases in costs.

61. To what extent were the following considered during cost estimating? All impacts are included in estimate if necessary at a planning level.

a. Right of way (ROW) Included

- b. Utility relocation or underground Only included for city owned utilities
- c. Stormwater considerations included
- d. Environmental mitigation strategies included if necessary
- e. Bridge, railroad, or major facility impacts included if necessary

- f. Retaining walls included if necessary, planning level
- g. Clearing and grading included as lump sum percentage
- h. Removal of current pavement or facilities included using preliminary quantities
- i. Signing and pavement markings included using preliminary quantities
- j. Sidewalk and street furniture Included using preliminary quantities
- k. Street trees, landscaping, irrigation Included using preliminary quantities
- I. Mobilization, staging, and traffic control Including using lump sum.
- m. Staff availability or need for outside services included
- 62. Please attach your cost estimate. Verify that it includes the following items:
  - a. Unit cost assumptions See attached.
  - b. Contingency assumptions. See attached.

#### SIGNATURE PAGE

All relevant applicant agency and other agency staff with authority must attest to the design and cost estimates of the project, and that proper coordination and cooperation exists between all parties. Please attach additional signature pages as warranted.

Applicant agency staff signature	res:	
Project manager	Obji	
Engineering	Cea B. Hustrenjer	
Right of Way	UaB. Durtsenjer	
Environmental	Tea /5. Deenseyer	
Other agency signatures (as re	quired):	
ODOT Highway		
ODOT Rail		
TriMet	Kerry Ayros - Palanuk, Director, Plann	ing & Polic
SMART		. U
Utilities		
Railroads		
Other (please indicate)		

# NE MLK Jr Blvd Safety & Access to Transit

# **Project context and background**

NE MLK Jr Blvd already has one of Portland's highest concentrations of affordable housing, and a great deal more is in the pipeline. As more and more people live on this corridor, pedestrian and commercial activity is increasing, which leads to conflicts with the high volumes of high speed traffic on this major thoroughfare.

The PBOT Safe Routes to School Plan also identified several crossing needs along the corridor. This project will focus on providing enhanced pedestrian crossings at regular spacing along MLK Jr Blvd to ensure safety and access to transit.

NE Martin Luther King Jr Blvd is a major destination and business hub for Black Portlanders. This project would not only seek to direct investments in crossing and transit amenities, but would also include streetscape improvements such as pedestrian scale lighting and a community-driven process to further develop the corridor's identity to celebrate NE MLK Jr Blvd as a vibrant business district.

# **Project details**



EXISTING OR FUTURE BIKEWAY CONNECTION

#### Project Cost Estimate: \$4,723,000

Local Match: \$600,000; RFFA Grant Request: \$4,123,000

#### FOR MORE INFORMATION

#### **Shane Valle**

Portland Bureau of Transportation - Transportation Planner shane.valle@portlandoregon.gov | 503.823.7736



FREMONT

соок

Active/Enhanced Crossing

杰

ROSA PARKS

HIGHLAND

HOLMAN

AINSWORTH

IARRETT

(₽

Å

(₿

2

B

ASHLEY

SIMPSON

NE MLK JR BLVD | SAFETY & ACCESS TO TRANSIT UPDATED: JUNE 14 2019

# **Project Estimate Report: Development Phase**

for

# **NE MLK Safety and Access to Transit**

#### 6/5/2019

Requested by: Zef Wagner

Prepared by: Kaitlin Littleford

Location: NE MLK Blvd at NE Highland St, NE Killingsworth St, NE Emerson St, NE

Mason St, NE Failing St, NE Beech St, NE Fremont St, and NE Cook St

**Description:** Crossing improvements including new and/or extended median islands, pedestrian ramps, and pedestrian hybrid beacons at NE Highland, NE Mason, NE Failing, and NE Cook Streets. Signal modification at NE Killingsworth and NE Fremont Streets.

#### Issues:

- Water none identified
- BES (storm, sanitary, water-quality facilities) Move inlet at NW corner Fremont and NE corner Killingsworth
- Signals and Street Lighting Four pedestrian hybrid beacons, two signal modifications, street lighting improvements at Emerson
- Environmental and Zoning None identified
- Contaminated Media None identified
- Right-of-Way Needs Temporary construction easements
- Railroads (BNSF; UPRR; PTTR) None identified
- Parks (landscaping and irrigation) None identified
- Other Jurisdictions (counties, schools, Port, ODOT, Tri-Met) Tri-Met bus stops

#### Cost Estimate:

Total Construction	\$ 1,906,000
Project Management (5%)	\$ 83,000
Design Engineering (25%)	\$ 414,000
Construction Management (15%)	\$ 248,000
Right-of-Way (Cost + 20% Contingency)	\$ 87,000
Overhead (80.85%)	\$ 603,000
Total Project Contingency	\$ 1,382,000

Total Project Estimate: \$4,723,000

#### **Estimating Assumptions:**

- Assumed all new ramps/sidewalks constructed as monolithic curb/gutter/sidewalk with 2 ft gutter pan
- Assumed excavation depths:
  - Existing sidewalk: 4" concrete + 2" aggregate base = 6"
  - Existing curb: 13.25"
  - Proposed gutter: 7"
  - Existing landscaping: 6" (soil approximately level with top of curb)
- Assumed temporary construction easement areas encompase 3 feet behind the property line, or 3 feet behind the work if the work is projected to be behind the property line.
- Assumed that sidewalk, curb, gutter, and AC repair would include the width of the driveway adjacent to the corner, at SE corner of MLK and Highland.
- Assumed no work at NW corner of MLK and Emerson, because the ramps there are compliant.
- Assumed reconstruction of entire NE corner of MLK and Mason due to too large of grade difference
- Assumed no work at NW corner of MLK and Mason as its reconstruction is shown in the permit plans for permit 2016-212618-000-00-CO, currently under construction.
- Assumed minor adjustment of manhole at SW corner of MLK and Mason.
- All quantities/estimate numbers for Beech taken from completed estimate, project T00613.
- Assumed all ramps would be reconstructed along with signal modification at Fremont.
- Assumed reconstructed of non-compliant NW and SW corners at Cook.
- Temporary Traffic Control items estimated in part by Wendy Cawley and Sabrina Kao.
- Signals and Street Lighting items estimated by Stefan Bussey.
- The years of inflation for this project is 5 years.
- The estimate contingency is 20%.
- The level of confidence for this estimate is low.

#### **Review & Approval:**

 June 6, 2019

 Reviewed by Engineer of Record
 Date

 Stur Tame
 June 6, 2019

 Reviewed and Approved by Engineering Services Division Manager
 Date

#### Attachments:

eby

- Detailed estimate spreadsheet
- Site map

#### CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION PRELIMINARY ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE FOR PROJECTS GRATER THAN \$1M \* Date: 6/5/2019

By: Kaitlin Littleford

PRELIMINARY ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF NE MARTIN LUTHER KING BLVD AT NE EMERSON, NE WYGANT, NE MASON, NE BEECH, AND NE COOK STREETS

VALUES IN BLUE ARE PERCENT OF CONTRACT.

#### ###### BID ITEMS ######

NO.	ITEMS OF WORK AND MATERIALS	SPEC REFERENCE	UNIT	TOTAL QUANTITY	l	JNIT PRICE	TOTAL AMOUNT
1	MOBILIZATION	0210	LS	1.00	\$	137,210.72	\$ 137,210.72
2	TEMPORARY PROTECTION & DIRECTION OF TRAFFIC	0225	LS	1.00	\$	41,163.22	\$ 41,163.22
3	TEMPORARY SIGNS	0225	SQFT	384.00	\$	22.25	\$ 8,542.08
4	TEMPORARY BARRICADES, TYPE II	0225	EACH	36.00	\$	100.00	\$ 3,600.00
5	TEMPORARY BARRICADES, TYPE III	0225	EACH	2.00	\$	150.00	\$ 300.00
6	TEMPORARY CONCRETE BARRIER, REFLECTORIZED	0225	FOOT	0.00	\$	24.00	\$ -
7	MOVING TEMPORARY CONCRETE BARRIER	0225	FOOT	0.00	\$	8.00	\$ -
8	TEMPORARY IMPACT ATTENUATOR	0225	EACH	0.00	\$	1,500.00	\$ -
9	TEMPORARY PEDESTRIAN CHANNELIZING DEVICES	0225	FOOT	875.00	\$	23.00	\$ 20,125.00
10	TEMPORARY PEDESTRIAN RAMPS, AC	0225	EACH	55.00	\$	400.00	\$ 22,000.00
11	TEMPORARY PLASTIC DRUMS	0225	EACH	204.00	\$	52.00	\$ 10,608.00
12	TEMPORARY REFLECTIVE PAVEMENT MARKERS	0225	EACH	0.00	\$	5.20	\$ -
13	TEMPORARY FLEXIBLE PAVEMENT MARKERS	0225	EACH	0.00	\$	4.30	\$ -
14	TEMPORARY STRIPING	0225	FOOT	0.00	\$	1.20	\$ -
15	STRIPE REMOVAL	0225	FOOT	0.00	\$	0.85	\$ -
16	STRIPING & STRIPE REMOVAL MOBILIZATION	0225	EACH	0.00	\$	1,020.00	\$ -
17	TEMPORARY TRAFFIC SIGNAL INSTALLATION	0225	EACH	0.00	\$	68,000.00	\$ -
18	SEQUENTIAL ARROW SIGNS	0225	EACH	4.00	\$	3,000.00	\$ 12,000.00
19	PORTABLE CHANGEABLE MESSAGE SIGNS	0225	EACH	2.00	\$	7,630.00	\$ 15,260.00
20	FLAGGERS	0225	HOUR	300.00	\$	52.50	\$ 15,750.00
21	TRAFFIC CONTROL SUPERVISOR	0225	DAY	80.00	\$	400.00	\$ 32,000.00
22	TEMPORARY TYPE ORANGE PLASTIC MESH FENCE	0270	FOOT	0.00	\$	3.60	\$ -
23	TEMPORARY CL-6R CHAIN LINK FENCE	0270	FOOT	0.00	\$	22.10	\$ -
24	EROSION CONTROL	0280	LS	1.00	\$	13,721.07	\$ 13,721.07
25	PLASTIC SHEETING	0280	SQFT	0.00	\$	0.20	\$ -
26	MATTING	0280	SQFT	0.00	\$	0.80	\$ -
27	CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCES	0280	EACH	0.00	\$	2,460.00	\$ -
28	SEDIMENT FENCE, SUPPORTED	0280	FOOT	0.00	\$	4.20	\$ -
29	SEDIMENT FENCE, UNSUPPORTED	0280	FOOT	0.00	\$	4.10	\$ -
30	INLET PROTECTION	0280	EACH	0.00	\$	118.00	\$ -
31	POLLUTION CONTROL PLAN	0290	LS	1.00	\$	1,372.11	\$ 1,372.11
32	CONTAMINATED MEDIA DISPOSAL	0291	CUYD	0.00	\$	262.00	\$ -
33	TRUCK LINERS	0291	EACH	0.00	\$	470.00	\$ -
34	HASP/CMDP WORKPLANS	0291	LS	0.00	\$	1,000.00	\$ -
35	CONSTRUCTION SURVEY WORK	0305	LS	1.00	\$	-	\$ -
36	REMOVAL OF PIPES	0310	FOOT	0.00	\$	25.30	\$ -
37	REMOVAL OF CURBS	0310	FOOT	0.00	\$	25.30	\$ -

NO.	ITEMS OF WORK AND MATERIALS	SPEC REFERENCE	UNIT	TOTAL QUANTITY	UNIT PRICE	TOTAL AMOUNT
38	REMOVAL OF WALKS AND DRIVEWAYS	0310	SQYD	0.00	\$ 13.90	\$-
39	REMOVAL OF SURFACINGS	0310	SQYD	0.00	\$ 8.20	\$-
40	REMOVAL OF INLETS	0310	EACH	0.00	\$ 310.00	\$ -
41	REMOVAL OF MANHOLES	0310	EACH	0.00	\$ 1,050.00	\$ -
42	REMOVAL OF RAILROAD TRACK AND TIES	0310	FOOT	0.00	\$ 76.50	\$ -
43	SALVAGING AND STOCKPILING OF COBBLESTONES	0310	SQYD	0.00	\$ 20.90	\$ -
44	REMOVE AND REINSTALL HORSE RINGS	0310	EACH	0.00	\$ 227.00	\$ -
45	REMOVAL OF STRUCTURES & OBSTRUCTIONS	0310	LS	1.00	<b>\$ 54,884.29</b>	\$ 54,884.29
46	REMOVAL OF FENCES	0310	FOOT	0.00	\$ 6.00	\$ -
47	CLEARING AND GRUBBING	0320	LS	1.00	\$ 35,674.79	\$ 35,674.79
48	TREE ROOT REMOVAL	0320	HOUR	8.00	\$ 330.00	\$ 2,640.00
49	TREE TRIMMING	0320	HOUR	0.00	\$ 152.00	\$ -
50	DITCH EXCAVATION	0330	CUYD	0.00	\$ 60.00	\$ -
51	GENERAL EXCAVATION	0330	CUYD	230.43	\$ 50.00	\$ 11,521.42
52	SURCHARGE EXCAVATION	0330	CUYD	0.00	\$ 3.80	\$ -
53	EMBANKMENT IN PLACE	0330	CUYD	0.00	\$ 24.00	\$ -
54	SETTLEMENT PLATE	0330	EACH	0.00	\$ 772.00	\$ -
55	12 INCH SUBGRADE STABILIZATION	0331	SQYD	11.10	\$ 45.55	\$ 505.61
56	AGGREGATE DITCH LINING	0333	SQYD	0.00	\$ 38.40	\$ -
57	WATERING	0340	MGAL	0.00	\$ 26.20	\$ -
58	DRAINAGE GEOTEXTILE, TYPE 2	0350	SQYD	0.00	\$ 2.10	\$ -
59	EMBANKMENT GEOTEXTILE	0350	SQYD	0.00	\$ 1.50	\$ -
60	SUBGRADE GEOTEXTILE	0350	SQYD	111.00	\$ 1.30	\$ 144.30
80	8 INCH PIPE, PVC ASTM D3034 SDR35, BEDDING TYPE: D	0445	FOOT	50.00	\$ 90.00	\$ 4,500.00
102	CONCRETE INLETS, TYPE G-2	0470	EACH	2.00	\$ 2,366.00	\$ 4,732.00
115	ADJUSTING INLETS	0490	EACH	9.00	\$ 837.00	\$ 7,533.00
116	FILLING ABANDON STRUCTURES	0490	EACH	0.00	\$ 2,400.00	\$ -
117	MINOR ADJUSTMENT OF MANHOLES	0490	EACH	1.00	\$ 1,130.00	\$ 1,130.00
118	MAJOR ADJUSTMENT OF MANHOLES	0490	EACH	0.00	\$ 2,033.00	\$ -
119	MANHOLES OVER EXISTING SEWERS	0490	EACH	0.00	\$ 4,200.00	\$ -
159	17 INCH ASPHALT CONCRETE PAVEMENT REPAIR	0748	SQYD	964.66	\$ 124.30	\$ 119,907.65
160	EXTRA FOR ASPHALT APPROACHES	0749	EACH	0.00	\$ 732.00	\$ -
161	ASPHALT CONNECTIONS	0749	SQFT	0.00	\$ 7.70	\$ -
162	ASPHALT SPEED BUMPS	0749	EACH	0.00	\$ 1,800.00	\$ -
163	PLAIN CONCRETE PAVEMENT, UNDOWELLED, 6 INCHES THICK	0756	SQYD	0.00	\$ 64.70	\$ -
164	PLAIN CONCRETE PAVEMENT, UNDOWELLED, 8 INCHES THICK	0756	SQYD	0.00	\$ 66.40	\$ -
165	PLAIN CONCRETE PAVEMENT, UNDOWELLED, 10 INCHES THICK	0756	SQYD	0.00	\$ 68.10	\$ -
166	PLAIN CONCRETE PAVEMENT, UNDOWELLED, 12 INCHES THICK	0756	SQYD	0.00	\$ 70.00	\$ -
167	PLAIN PERVIOUS CONCRETE PAVEMENT, UNDOWELLED, 10 INCHES THICK	0757	SQYD	0.00	\$ 73.00	\$-
168	CONCRETE CURBS, CURB AND GUTTER	0759	FOOT	0.00	\$ 51.05	\$ -
169	CONCRETE CURBS, STANDARD CURB	0759	FOOT	0.00	\$ 37.25	\$ -
170	CONCRETE CURB, MOUNTABLE CURB	0759	FOOT	0.00	\$ 37.25	\$ -
171	CONCRETE CURBS, THICKENED CURB AND GUTTER	0759	FOOT	0.00	\$ 65.00	\$ -
172	CONCRETE ISLANDS	0759	SQFT	2,415.39	\$ 25.95	\$ 62,679.37
173	CONCRETE DRIVEWAYS	0759	SQFT	0.00	\$ 17.00	\$ -

NO.	ITEMS OF WORK AND MATERIALS	SPEC REFERENCE	UNIT	TOTAL QUANTITY	UNIT PRICE	TOTAL AMOUNT
174	CONCRETE DRIVEWAYS, REINFORCED	0759	SQFT	0.00	\$ 17.30	\$ -
175	CONCRETE WALKS	0759	SQFT	0.00	\$ 11.77	\$ -
176	MONOLITHIC CURB AND SIDEWALKS	0759	SQFT	0.00	\$ 19.75	\$ -
177	MONOLITHIC CURB GUTTER AND SIDEWALKS	0759	SQFT	10,873.61	\$ 19.75	\$ 214,753.80
200	IMPACT ATTENUATORS, TYPE B	0830	EACH	0.00	\$ 4,780.00	\$ -
201	IMPACT ATTENUATORS, TYPE E	0830	EACH	0.00	\$ 16,000.00	\$ -
202	DELINEATORS TYPE 2	0840	EACH	0.00	\$ 68.80	\$ -
203	DELINEATORS TYPE 4	0840	EACH	0.00	\$ 29.30	\$ -
204	PAVEMENT LINE REMOVAL	0851	FOOT	1,100.00	\$ 0.73	\$ 803.00
205	PAVEMENT LEGEND REMOVAL	0851	EACH	0.00	\$ 84.00	\$ -
206	PAVEMENT BAR REMOVAL	0851	SQFT	1,224.00	\$ 3.00	\$ 3,672.00
207	BI-DIRECTIONAL YELLOW TYPE I MARKERS	0855	EACH	0.00	\$ 6.70	\$ -
208	MONO-DIRECTIONAL WHITE TYPE I MARKERS	0855	EACH	0.00	\$ 5.65	\$ -
209	SURFACE MOUNTED TUBULAR MARKERS	0856	EACH	11.00	\$ 85.00	\$ 935.00
210	LONGITUDINAL PAVEMENT MARKING - PAINT	0860	FOOT	0.00	\$ 0.46	\$ -
211	CURB MARKINGS - PAINT	0861	FOOT	42.00	\$ 4.00	\$ 168.00
212	THERMOPLASTIC, NON-PROFILE, 120 MILS, EXTRUDED	0865	FOOT	1,290.00	\$ 1.40	\$ 1,806.00
213	PAVEMENT LEGEND, TYPE B: ARROWS	0867	EACH	0.00	\$ 260.00	\$ -
214	PAVEMENT LEGEND, TYPE B: "ONLY"	0867	EACH	0.00	\$ 332.00	\$ -
215	PAVEMENT LEGEND, TYPE B: BICYCLE LANE SYMBOLS	0867	EACH	0.00	\$ 354.00	\$ -
216	PAVEMENT LEGEND, TYPE B-HS: ARROWS	0867	EACH	0.00	\$ 299.00	\$ -
217	PAVEMENT LEGEND, TYPE B-HS: BICYCLE LANE STENCIL	0867	EACH	2.00	\$ 277.00	\$ 554.00
218	PAVEMENT BAR , TYP B-HS	0867	SQFT	1,320.00	\$ 8.90	\$ 11,748.00
219	PAVEMENT BAR, TYPE A	0867	SQFT	0.00	\$ 4.80	\$ -
220	PAVEMENT BAR, TYPE B	0867	SQFT	0.00	\$ 8.80	\$ -
221	REMOVE EXISTING SIGNS	0905	LS*	0.00	\$ 41.70	\$ -
222	REMOVE & REINSTALL EXISTING SIGNS	0905	LS*	0.00	\$ 167.00	\$ -
223	SIGN SUPPORT FOOTINGS, BREAKAWAY	0920	LS*	0.00	\$ 182.00	\$ -
224	SIGNAL POLE MOUNTS	0930	LS*	0.00	\$ 570.00	\$ -
225	PIPE SIGN SUPPORTS	0930	LS*	0.00	\$ 180.00	\$ -
226	BICYCLE RACK SIGN SUPPORTS	0930	EACH	0.00	\$ 200.00	\$ -
227	SURFACE MOUNTED FLEXIBLE POST SIGN SUPPORTS	0932	EACH	0.00	\$ 100.00	\$ -
228	TYPE "B" SIGNS IN PLACE	0940	SQFT	0.00	\$ 18.60	\$ -
229	TYPE "B1" SIGNS IN PLACE	0940	SQFT	0.00	\$ 23.20	\$ -
230	TYPE "C" SIGNS IN PLACE	0940	SQFT	0.00	\$ 19.80	\$ -
231	TYPE "G" SIGNS IN PLACE	0940	SQFT	0.00	\$ 35.70	\$ -
232	TYPE "G1" SIGNS IN PLACE	0940	SQFT	0.00	\$ 36.10	\$ -
233	TYPE "G5" SIGNS IN PLACE	0940	SQFT	0.00	\$ 33.00	\$ -
234	TYPE "R" SIGNS IN PLACE	0940	SQFT	0.00	\$ 20.50	\$ -
235	TYPE "R1" SIGNS IN PLACE	0940	SQFT	0.00	\$ 18.10	\$ -
236	TYPE "W1" SIGNS IN PLACE	0940	SQFT	41.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 820.00
237	TYPE "W2" SIGNS IN PLACE	0940	SQFT	0.00	\$ 20.60	\$ -
238	TYPE "W4" SIGNS IN PLACE	0940	SQFT	0.00	\$ 25.00	\$ -
239	TYPE "W6" SIGNS IN PLACE	0940	SQFT	0.00	\$ 15.00	\$ -
240	TYPE "W11" SIGNS IN PLACE	0940	SQFT	120.00	\$ 20.60	\$ 2,472.00

NO.	ITEMS OF WORK AND MATERIALS	SPEC REFERENCE	UNIT	TOTAL QUANTITY	UNIT PRICE		TOTAL AMOUNT
241	TYPE "W12" SIGNS IN PLACE	0940	SQFT	21.00	\$ 26.00	\$	546.00
242	TYPE "Y1 "SIGNS IN PLACE	0940	SQFT	210.00	\$ 13.10	\$	2,751.00
243	TYPE "Y2" SIGNS IN PLACE	0940	SQFT	0.00	\$ 14.60	\$	-
244	REMOVAL OF ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS (lighting)	0950	LS*	0.00	\$ 500.00	\$	-
245	REMOVAL OF ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS (traffic signals)	0950	LS*	0.00	\$ 2,400.00	\$	-
246	POLE FOUNDATIONS	0970	LS*	0.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$	-
247 248 249	STREET LIGHTING (Emerson)	0970	LS*	1.00	\$ 39,000.00	\$	39,000.00
250	SWITCHING, CONDUIT AND WIRING	0970	LS*	0.00	\$ 15,000.00	\$	-
251	TRAFFIC SIGNAL INSTALLATION (Highland Ped Hybrid Beacon)	0990	LS*	1.00	\$ 157,400.00	\$	157,400.00
	TRAFFIC SIGNAL INSTALLATION (Mason Ped Hybrid Beacon)	0990	LS*	1.00	\$ 154,500.00	\$	154,500.00
	TRAFFIC SIGNAL INSTALLATION (Failing Ped Hybrid Beacon)	0990	LS*	1.00	\$ 146,700.00	\$	146,700.00
	TRAFFIC SIGNAL INSTALLATION (Cook Ped Hybrid Beacon)	0990	LS*	1.00	\$ 140,500.00	\$	140,500.00
252	TRAFFIC SIGNAL MODIFICATION (Killingsworth)	0990	LS*	1.00	\$ 82,500.00	\$	82,500.00
	TRAFFIC SIGNAL MODIFICATION (Fremont)	0990	LS*	1.00	\$ 55,000.00	\$	55,000.00
TOTAL BID ITEMS							1,656,133.43

#### ###### ANTICIPATED ITEMS #######

NO.	ITEMS OF WORK AND MATERIALS	REFERENCE	UNIT	QUANTITY	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT
1	RIGHT OF WAY MONUMENTATION		LS	0.00	\$-	\$ -
2	RELOCATE WATER FACILITIES - FIRE HYDRANT		EACH	0.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ -
3	RELOCATE WATER FACILITIES - METER		EACH	0.00	\$ 6,000.00	\$ -
4	STREET LIGHTING - UPGRADE LUMINAIRES		EACH	0.00	\$ 600.00	\$ -
5	STREET LIGHTING - INSTALL ARMS AND LUMINAIRES		EACH	0.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -
6	CONNECT CONTRACTOR INSTALLED TRAFFIC SIGNAL LOOPS TO CONTROLLER BY MO		EACH	0.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
7	PLANT TREES AND ESTABLISHMENT BY OTHERS		EACH	0.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -
8	STORMWATER PLANTINGS AND PLANT ESTABLISHMENT		SQFT	0.00	\$ 20.00	\$ -
9	STORMWATER OFFSITE MANAGEMENT FEE		SQFT	0.00	\$ 3.70	\$ -
10	ROCK EXCAVATION		CUYD	0.00	\$ 106.00	\$ -
11	RAILROAD PROTECTION SERVICES (ONE YEAR)		LS	0.00	\$ 100,000.00	\$ -
12	ASPHALT CEMENT ESCALATION		LS	1.00	\$ -	\$ -
13	FUEL ESCALATION		LS	1.00	\$ -	\$ -
14	TESTING CONTAMINATED MEDIA		LS	0.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -
15	BOLI FEE PAYMENT		LS	1.00	\$ 1,656.13	\$ 1,656.13
16	CONTRACT CONTINGENCY (REQUIREMENT TO ACCEPT BIDS UP TO 10% OVER ESTIMATE)		LS	1.00	\$ 165,613.34	\$ 165,613.34

#### TOTAL ANTICIPATED ITEMS

#### SCHEDULE SUMMARY

BID ITEMS

#### CONSTRUCTION CONTINGENCY

\$

\$

5% of Bid Items\*

\$ 167,269.48

1,656,133

82,807

		1				_	
NO.	ITEMS OF WORK AND MATERIALS	SPEC REFERENCE	UNIT	TOTAL QUANTITY	UNIT PRICE		TOTAL AMOUNT
SUB	TOTAL					\$	1,738,940
ANT	CIPATED ITEMS					\$	167 269
						<u> </u>	,
тот	AL CONSTRUCTION					\$	1,906,210
PRO	JECT MANAGEMENT			5% of	Bid Items	\$	82,807
DES	GN ENGINEERING			25% of	Bid Items	\$	414,033
CON	STRUCTION MANAGEMENT			15% of	Bid Items	\$	248,420
SUB	TOTAL					\$	745,260
PRO	JECT ENGINEERING & MANAGEMENT OVERHEAD			80.85% of	PM, Eng, and CM	\$	602,542
тот	AL PROJECT ENGINEERING & MANAGEMENT					\$	1,347,802
RIGH	IT-OF-WAY LAND, IMPROVEMENTS, AND DAMAGES					\$	15,980
RIGH	IT-OF-WAY APPRAISAL, TITLE INSURANCE, AND NEGOTIATION					\$	66,000
RIGH	IT-OF-WAY CONTINGENCY			30% D	Land, Improve, and amages	\$	4,794
тот	AL PROJECT RIGHT-OF-WAY					\$	86,774
			Years	Inflation			
INFL	ATION RATE ON CONTRACT		5	<b>4.5%</b> of	Construction	\$	469,274
INFL	ATION RATE ON PERSONNEL		5	2.0% of	Eng & Mgmt	\$	140,280
EST	MATE CONTINGENCY FOR UNDEFINED OR CHANGE IN SCOPE			20% of In	Const, Eng & Mgmt, and flation	d \$	772,713
тот	AL PROJECT CONTINGENCY					\$	1,382,267
TO1	AL PROJECT ESTIMATE					\$	4,723,053
LS*	Unit Price shown is: Pound, Each, or Foot Basis as applicable						
	Remove * and change unit to 1 in the Bid Form						
	Use 3.5% Construction Contingency for Federal-Aid Projects						
	Blue numbers, % may be changed by Engineer with EOR concurrence.						
	76.76% overhead rate is for the 18/19 fiscal years and applies to all projects, regard	ess of funding s	ource				
	(i.e. federal, I/A, LID's, GTR, PDC, ODOT, OTIA)						
	Yellow Highlighted Quantity Items are calculated values from Quantities Tab						
	Orange Highlighted prices are to be calculated in Fuel/Asphalt Worksheet						
	Refer to NOTES tab for info on the use of each Bid Item						
	When printing Estimate for review, hide columns C, D, and E						
				I	UNIT PRICE		

### UNIT QUANTITY PER YEAR TOTAL

O&M COSTS PER YEAR w.o. OVERHEAD



DocuSign Envelope ID: A01EBCC2-1F00-47DD-8A28-2329489E5DB8

### LEGEND

0

Proposed Sidewalk (incl. ramps and curb)

- Proposed Gutter Pon
- Proposed Asphalt Concrete Repair Area
- **E** Temporary Construction Easement

NE MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. BLVD

NE KILLINGSWORTH ST.

40

60

80











DocuSign Envelope ID: A01EBCC2-1F00-47DD-8A28-2329489E5DB8

# LEGEND

10

- Proposed Sidewalk (incl. ramps and curb)Proposed Concrete Island
- Proposed Gutter Pan
- Proposed Asphalt Concrete Repair Area
- **Temporary Construction Ease**ment
- Proposed Pedestrian Actuaed Beacon

NE MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. BLVD.

NE COOK ST

2Ø

 $\square$ 

4Ø

FEET

6Ø



#### **Certificate Of Completion**

Envelope Id: A01EBCC21F0047DD8A282329489E5DB8 Subject: Please DocuSign: MLK Safety and Access to Transit (Updated).pdf Source Envelope: Document Pages: 15 Signatures: 2 Certificate Pages: 5 Initials: 1 AutoNav: Enabled Envelopeld Stamping: Enabled Time Zone: (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)

#### **Record Tracking**

Status: Original 6/6/2019 8:55:17 AM

#### Signer Events

Jason Shepard jason.shepard@portlandoregon.gov Engineer City of Portland Bureau of Transportation Security Level: Email, Account Authentication (None)

**Electronic Record and Signature Disclosure:** Not Offered via DocuSign

Eva Huntsinger

eva.huntsinger@portlandoregon.gov

Security Level: Email, Account Authentication (None)

**Electronic Record and Signature Disclosure:** Accepted: 6/22/2017 12:42:00 PM ID: 601049b1-22a3-4ab3-8399-73096be19367

Steve Townsen

**Certified Delivery Events** 

steve.townsen@portlandoregon.gov

**City Engineer** City of Portland

Security Level: Email, Account Authentication (None)

**Electronic Record and Signature Disclosure:** Not Offered via DocuSign

Holder: Christopher Shearer christopher.shearer@portlandoregon.gov

Signature Adoption: Uploaded Signature Image Using IP Address: 74.120.152.118

Signature Adoption: Uploaded Signature Image

Using IP Address: 107.77.205.196

Sent: 6/6/2019 8:58:33 AM Viewed: 6/6/2019 9:12:50 AM Signed: 6/6/2019 9:13:39 AM

Sent: 6/6/2019 9:13:40 AM Viewed: 6/6/2019 9:21:16 AM Signed: 6/6/2019 9:21:26 AM

Timestamp

In Person Signer Events Signature Timestamp **Editor Delivery Events** Status Timestamp **Agent Delivery Events** Status Timestamp Intermediary Delivery Events Status Timestamp

Signature Adoption: Uploaded Signature Image Using IP Address: 74.120.152.116

Status

Signed using mobile

Ster Tomm

Je Su

eвh

Signature

Status: Completed

Envelope Originator: **Christopher Shearer** 1120 SW 5th Avenue, Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204 christopher.shearer@portlandoregon.gov IP Address: 74.120.152.116

Location: DocuSign

Sent: 6/6/2019 8:57:55 AM

Viewed: 6/6/2019 8:58:24 AM

Signed: 6/6/2019 8:58:32 AM

Timestamp

Carbon Copy Events	Status	Timestamp
kaitlin Littleford kaitlin.littleford@portlandoregon.gov	COPIED	Sent: 6/6/2019 9:21:28 AM Viewed: 6/6/2019 9:38:06 AM
Security Level: Email, Account Authentication (None)		
Electronic Record and Signature Disclosure: Not Offered via DocuSign		
Witness Events	Signature	Timestamp
Notary Events	Signature	Timestamp
Envelope Summary Events	Status	Timestamps
Envelope Sent	Hashed/Encrypted	6/6/2019 9:21:28 AM
Certified Delivered	Security Checked	6/6/2019 9:21:28 AM
Signing Complete	Security Checked	6/6/2019 9:21:28 AM
Completed	Security Checked	6/6/2019 9:21:28 AM
Payment Events	Status	Timestamps
Electronic Record and Signature Discl	osure	

#### **CONSUMER DISCLOSURE**

From time to time, City of Portland Bureau of Transportation (we, us or Company) may be required by law to provide to you certain written notices or disclosures. Described below are the terms and conditions for providing to you such notices and disclosures electronically through the DocuSign, Inc. (DocuSign) electronic signing system. Please read the information below carefully and thoroughly, and if you can access this information electronically to your satisfaction and agree to these terms and conditions, please confirm your agreement by clicking the â€<sup>T</sup>I agreeâ€<sup>TM</sup> button at the bottom of this document.

#### **Getting paper copies**

At any time, you may request from us a paper copy of any record provided or made available electronically to you by us. You will have the ability to download and print documents we send to you through the DocuSign system during and immediately after signing session and, if you elect to create a DocuSign signer account, you may access them for a limited period of time (usually 30 days) after such documents are first sent to you. After such time, if you wish for us to send you paper copies of any such documents from our office to you, you will be charged a \$0.00 per-page fee. You may request delivery of such paper copies from us by following the procedure described below.

#### Withdrawing your consent

If you decide to receive notices and disclosures from us electronically, you may at any time change your mind and tell us that thereafter you want to receive required notices and disclosures only in paper format. How you must inform us of your decision to receive future notices and disclosure in paper format and withdraw your consent to receive notices and disclosures electronically is described below.

#### **Consequences of changing your mind**

If you elect to receive required notices and disclosures only in paper format, it will slow the speed at which we can complete certain steps in transactions with you and delivering services to you because we will need first to send the required notices or disclosures to you in paper format, and then wait until we receive back from you your acknowledgment of your receipt of such paper notices or disclosures. To indicate to us that you are changing your mind, you must withdraw your consent using the DocuSign â€<sup>™</sup>Withdraw Consentâ€<sup>TM</sup> form on the signing page of a DocuSign envelope instead of signing it. This will indicate to us that you have withdrawn your consent to receive required notices and disclosures electronically from us and you will no longer be able to use the DocuSign system to receive required notices and consents electronically from us or to sign electronically documents from us.

#### All notices and disclosures will be sent to you electronically

Unless you tell us otherwise in accordance with the procedures described herein, we will provide electronically to you through the DocuSign system all required notices, disclosures, authorizations, acknowledgements, and other documents that are required to be provided or made available to you during the course of our relationship with you. To reduce the chance of you inadvertently not receiving any notice or disclosure, we prefer to provide all of the required notices and disclosures to you by the same method and to the same address that you have given us. Thus, you can receive all the disclosures and notices electronically or in paper format through the paper mail delivery system. If you do not agree with this process, please let us know as described below. Please also see the paragraph immediately above that describes the consequences of your electing not to receive delivery of the notices and disclosures

electronically from us.

#### How to contact City of Portland Bureau of Transportation:

You may contact us to let us know of your changes as to how we may contact you electronically, to request paper copies of certain information from us, and to withdraw your prior consent to receive notices and disclosures electronically as follows:

To contact us by email send messages to: tim.doherty@portlandoregon.gov

#### To advise City of Portland Bureau of Transportation of your new e-mail address

To let us know of a change in your e-mail address where we should send notices and disclosures electronically to you, you must send an email message to us at tim.doherty@portlandoregon.gov and in the body of such request you must state: your previous e-mail address, your new e-mail address. We do not require any other information from you to change your email address. In addition, you must notify DocuSign, Inc. to arrange for your new email address to be reflected in your DocuSign account by following the process for changing e-mail in the DocuSign system. **To request paper copies from City of Portland Bureau of Transportation** 

To request delivery from us of paper copies of the notices and disclosures previously provided by us to you electronically, you must send us an e-mail to tim.doherty@portlandoregon.gov and in the body of such request you must state your e-mail address, full name, US Postal address, and telephone number. We will bill you for any fees at that time, if any.

#### To withdraw your consent with City of Portland Bureau of Transportation

To inform us that you no longer want to receive future notices and disclosures in electronic format you may:

i. decline to sign a document from within your DocuSign session, and on the subsequent page, select the check-box indicating you wish to withdraw your consent, or you may; ii. send us an e-mail to tim.doherty@portlandoregon.gov and in the body of such request you must state your e-mail, full name, US Postal Address, and telephone number. We do not need any other information from you to withdraw consent. The consequences of your withdrawing consent for online documents will be that transactions may take a longer time to process.

Operating Systems:	Windows® 2000, Windows® XP, Windows
	Vista®; Mac OS® X
Browsers:	Final release versions of Internet Explorer®
	6.0 or above (Windows only); Mozilla Firefox
	2.0 or above (Windows and Mac); Safariâ,,¢
	3.0 or above (Mac only)
PDF Reader:	Acrobat® or similar software may be required
	to view and print PDF files
Screen Resolution:	800 x 600 minimum
Enabled Security Settings:	Allow per session cookies

#### **Required hardware and software**

\*\* These minimum requirements are subject to change. If these requirements change, you will be asked to re-accept the disclosure. Pre-release (e.g. beta) versions of operating systems and browsers are not supported.

#### Acknowledging your access and consent to receive materials electronically

To confirm to us that you can access this information electronically, which will be similar to other electronic notices and disclosures that we will provide to you, please verify that you were able to read this electronic disclosure and that you also were able to print on paper or electronically save this page for your future reference and access or that you were able to e-mail this disclosure and consent to an address where you will be able to print on paper or save it for your future reference and access. Further, if you consent to receiving notices and disclosures exclusively in electronic format on the terms and conditions described above, please let us know by clicking the â€TI agreeâ€TM button below.

By checking the â€<sup>-</sup>I agreeâ€<sup>TM</sup> box, I confirm that:

- I can access and read this Electronic CONSENT TO ELECTRONIC RECEIPT OF ELECTRONIC CONSUMER DISCLOSURES document; and
- I can print on paper the disclosure or save or send the disclosure to a place where I can print it, for future reference and access; and
- Until or unless I notify City of Portland Bureau of Transportation as described above, I consent to receive from exclusively through electronic means all notices, disclosures, authorizations, acknowledgements, and other documents that are required to be provided or made available to me by City of Portland Bureau of Transportation during the course of my relationship with you.

#### Summary of Non-Discriminatory Engagement, City of Portland 2019 RFFA Applications

All projects being submitted by the City of Portland have gone through a thorough planning level public involvement process. These projects came out of the Transportation System Plan (TSP) project list, which was adopted as a part of the Portland Comprehensive Plan update in December 2016. The Comprehensive Plan and TSP project list went through a long and robust public engagement process, with a strong equity focus on low income communities, communities of color, and residents with limited English proficiency.

The Transportation System Plan update went through four rounds of public review and comment, including internal, discussion, proposed, and recommended drafts over the course of several years. At each point in this process, the public at large, as well as numerous technical and community advisory committees, neighborhood associations, and other stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback. In all, between January 2014 and March 2015, PBOT staff attended and presented at 54 meetings, including the Transportation Expert Group, the Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Freight Advisory committees, Planning and Sustainability Commission, Joint Modal Committee, neighborhood coalitions and associations, and numerous open houses. At these meetings, PBOT staff received feedback about the selection criteria for determining which projects made it to the final project list as well as tweaks to elements of the various projects.

In addition to physical outreach at public meetings, over 600 comments on specific projects were received through the Map App; an online public engagement mapping platform where people could click through each of the projects on an interactive map and provide comments. PBOT also worked with consultants to engage underrepresented populations in commenting on the candidate project list and establishing relationships for the next phases of the TSP update. This work was focused on exploring how a variety of underrepresented populations would like to be involved in PBOT activities, both currently on the TSP update and in future projects. This work established a foundation for engaging underrepresented populations bureau-wide in the future.

In addition to the thorough vetting process for selecting these projects, several of the RFFA project candidates have gone through additional engagement as a part of other area and project planning efforts. The summaries for each project's public engagement process is included in their respective application materials.

#### 2022-2024 RFFA Public Engagement and Non-Discrimination Certification

Submitting agency name City of Portland Bureau of Transportation

Project name This checklist applies to all City of Portland applications

#### Background and purpose

Use of this checklist is intended to ensure project applicants have offered an adequate opportunity for public engagement, including identifying and engaging historically marginalized populations. Applications for project implementation (construction) are expected to have analyzed the distribution of benefits and burdens for people of color, people with limited English proficiency and people with low income compared to those for other residents. The checklist demonstrates:

- project sponsors have performed plan-level public engagement, including identifying and engaging historically marginalized communities, during development of local transportation system plans, subarea plans or strategies, topical plans or strategies (e.g., safety), modal plans or strategies (e.g., freight) and transit service plans from which the applicant project is drawn.
- if project development is completed, project sponsors have performed project-level public engagement, including identifying and engaging historically marginalized populations, and have analyzed potential inequitable impacts for people of color, people with limited English proficiency and people with low incomes compared to those for other residents.
- if project development is not completed, project sponsors attest the intent to perform project-level public engagement, including identifying and engaging historically marginalized populations, and to analyze potential inequitable impacts for people of color, people with limited English proficiency and people with low income compared to those for other residents.

Metro is required to comply with federal (US. Department of Transportation, Federal Highways Administration and Federal Transit Administration) and state (ODOT) guidance on public engagement and on Title VI of the Civil Rights Act and other civil rights requirements. Documentation of the local actions described below may be requested by regulators; if such a request is unable to be met, the allocation may be found to be out of compliance, requiring regional and local corrective action.

The completed checklist will aid Metro in its review and evaluation of projects for the 2022-2024 regional flexible funds allocation.

#### Instructions

Applicants must complete this certification, including a summary of non-discriminatory engagement (see Section 2) and certification statement (see Section 3), for projects submitted to Metro for consideration for 2022-2024 regional flexible funding.

Project sponsors should keep referenced records on file in case of a dispute. Retained records are not submitted to Metro unless requested.

A public engagement quick guide is available at <u>oregonmetro.gov/rffa</u>. Please forward questions regarding the public involvement checklist to regional flexible funds allocation project manager Dan Kaempff at <u>daniel.kaempff@oregonmetro.gov</u> or 503-813-7559.

#### 1. Checklist

Transportation or service plan development (from which the applicant project was drawn)

At the beginning of the agency's transportation system, topical modal, subarea or transit service plan, a public engagement plan was developed to encourage broad-based, early and continuing opportunity for public involvement.

Retained records: public engagement plan and/or procedures

During the development of the agency's transportation system, topical, modal, subarea or transit service plan, a jurisdiction-wide demographic analysis was completed to understand the locations of communities of color, people with limited English proficiency, people with low income and, to the extent reasonably practicable, people with disabilities, older adults and youth in order to include them in engagement opportunities.

Retained records: summary of or maps illustrating jurisdiction-wide demographic analysis

Public notices included a statement of non-discrimination (Metro can provide a sample).

Retained records: public engagement reports including/or dated copies of notices

Throughout the process, timely and accessible forums for public input were provided.

**Retained records:** public engagement reports including/or descriptions of opportunities for ongoing engagement, descriptions of opportunities for input at key milestones, public meeting records, online or community survey results

Throughout the process, appropriate interested and affected groups were identified and contact information was maintained in order to share project information, updates were provided for key decision points, and opportunities to engage and comment were provided.

**Retained records:** public engagement reports including/or list of interested and affected parties, dated copies of communications and notices sent, descriptions of efforts to engage the public, including strategies used to attract interest and obtain initial input, summary of key findings; for announcements sent by mail or email, documented number of persons/groups on mailing list

Throughout the process, focused efforts were made to engage underrepresented populations such as communities of color, limited English proficient and low-income populations, disabled, seniors and youth. Meetings or events were held in accessible locations with access to transit. Language assistance was provided, as needed, which may include translation of key materials, using a telephone language line service to respond to questions or take input in different languages and providing interpretation at meetings or events.

**Retained records:** public engagement reports including/or list of community organizations and/or diverse community members with whom coordination occurred; description of language assistance resources and how they were used, dated copies of communications and notices, copies of translated materials, summary of key findings

Public comments were considered throughout the process, and comments received on the staff recommendation were compiled, summarized and responded to, as appropriate.

**Retained records:** public engagement reports or staff reports including/or summary of comments, key findings and final staff recommendation, including changes made to reflect public comments

Adequate notification was provided regarding final adoption of the plan or program, at least 15 days in advance of adoption, if feasible, and follow-up notice was distributed prior to the adoption to provide more detailed information. Notice included information and instructions for how to testify, if applicable.

**Retained records:** public engagement reports or final staff reports including/or dated copies of the notices; for announcements sent by mail or email document number of persons/groups on mailing list

#### **Project development**

This part of the checklist is provided in past tense for applications for project implementation (construction) funding where the project development has been completed. Parenthetical notes in future tense are provided for applicants that have not completed project development to attest to ongoing and future activities.

At the beginning of project development, a public engagement plan was (shall be) developed to encourage broad-based, early and continuing opportunity for public involvement.

Retained records: public engagement plan and/or procedures

During project development, a demographic analysis was (shall be) completed for the area potentially affected by the project to understand the locations of communities of color, people with limited English proficiency, people with low income and, to the extent reasonably practicable, people with disabilities, older adults and youth in order to include them in engagement opportunities.

Retained records: summary of or maps illustrating demographic analysis

Throughout project development, public notices were (shall be) published and requests for input were (shall be) sent in advance of the project start, engagement activity or input opportunity.

**Retained records:** dated copies of notices (may be included in retained public engagement reports)

Throughout project development, public documents included (shall include) a statement of non-discrimination (Metro can provide a sample).

Retained records: public documents, including meeting agendas and reports

Throughout project development, timely and accessible forums for public input were (shall be) provided.

**Retained records:** descriptions of opportunities for ongoing engagement, descriptions of opportunities for input at key milestones, public meeting records, online or community survey results (may be included in retained public engagement reports)

Throughout project development, appropriate interested and affected groups were (shall be) identified and contact information maintained in order to share project information, updates were (shall be) provided for key decision points, and opportunities to engage and comment were (shall be) provided.

**Retained records:** list of interested and affected parties, dated copies of communications and notices sent, descriptions of efforts to engage the public, including strategies used to attract interest and obtain initial input, summary of key findings; for announcements sent by mail or email, documented number of persons/groups on mailing list (may be included in retained public engagement reports)

Throughout project development, focused efforts were made to engage historically marginalized populations, including people of color, people with limited English proficiency and people with low income, as well as people with disabilities, older adults and youth. Meetings or events were held in accessible locations with access to transit. Language assistance was provided, as needed, such as translation of key materials, use of a telephone language line service to respond to questions or take input in different languages, and interpretation at meetings or events.

**Retained records:** description of focused engagement efforts, list of community organizations and/or community members representing diverse populations with whom coordination or consultation occurred, description of language assistance resources and how they were used, dated copies of communications and notices, copies of translated materials, summaries of key findings (may be included in retained public engagement reports)

Throughout – and with an analysis at the end of – project development, consideration was (shall be) given to potential inequitable impacts of the project for people of color, people with limited English proficiency and people with low income compared to those for other residents, as identified through engagement activities.

**Retained records:** description of identified populations and information about and analysis of potential inequitable impacts of the project for them in relation to other residents (may be included in retained public engagement reports)

Public comments were (shall be) considered throughout project development, and comments received on the staff recommendation were (shall be) compiled, summarized and responded to, as appropriate.

**Retained records:** summary of comments, key findings and changes made to final staff recommendation or adopted plan to reflect public comments (may be included in retained public engagement reports or legislative staff reports)

Adequate notification was (shall be) provided regarding final adoption of the plan, including how to obtain additional detailed information, at least 15 days in advance of adoption. Notice included (shall include) information on providing public testimony.

**Retained records:** dated copies of the notices; for announcements sent by mail or email, documentation of number of persons/groups on mailing list (may be included in retained public engagement reports or legislative staff reports)

#### 2. Summary of non-discriminatory engagement

Attach a summary (1-2 pages) of the key elements of:

- if project development is completed, the public engagement process for this project, including outreach to communities of color, people with limited English proficiency and people with low income
- if project development is not completed, the public engagement plan for this project or agency public engagement practice, including outreach to communities of color, people with limited English proficiency and people with low income.

#### 3. Certification statement

<u>The City of Portland Bureau of Transportation</u> (agency) certifies the information provided on this checklist is accurate.

As attested by:

(signature)

Taylor Phillips, Transportation Planner

(name and title)

a-21-19

(date)



### **APPENDIX C – ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION DESIGN GUIDELINES**

**Please note:** These guidelines are taken from Metro's Regional Active Transportation Plan (2014) and Regional Transportation Safety Strategy (2018), and is consistent with Metro's street and trail design guidance, which is currently in the process of being updated. The street and trail guidance is scheduled to be completed in July 2019. Applicants are free to use design guidance from draft regional documents prior to adoption.

The following checklist items are street design elements that are appropriate and desirable in regional mobility corridors. Trail projects should use the Off-Street and Trail Facilities checklist (item D) at the end of this list. All other projects should use items A – C.

A. Pedestrian Project design elements – check all that apply Design elements emphasize separating pedestrians from motor vehicle traffic with buffers, increasing the visibility of pedestrians, especially when crossing roadways, and making it easier and more comfortable for people walking to access destinations.

For every element checked describe existing conditions and proposed features:

- Add sidewalks or improve vertical delineation of pedestrian right-of-way (i.e. missing curb)
- Add sidewalk width and/or buffer for a <u>total</u> width of 17 feet or more (recommended), 10 feet minimum <u>(over 30 mph, ADT over 6,000)</u>. Buffer may be provided by parking, protected bike lane, furnishing zone, street trees/planting strip. Greater width overall is desired in high activity areas, greater buffer separation is desired on streets with higher motor vehicle speeds and or volumes.
- □ Add sidewalk width and/or buffer for a total width of 10 feet or more (recommended), 8 feet minimum on streets with lower traffic volumes and speeds (ADT less than 6,000 and 25 mph or less). Buffer may be provided by parking, protected bike lane, furnishing zone, street trees/planting strip. Greater width overall is desired in high activity areas, greater buffer separation is desired on streets with higher motor vehicle speeds and or volumes.
- □ Sidewalk clear zone of 6 feet or more
- , Remove obstructions from the primary pedestrian-way or add missing curb ramps
- Add enhanced pedestrian crossing(s) at appropriate locations
- Re-open closed crosswalks
- Add crosswalk at transit stop
- Raised pedestrian refuge median or raised crossing, required if project is on a roadway with 4 or more lanes
- X Reduced pedestrian crossing distance
- Narrowed travel lanes (reduces pedestrian crossing distance)
- Reduced corner radii (e.g. truck apron) (enhances pedestrian safety)
- Curb extensions and/or in-lane transit boarding
- Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) or pedestrian signal
- Lighting, especially at crosswalks pedestrian scale (10-15 feet), preferably poised over sidewalk
- Dark skies compliant lighting
- Add countdown heads at signals
- □ Shorten signal cycle lengths of 90 seconds or less pedestrian friendly signal timing, lead pedestrian intervals
- Access management: minimize number and spacing of driveways

- Arterial traffic calming: Textured intersections, gateway treatments, raised medians, road diets, roundabouts
- □ Wayfinding
- Pedestrian priority street treatment (e.g. woonerf) on very low traffic/low volume street
- Other pedestrian priority design elements

#### B. Bicycle Project design elements

Design elements emphasize separating bicycle and motor vehicle traffic, increasing visibility of bicyclists, and making it easier and more comfortable for people traveling by bicycle to access routes and destinations.

For every element checked describe existing conditions and proposed features:

- On streets with traffic speeds and volumes over 30 mph, ADT over 6,000: Protected bicycle lane with vertical separation, minimum width 6 feet with minimum 2 foot buffer (refer to table below for recommended widths based on projected used)
- □ On streets with traffic speeds and volumes over 30 mph and ADT 3,000 to 6,000: Buffered bicycle lane, at least 6 foot bike lane with minimum 2 foot buffer (refer to table below for recommended widths based on projected used)
- □ Bicycle boulevard treatment (markings, slowed traffic speeds, wayfinding etc.) where ADT is less than 3,000 per day and speeds are equal to or less than 20 mph
- Separated multi-use path parallel to roadway with at least 5 foot separation from roadway (refer to item D below)
  - Bike priority treatments at intersections and crossings, including advance stop lines, bike boxes, bicycle priority signals, high-intensity activated crosswalk (HAWK) signals, user-activated signals
- Protected intersection treatments
- Access management: minimize number and spacing of driveways
- □ Arterial traffic calming: Textured intersections, gateway treatments, raised medians, road diets, roundabouts
- Raised pedestrian refuge median or raised crossing with bicycle crossing treatments, required
   if project is on a roadway with 4 or more lanes
- Lighting at intersections
- Dark skies compliant lighting
- **O** Other bicycle priority design elements

Use the following table to help determine the suitable bikeway widths:

Peak Hour One- way User Volume	Preferred Operating Space Width	Minimum Operating Space Width
<150	6.5 feet	5 feet
150-750	8 feet	6.5 feet
>750	10 feet	8 feet
Peak Hour Two- way User Volume	Preferred Operating Space Width	Minimum Operating Space Width
<150	11 feet	8 feet
150-350	12 feet	10 feet
>350	16 feet	12 feet

#### Source: Metro

Note: Recommended widths do not include 2' minimum buffer, or shy distance from curb, if applicable

#### C. Other Complete Street Features

- For every element checked describe existing conditions and proposed features:
- □ Transit priority treatments (e.g. queue jumps, transit signal priority)
- □ Move transit stop to far side of signal
- Benches
- **□** Transit stop amenities or bus stop pads
- **Gateway feature**
- □ Street trees and/or landscaping
- □ Stormwater treatments
- □ Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) elements (i.e. signal timing and speed detection)
- U Wayfinding
- **O**ther complete streets design elements:

#### D. Off-Street and Trail Facilities

Use of federal transportation funds on separated pathways are intended for projects that primarily serve a transportation function. Pathways for recreation are not eligible for federal transportation funding through the regional flexible fund process. Federal funds are available from other sources for recreational trails. To allow for comfortable mixing of persons on foot, bicycle and mobility devices at volumes expected to be a priority for funding in the metropolitan region, a 12-foot hard surface with shoulders is a base design width acceptable to FHWA Oregon. Exceptions to this width for limited segments is acceptable to respond to surrounding context, with widths less than 10-feet subject to a design exception process. Wider surfaces are desirable in high volume locations.

- **G** For every element checked describe existing conditions and proposed features:
- □ Minimum 12' trail width (plus at least 1' shoulder on each side)

- Treatments separating pedestrians and bicycles (e.g., separate pedestrian path), if necessary
- Always maintains minimum 5' separation when adjacent to street or is never adjacent to street
- All on-street segments with average annual daily traffic over 1,000 include one of the following treatments, (item C, above) or no on-street segments
- Sidewalks and separated bikeway on each side of the street this configuration is appropriate along streets with frequent access points and where the on-street connection continues for more than a couple blocks. This configuration needs to design for transitions between the multi-use path and the bicycle lanes on each side of the street. Refer to Item B above to check off bikeway treatments.
- Sidewalk and two-way separated bicycle lane on one side of the street this configuration is most appropriate when one side of the street has few or no access points, and therefore would have few motor vehicle conflicts with users. It also offers the possibility of transitioning to and from the multi-use paths without needing to cross the street. Refer to Item B above to check off bikeway treatments.
- A multi-use path on one or both sides of the street (with 5' separation) this configuration is also appropriate when the street has few or no access points. It also offers the possibility of transitioning to and from the trail without needing to cross the street. A multi-use path is more space efficient than separated bicycle lanes and sidewalks and can be used when trail user volumes do not warrant separation
- At least 3' of shy distance (more in high traffic areas) from the edge of paved trail to walls, light fixtures, trees or other vertical elements; shy distance can include buffer
- All street crossings include an appropriate enhanced high-visibility crosswalk treatment
- Trail users do not have to travel out of direction at street crossings
- All 4-lane street crossings include appropriate refuge island or no 4-lane street crossings
- Frequent access points (generally every ¼-mile)
- Access points are easily visible and provide adequate sight distance
- All crosswalks and underpasses include Dark Skies compliant lighting
- Dark Skies compliant trail lighting throughout
- Trailhead improvements (e.g., signs, information, trash receptacles, bicycle parking, seating)
- Rest areas with benches and wheelchair spaces
- □ Wayfinding or interpretive signage
- Signs regulating bike/pedestrian interaction (e.g. bikes yield to pedestrians)
- □ Trail priority at all local street/driveway crossings
- Landscaping, trees, enhancements to the natural landscape
- Wildlife crossings are incorporated into the design, if necessary
- Pervious pavement treatments



Use the following table to help determine the suitable trail/multi-use path width:

#### Source: Metro

Note: In considering other types of users, count slower-moving users as pedestrians and faster ones as bicyclists

For additional guidance and assistance with incorporating active transportation elements into your project proposal, please contact Lake McTighe <u>lake.mctighe@oregonmetro.gov</u> (503) 797-1660

# Regional Flexible Funds

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION & FREIGHT CANDIDATE PROJECTS



#### PORTLAND CITY COUNCIL

Ted Wheeler, Mayor Chloe Eudaly, Commissioner in Charge Amanda Fritz Nick Fish Jo Ann Hardesty

#### **PROJECT TEAM**

**Zef Wagner** Project Development Lead

Mark Lear Resource Manager

**Taylor Phillips** Project Development

Mike Serritella Project Development

# To obtain a copy of this document or more information about this project, please contact:

Portland Bureau of Transportation 1120 SW 5th Avenue, Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204 Phone: 503-823-6152

The City of Portland complies with all non-discrimination, Civil Rights laws including Civil Rights Title VI and ADA Title II. To help ensure equal access to City programs, services and activities, the City of Portland will reasonably modify policies/procedures and provide auxiliary aids/services to persons with disabilities. Call 503.823.5282, TTY 503.823.6868 or Oregon Relay Service: 711 with such requests, or visit http://bit.ly/13EWaCg

# Regional Flexible Funds

# ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION & FREIGHT CANDIDATE PROJECTS

**Project Candidates Summary** 

01

02	Projects in Context   Equity, Safety, & Growth
	Project Summary Sheets
04	<b>A</b> - N Willamette Blvd: Active Transportation Corridor
05	B - MLK Jr Blvd: Safety & Access to Transit
06	<b>C</b> - Columbia/Cully/Alderwood Intersection Improvements
08	D - SE Belmont & SE Morrison Transit & Bike Improvements
09	E - SE Stark & SE Washington Corridor Improvements
10	F - 122nd Ave: Safety Access & Transit

- **11 G** SW Taylors Ferry Rd Walkway & Bikeway
- **12 H** Springwater to SE 17th Trail Connection

# Regional Flexible Funds

# 



IV | RFFA PROJECT CANDIDATES 2022-2024

# Project candidates summary

ID	Project Name	Project Location	Project Description
Α	Willamette Blvd Active Transportation Corridor	N Willamette Blvd (Rosa Parks - Richmond)	Enhance existing bike lanes along Willamette Blvd from Rosa Parks to Ida and extend bike lanes from Ida to Richmond. Incorporate pedestrian crossings, intersection improvements, and transit access improvements along the corridor.
В	MLK Jr Blvd Safety & Access to Transit	NE MLK Jr Blvd (Highland - Cook)	Construct high-priority enhanced pedestrian crossings and signal upgrades along NE MLK Jr Blvd to improve pedestrian/bicycle safety and access to transit.
C	Cully/Columbia Freight Improvements	NE Cully Blvd & Columbia Blvd	Construct major intersection improvements at NE Columbia Blvd & Cully Blvd to improve freight movement, including a new traffic signal, side-by-side left turn pockets to Cully and Alderwood, right-turn pockets, and railroad crossing improvements. Project also includes sidewalks and a multi-use path to separate pedestrians and bicycles from traffic.
D	Central City in Motion: Belmont/ Morrison	SE Belmont/Morrison St (Grand - 12th)	Construct pedestrian crossings, protected bike lanes, and enhanced transit improvements along the Belmont/ Morrison couplet in the Central Eastside.
E	Stark/Washington Corridor Improvements	SE Stark/Washington Couplet (92nd - 108th)	Implement roadway safety redesign and construct enhanced pedestrian crossings, transit priority improvements, and protected bikeways in the Stark/ Washington couplet in Gateway.
F	122nd Ave Corridor Improvements (Phase 2)	122nd Ave (Sandy - Burnside)	Construct high-priority enhanced pedestrian crossings, bikeway improvements, and enhanced transit improvements along 122nd Ave.
G	SW Taylors Ferry Walkway & Bikeway	SW Taylors Ferry (48th - Capitol Hwy)	Construct high-priority sidewalk and bikeway connections on W Taylors Ferry Rd to provide active transportation access to SW Corridor station areas.
н	Springwater to 17th Trail Connection	Springwater Corridor (13th - 17th); SE 17th Ave (Linn - St Andrews)	Extend the Springwater Trail from 13th to 17th, and extend 17th Ave Trail from St Andrews to Linn, connecting the Milwaukie 17th Ave Trail to the Springwater Corridor.

# **Projects in Context**

This collection of projects align with the Portland Bureau of Transportation's commitment to **addressing equity, improving safety, and managing for future population growth.** 

- **EQUITY** PBOT uses the **Equity Matrix** to analyze investments based on the comparative racial and economic demography of all areas of the City.
- SAFETY

PBOT's *Vision Zero Action Plan* sets a goal of eliminating all transportation related deaths and serious injuries. The plan identifies a **High Crash Network** of streets where the highest rates of crashes occur.

### GROWTH

Strategic investments in Comprehensive Plan **Centers and Corridors** help manage growth by giving people transporation options when traveling to and between areas of the city targeted for the most growth.



# EQUITY









# A: N Willamette Blvd

# **Active Transportation Corridor**



## Project context and background

This project is needed to provide a major low-stress bikeway connection from the rapidly-growing St Johns Town Center to jobs, educational institutions, and other major transportation investments in the City of Portland.

This project was prioritized in the 2030 Bicycle Plan and builds on recent and upcoming improvements on Rosa Parks, Willamette, and Greeley east of the project area. North Portland is growing and residents need safe, comfortable and clearly defined travel options. An improved Willamette can serve as an active transportation 'super-highway' and help function as a primary route to connect future investments in walking and biking. By improving biking and access to transit for people in North Portland, we will give more residents the ability to choose travel options beyond single occupancy vehicles.

## **Project Details**

The signature element of this project is a proposed world class cycle track on N Willamette between N Rosa Parks Way and the University of Portland campus. This investment would also include improved transit amenities and enhanced pedestrian crossings. From the University of Portland campus, an enhanced bikeway is envisioned connecting to the St Johns Town Center. A complementary locally funded project, would extend the connection futher into the peninsula, making a low-stress connection to Pier Park.

#### Project Cost Estimate: \$6,106,000

Local Match: \$1,650,000; RFFA Grant Request: \$4,456,000

#### FOR MORE INFORMATION

#### Zef Wagner

Portland Bureau of Transportation - Transportation Planner zef.wagner@portlandoregon.gov | 503.823.7164



# **NE MLK Jr Blvd** Safety & Access to Transit

# Project context and background

NE MLK Jr Blvd already has one of Portland's highest concentrations of affordable housing, and a great deal more is in the pipeline. As more and more people live on this corridor, pedestrian and commercial activity is increasing, which leads to conflicts with the high volumes of high speed traffic on this major thoroughfare.

The PBOT Safe Routes to School Plan also identified several crossing needs along the corridor. This project will focus on providing enhanced pedestrian crossings at regular spacing along MLK Jr Blvd to ensure safety and access to transit.

NE Martin Luther King Jr Blvd is a major destination and business hub for Black Portlanders. This project would not only seek to direct investments in crossing and transit amenities, but would also include streetscape improvements such as pedestrian scale lighting and a community-driven process to further develop the corridor's identity to celebrate NE MLK Jr Blvd as a vibrant business district.

# **Project details**



EXISTING OR FUTURE BIKEWAY CONNECTION

#### Project Cost Estimate: \$4,723,000

Local Match: \$600,000; RFFA Grant Request: \$4,123,000

#### FOR MORE INFORMATION

#### Shane Valle

Portland Bureau of Transportation - Transportation Planner shane.valle@portlandoregon.gov | 503.823.7736



ROSA PARKS

HIGHLAND

HOLMAN

AINSWORTH

IARRETT

(₽

Å

(₿

2

B

Ľ

U

ASHLEY

SIMPSON

PBBOT PORTLAND BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION

Active/Enhanced Crossing

杰

соок

# C: **Cully/Columbia** Intersection Improvements



# Project context and background

The Columbia corridor is a key link in Portland's regional freight network, connecting major freight destinations, including the airport and USPS facilities, to the I-5 and I-205 freeways and the rest of the region. The intersections of Columbia Blvd at Alderwood Rd and at Cully Blvd are seeing increased traffic and trucking demand from the US Postal Service facility and airport in recent years, causing congestion that impacts freight reliability as well as contributing to dangerous conditions for all road users. In addition to increased freight and vehicular traffic, this area is seeing much more pedestrian and bicycle traffic due to job growth along the Columbia corridor, as well as popularity of several Parks facilities nearby. The Columbia/Cully/Alderwood

projects were identified as a transportation need in the Airport Futures Plan, to accommodate anticipated traffic growth associated with PDX Airport. They aim to enhance freight mobility and access by making it easier to make left turns onto and off of Columbia Blvd, while also improving safety for all road users.

#### Project Cost Estimate: \$5,084,193

Local Match: \$1,650,000; RFFA Grant Request: \$3,434,193

#### FOR MORE INFORMATION

#### Winston Sandino

Portland Bureau of Transportation - Project Manager winston.sandino@portlandoregon.gov | 503.823.5767



COLUMBIA/CULLY/ALDERWOOD IMPROVEMENTS UPDATED: JUNE 14.19

06 | RFFA PROJECT CANDIDATES 2022-2024 \*Cost estimates are based on preliminary project scopes and are subject to change as projects are further refined

### **Project details**

A funded project slated for construction in 2020 will reconstruct the intersection of Alderwood Rd at NE Columbia Blvd, install a permanent traffic signal at this intersection, construct sidewalks along the south side of NE Columbia Blvd from Alderwood Rd to Cully Blvd and a multi-use path on the north side of Columbia Blvd between Cully and Alderwood that continues north on Alderwood. Operations will be improved with an exclusive right turn lane from Alderwood to westbound Columbia and dual side by side left turn pockets on Columbia Blvd between Alderwood and Cully. PBOT is also applying for funding to construct sidewalks on Cully, improve the intersection of Cully and Columbia with a left turn lane and signal, and use previously acquired right-ofway to widen the road along Columbia between Cully and Alderwood.





COLUMBIA/CULLY/ALDERWOOD IMPROVEMENTS UPDATED: JUNE 14.19

# D: **SE Belmont & SE Morrison** Transit and Bike Improvements



# **Project background and details**

Belmont and Morrison are key east/west connections in the Central Eastside, providing important retail, freight, and transit access. This project is included in the recently adopted Central City in Motion Plan and improves transit access and speed with new transit islands and bus and turn (BAT) lanes, improves pedestrian crossings, and provides protected bike lanes.

Note: Bikeway enhancements west of SE MLK Jr Blvd are located beneath the viaducts, providing a connection for people biking to SW Water Ave.

#### Project Cost Estimate: \$6,462,000

Local Match: \$1,938,600; RFFA Grant Request: \$4,523,400

#### FOR MORE INFORMATION

#### Gabriel Graff

Portland Bureau of Transportation - Project Manager gabriel.graff@portlandoregon.gov | 503.823.5291



BELMONT/MORRISON TRANSIT AND BIKE IMPROVEMENTS UPDATED: JUNE 14.19

08 | RFFA PROJECT CANDIDATES 2022-2024 \*cost estimates are based on preliminary project scopes and are subject to change as projects are further refined

# E: **Stark/Washington** Corridor Improvements



## **Project background and details**

The Stark/Washington couplet is one of the major business hubs in Gateway, but is currently very autooriented and sees high rates of crashes, with three to four lanes in each direction, difficult pedestrian crossings, and narrow sidewalks and bike lanes. This project will transform this area into a more ped/bike/ transit oriented hub for East Portland, with safety improvements ranging from protected bike lanes to bus lanes and transit islands to enhanced crossings. This is a Vision Zero project on a High Crash Corridor and serves a high equity need. This project was also prioritized in the Growing Transit Communities Plan, adopted in 2017.

#### Project Cost Estimate: \$6,532,000

Local Match: \$1,200,000; RFFA Grant Request: \$5,332,000

#### FOR MORE INFORMATION

#### **David Backes**

Portland Bureau of Transportation - Project Manager david.backes@portlandoregon.gov | 503.823.5811



2022-2024 RFFA PROJECT CANDIDATES 09

# F: **122nd Ave** Safety, Access & Transit

# Project context and background

Currently, 122nd Ave is a High Crash Corridor that does not adequately serve all modes. Five of the City's thirty highest crash intersections are along 122nd Ave. Since 2010, there have been over 400 people injured while traveling on 122nd, including 127 people walking and biking. Nine people have died in the past 8 years.

122nd Ave is a stressful environment to walk, bike, cross the street and access transit. The street is typically a five-lane arterial with on-street parking and narrow bike lanes that becomes turn lanes at major signalized intersection. The sidewalks are often narrow and substandard. Most of 122nd Avenue does not meet the City's new guidelines for marked crosswalk spacing. Buses experience delay, including slow average speeds, high dwell time at stops and significant travel speed variability during peak travel times.

PBOT is developing a plan to identify improvements on 122nd Ave, between SE Foster and NE Marine Dr., with the goal to increase safety for all, improve pedestrian & bicycle access and support better transit while balancing needs of freight & other modes, identify improvements to help eliminate serious injuries and fatalities, and remove 122nd Ave from the Vision Zero High Crash Corridor network.

## **Project details**

PBOT's RFFA application scope draws from staff recommendations and public stakeholder feedback on elements of the draft 122nd Ave Plan: Safety, Access and Transit. The improvements proposed to be included in the RFFA project scope include new enhanced and marked crossings in the vicinity of **NE Beech**, **NE Sacramento/ Brazee (dependent on funding/actual costs), NE Broadway/** Hancock, and NE Wasco/Multnomah.

#### Project Cost Estimate: \$6,491,000

Local Match: \$1,947,300; RFFA Grant Request: \$4,543,700

#### FOR MORE INFORMATION

#### **April Bertelsen**

Portland Bureau of Transportation - Transit Coordinator April.Bertelsen@portlandoregon.gov | 503.823.6177





# G: SW Taylors Ferry Rd



## Project context and background

SW Taylors Ferry Rd from SW 49th to SW Capitol Hwy is the only route to the Barbur Transit Center and other community destinations for neighbors living west of Capitol Hwy and Interstate 5. Today the street lacks bicycle facilities and has a degraded, substandard walkway on one side of the street..

The project would build upon and connect to funded complete street upgrades of Capitol Hwy, extending the reach of those investments. The project implements the 2035 Comprehensive plan by making connections to and through the West Portland Town Center, an important growth area in Southwest Portland.

SW Taylors Ferry Road is designated as a City Bikeway and City Walkway in the Portland Transportation System Plan. The project is on the Primary Investment Route for Markham Elementary School in the Portland Safe Routes to School plan (2018). TriMet identified this project as Tier 1 priority to improve access to the Barbur Boulevard Transit Center as a part of the TriMet Bike Plan (2016).

### **Project details**

This project will construct a sidewalk and widen the roadway to provide bicycle lanes on SW Taylors Ferry Rd between SW Capitol Hwy and SW 49th Ave. Retaining walls may be needed to address grades, maintain access to properties and provide necessary width for these improvements. Project staff will collaborate with the Bureau of Environmental Services to understand opportunities to extend the culvert at Woods Creek.

#### Project Cost Estimate: \$4,276,000

Local Match: \$600,000; RFFA Grant Request: \$3,676,000

#### FOR MORE INFORMATION Nick Falbo

Portland Bureau of Transportation - Senior Planner Nick.Falbo@portlandoregon.gov | 503.823.6452

2022-2024 **RFFA PROJECT CANDIDATES** | 11 \*Cost estimates are based on preliminary project scopes and are subject to change as projects are further refined.

# H: **Springwater to 17th** Trail Connection



## **Project background and details**

There exists a major gap between the Springwater Corridor Trail and Milwaukie's 17th Ave Trail that limits their attractiveness as major commute routes to downtown Portland. Once connected, people will be able to ride from Oregon City to downtown Portland on a low-stress bikeway using the Trolley Trail, 17th Ave Trail, and Springwater Trail. This project will fill this gap, and will also make progress toward filling the gap in the Springwater Trail to the east.

#### Project Cost Estimate: \$6,534,000

Local Match: \$1,000,000; RFFA Grant Request: \$5,534,000

#### FOR MORE INFORMATION

Maya Agarwal Portland Parks & Recreation maya.agarwal@portlandoregon.gov | 503-823-2507



SPRINGWATER TO 17TH TRAIL CONNECTION UPDATED: JUNE 14.19





# ORDINANCE No. 189555

\*Authorize application to the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program Regional Flexible Funds for 2022-24 for 8 grants up to \$36 million (Ordinance)

The City of Portland ordains:

Section 1. The Council finds:

- 1. Metro is responsible for the application and programming of federal transportation funding for the Portland Metropolitan Planning Organization.
- In this cycle, Metro anticipates allocating approximately \$142 million, comprised of federal Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) and Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) program funds, to be obligated in the 2022-2024 timeframe.
- 3. This process allocates money both to region-wide investments that make our communities more livable and give people choices in how they travel, and to individual projects planned and built by local transportation agencies.
- 4. Following the adoption of the 2018 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), JPACT and the Metro Council decided that Regional Flexible Funds for individual projects should be focused on achieving the four primary RTP investment priorities: advancing Equity; improving Safety; implementing the region's Climate Smart Strategy; and, managing Congestion.
- City staff used the recently adopted 2018 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to develop a candidate list of projects for the 2022-24 Regional Flexible Funds Process using the equity, safety, climate, and congestion priorities.
- The candidate list of projects was reviewed with the Portland Pedestrian, Bicycle, Freight, and Bureau advisory committees. In addition, the candidate projects were reviewed and approved for submission by the Portland Transportation Coordination Committee.
- Federal-aid projects require a minimum of 10.27% local match. Local match of up to \$9,000,000 will be provided by System Development Charge funding and/or General Transportation revenue already set aside for local match of federally funded projects in the 2022 to 2024 timeframe.

NOW, THEREFORE, The Council directs:

- a. The Commissioner-in-Charge is hereby authorized to make application to Metro for eight grants of up to a total amount of \$36,000,000.
- b. The Commissioner-in-Charge is authorized to provide such information and assurances as are required for the grant period.
- c. The OMF Grants Office is authorized to perform all administrative matters in relation to the grant application, grant agreement or amendments, requests for reimbursement from the grantor, and to submit required online grant documents on the Commissioner-in-Charge's behalf.

Section 2. The Council declares that an emergency exists because applications are due to Metro by June 21, 2019; therefore, this ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage by the Council.

Passed by the Council, JUN 1 2 2019

Commissioner Chloe Eudaly Prepared by: Mark Lear; CB Date Prepared: May 20, 2019

MARY HULL CABALLERO Auditor of the City of Portland By Deputy

### 563

#### Agenda No. Ordinance NO. 189555 Title

\*Authorize application to the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program Regional Flexible Funds for 2022-24 (Ordinance)



	FOUR-FIFTHS AGENDA	COMMISSIONERS VOTED AS FOLLOWS:		
Start time:			YEAS	NAYS
Total amount of time needed: (for presentation, testimony and discussion)	1. Fritz	1. Fritz	-	
	2. Fish	2. Fish	V	
CONSENT X	3. Hardesty	3. Hardesty	V	
REGULAR  Total amount of time needed:	4. Eudaly	4. Eudaly	~	
(for presentation, testimony and discussion)	Wheeler	Wheeler		

1140