



Regional Funding Allocation: Outcomes Evaluation Report

2028-2030 Regional Flexible Funds

Step 2

April 15, 2025

Nondiscrimination Notice to the Public

Metro hereby gives public notice that it is the policy of the Metro Council to assure full compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987, Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice and related statutes and regulations in all programs and activities. Title VI requires that no person in the United States of America shall, on the grounds of race, color, sex, or national origin be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity for which Metro receives federal financial assistance. Any person who believes they have been aggrieved by an unlawful discriminatory practice under Title VI has a right to file a formal complaint with Metro. Any such complaint must be in writing and filed the Metro's Title VI Coordinator within one hundred eighty (180) days following the date of the alleged discriminatory occurrence. For more information, or to obtain a Title VI Discrimination Complaint Form, see the web site at www.oregonmetro.gov or call 503-797-1536.

INTRODUCTION

Every three years, Metro leads a discussion among the region's residents, jurisdictional and public agency staff, and elected officials to select which transportation needs are to be funded with the region's allotment of federal transportation dollars, known as the Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA). Metro is currently deciding how to invest federal funding available in the federal fiscal years 2028 through 2030.

An estimate of approximately up to \$42 million is available for projects to improve streets and trails throughout the region. While this amount of regional funding is small relative to all the dollars spent on transportation in the region, the Regional Flexible Funds are eligible to be spent on a wide range of transportation system needs. As such, they are a critical part of fulfilling the vision, goals, and objectives of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY

In September 2024, Metro opened a call for project proposals to be submitted by the region's local jurisdictions and special districts. Twenty-four proposals were submitted by the November 22nd, 2024 deadline.

The Outcomes Evaluation is an analysis of the applications, comparing and rating the projects using a set of performance measures criteria aligned towards the transportation goals in the RTP. It is one of several sources of information available for decision makers in developing a list of project investments.

The performance measures were developed as part of the 2028-2030 RFFA Program Direction adopted by the Metro Council in July 2024. The performance measures for the Regional Flexible Funds are taken directly from the 2023 RTP five goals. The RTP goals areas are as follows:

- Equitable Transportation
- Safe System
- Climate Action and Resilience
- Mobility Options
- Thriving Economy
- Design*

*Design is not one of the five RTP goals areas, but pulled out as a stand-alone criteria in lieu of having the design criteria embedded within each of the performance measures for the five RTP goal areas. The applications were assessed in how Metro's Designing Livable Streets and Trails guidelines were applied in the description of the project scope elements.

The overarching methodology for the Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation and the associated performance measures for the RTP goals areas and design were first discussed at the TPAC workshop in June 2024. As a starting place, Metro staff shared an outline of the performance measures used as part of the 2025-2027 Regional Flexible Fund Allocation and identified the different updates needed to reflect the adopted 2023 RTP goals. A refined version of the performance measures was shared at the August 2024 TPAC workshop ahead of opening the solicitation for Step 2 in September 2024. In addition, TPAC community organization representatives were provided a separate opportunity to review, discuss, and provide refinements to the performance measures in summer 2024. Metro staff also offered provided an overview and training on how to use and apply the Designing Livable Streets and Trails guidebook in September 2024. Final performance measures criteria for the purpose of scoring and rating Step 2 proposals were finalized in December 2024.

Using the performance measures criteria, Metro staff scored each project within the each of the five RTP goal areas to inform a categorial and then an overall rating. For those projects seeking construction funding, a scoring and a rating was also provided for the design performance measures criteria. Project development applications were not rated under design. All the RTP goals areas were weighted equally and if design was included as part of the Step 2 application evaluation, it was also weighted equally. The project application scoring involved three components where the application could receive a score that would eventually be complied to the overall application's rating. The three components include:

- 1) A geospatial analysis which provided a score of the performance measure criteria according to the setting and location of the proposed project as described and drawn in the Step 2 application. An example of a GIS scoring question includes: if a project is located in an equity focus area then the project application received an automatic score of 1.
- 2) A geospatial or policy dependent review of the performance measure criteria according to whether the proposed project location is within a specific geospatial area or on a facility or policy criteria. Examples of scoring questions of each type provided.
 - a. Geospatial dependent review: Is the project located in a K – 12 grade walkshed?
Instruction: If yes, then review the proposed project application scope and details. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school? If yes, score 1 point.
 - b. Policy dependent review: Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations?
Instruction: If yes, refer to Regional Transit Strategy Enhance Transit treatments and toolbox. Score 1 if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs).
- 3) A review of the project scope and application details according to performance measure criteria. An example of a scoring question includes:
 - a. How has public input informed project's prioritization?
Instruction: Review Community Involvement section application questions. Has the public been informed of the project and had sufficient opportunities to comment? Has that input informed how the project has been developed and prioritized for funding? Score 1 – 5 if there is demonstrated public involvement and implementation of that input.

For further information on performance measures and evaluation questions, as part of Appendix 2 of this report is the list of the Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation performance measures criteria and scoring questions applied to the Step 2 project applications.

Approximately 20% of the Outcomes Evaluation analysis on the Step 2 applications were done using geospatial analysis (component 1 described above) to determine if the project met a given performance measure. The remaining 80% of the evaluation was based on either a geospatial or policy dependent review of the proposed project description in the application according to the performance measure criteria (component 2 described above) or a review of the project scope and application details according to performance measure criteria (component 3 described above).

Once all the scores were compiled and calculated, all Step 2 project proposals were given a BEST/BETTER/GOOD rating in each of the five RFFA goal areas and design, if applicable. In addition, an overall rating was provided. The ratings were based on Jenks natural break points calculation with review by Metro staff to determine if any adjustments are necessary to the natural break points for the ratings. See further discussion on the ratings methodology in the following section.

UNDERSTANDING THE PROJECT RATINGS

Projects needing planning and development work invariably have a lower degree of certainty in their design, alignment, budget, etc. This makes them difficult to directly compare in a technical analysis to projects that have been through a sufficient level of development to be eligible for construction funding.

Because of these factors, it made sense to compare projects within the following categories:

- Projects seeking Regional Flexible Funds for Planning and/or Project Development
- Projects seeking Regional Flexible Funds for Construction

Creating distinct categories allows for a more relevant comparison between applications at similar phases of their development and seeking a specific funding source with different criteria. As information, a summary of all projects overall is provided as part of Appendix 1.

- Each project was evaluated and given a GOOD/BETTER/BEST rating in each of the relevant RTP goal areas and design, if applicable. No RTP goal area or design is weighted greater than the others. Project applications were also given an overall rating, based on the averages of the scores.
- There were six categories with a total of 91 points available (or 75 total points for only the five RTP goal areas). The number of points per question and each in each section area was adjusted so that the total number of points available in each RTP goal area and Design equaled 16.67% of the overall project rating for construction proposals and 20% of the overall project rating for project development proposals.

Simply totaling the scores would have resulted in some questions being weighted differently than others, which was not the policy intent of the 2028-2030 RFFA Program Direction. Using percentages of the total points in each criteria area creates a rating methodology that does not unintentionally weight the scoring towards any specific criteria area.

The GOOD/BETTER/BEST ratings are based on how a project compares relative to other projects within its specific goal area (e.g. Equitable Transportation, Mobility Options) and among the project type (e.g. Step 2 applications only seeking planning and/or project development funding). In addition, an overall GOOD/BETTER/BEST rating is assigned by project type according to normalized scores across all the goal areas and design, if applicable. As noted in a previous section the GOOD/BETTER/BEST ratings were initially determined through a Jenks natural breaks classification. Following the Jenks natural breaks classification, Metro staff reviewed the break points and, if necessary, made adjustments to the break point between one rating to the other. Adjustments were mostly made for the ratings in the goal area and overall ratings of the Step 2 project development applications in part because the Jenks natural breaks classification created unusual breaks with a very small pool (five applications) to process. Where adjustments were made to ratings in the goals areas for the Step 2 construction applications, usually the adjustments were

often for one or up to three projects.

In taking this approach, two details are likely noticeable: 1) when looking at the different rating across all the Step 2 applications there is often not a consistent or standard number of applications across each of the ratings; and 2) in some cases based on the breaks not all three ratings (GOOD/BETTER/BEST) are represented. Below is an example of how the ratings were derived, using the Step 2 project application type (Construction), are described below:

In the Equitable Transportation goal area, the average score was 64.4 percent. The scores ranged from a high of 82.5 percent to a low of 23.8 percent. Looking at the average, maximum and minimum Equitable Transportation scores of these projects, natural breaks in the scores emerged. There were seven projects that achieved a 74.6 percent score or greater; these were rated BEST. Nine projects had scores ranging from 57.1 percent to 69.8 percent; these were rated BETTER. Three projects had scores below 49.2 percent score and were rated GOOD.

The Overall rating was calculated using the average of the criteria area ratings for application within a specific category. The overall rating is derived based on the project's average scores, relative to the other projects average scores, not to the project's individual RTP goal area or design rating. For example, an application may have BETTER ratings in the Equitable Transportation, Safe System, and Thriving Economy goal areas, but receives a GOOD rating overall. This is because its overall rating is low compared to the other application's overall ratings. The Outcomes Evaluation ratings for the Step 2 applications are provided in Table 1.

Table 1. 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Ratings

Appendix 1

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation All Applications Ratings Summary Condensed - Final

28-30 Regional Flexible Funds Step 2: Construction Applications									
Project Tracker ID	Project	Total Score	Overall Rating	Equitable Transportation	Safe System	Climate Action & Resilience	Mobility Options	Thriving Economy	Design
CFP24	NE Glisan St: 82nd Avenue Multimodal Safety and Access	70.97	Best	Best	Best	Best	Best	Better	Best
CFP18	NW Division Street Complete Street: Gresham-Fairview Trail - Birdsdale Avenue	60.58	Best	Best	Better	Best	Good	Better	Best
CFP23	NE MLK Jr Blvd Safety and Access to Transit	60.56	Best	Best	Best	Better	Better	Best	Better
CFP16	Beaverton Creek Trail: Merlo Road Improvements	60	Best	Better	Best	Best	Best	Better	Best
CFP28	Cedar Mill Better Bus and Access to Transit Enhancements	59.71	Best	Better	Good	Best	Best	Better	Better
CFP5	NE Prescott St: 82nd Ave Multimodal Safety and Access	59.45	Best	Best	Good	Better	Better	Better	Best
CFP10	Bridge Crossing of Hwy. 26 by the Westside Trail	58.14	Better	Better	Better	Better	Better	Better	Best
CFP12	Gladstone Historic Trolley Trail Bridge Construction	57.8	Better	Best	Better	Best	Better	Better	Best
CFP17	Beaverton Downtown Loop: SW Hall Blvd - 3rd St to 5th St	54.62	Better	Better	Good	Better	Best	Better	Better
CFP22	North Dakota Street (Fanno Creek) Bridge Replacement	52.34	Better	Best	Good	Best	Good	Better	Better
CFP8	OR 212/224 Sunrise Hwy Phase 2: Bike/Ped Facilities and Interchange Improvements (CON)	52.32	Better	Best	Good	Better	Good	Best	Good
CFP26	W Burnside Green Loop Crossing	52.21	Better	Better	Best	Good	Better	Better	Better
CFP3	Clackamas Industrial Area Improvements: SE Jennifer Street Multi-use Path	51.1	Better	Better	Good	Good	Better	Best	Better
CFP13	NE Halsey Street Complete Street: 192nd Avenue - 201st Avenue	50.9	Better	Better	Best	Better	Better	Better	Good
CFP6	Westside Trail Segment 1 - King City	47.65	Good	Better	Better	Better	Good	Good	Better
CFP19	Outer Halsey and Outer Foster (ITS Signal Improvements)	47.3	Good	Better	Better	Good	Best	Better	Good
CFP9	Red Electric Trail East of SW Shattuck Rd	44.78	Good	Good	Better	Good	Good	Good	Best
CFP21	Smart SW 185th Avenue ITS and Better Bus Project	44.48	Good	Good	Good	Best	Better	Better	Good
CFP29	Cedar Creek/Ice Age Tonquin Trail: Roy Rogers - OR 99W	44.14	Good	Good	Best	Good	Best	Good	Better

28-30 Regional Flexible Funds Step 2: Planning and Project Development Applications									
Project Tracker ID	Project	Total Score	Overall Rating	Equitable Transportation	Safe System	Climate Action & Resilience	Mobility Options	Thriving Economy	Design
CFP15	NE 223rd Ave: NE Glisan to NE Marine Dr Safety Corridor Planning	81.41	Best	Best	Best	Best	Best	Best	N/A
CFP11	Railroad Avenue Multi-use Path: 37th Avenue to Linwood Avenue	54.05	Better	Better	Best	Better	Better	Better	N/A
CFP14	OR99E (McLoughlin Boulevard) 10th Street to Tumwater village: Shared-Use Path and Streetscape Enhancements Project Development	51.88	Better	Better	Better	Better	Better	Better	N/A
CFP25	Lakeview Blvd - Jean Rd to McCowan Rd	30.3	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Better	N/A
CFP27	SW 175th Design: SW Condor Lane to SW Kemmer Road	27.9	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	N/A

PROJECT RATING DETAILS

The compiled ratings by project type and RTP goal area and design are included in Appendix 1 to this report. Appendix 2 includes the individual technical rating worksheets and the Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation performance measures criteria and scoring questions. For ease to search and view in detail an Excel workbook of Appendix 1 and 2 is available for download on the [28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 webpage](#).

The following pages provide details on the candidate project's Outcomes Evaluation ratings. A summary table illustrates the projects' ratings. Following this, rating details for each project are listed in alphabetical order by jurisdiction and according to application type (e.g. project development or construction) as follows:

Planning and Project Development

- Lakeview Blvd - Jean Rd to McEwan Rd
- Railroad Avenue Multiuse Path: 37th Avenue to Linwood Avenue
- NE 223rd Ave: NE Glisan to NE Marine Dr Safety Corridor Planning
- OR99E (McLoughlin Boulevard) 10th Street to Tumwata village: Shared-Use Path and Streetscape Enhancements Project Development
- SW 175th Design: SW Condor Lane to SW Kemmer Road

Construction

- Beaverton Downtown Loop: SW Hall Blvd - 3rd St to 5th St
- Clackamas Industrial Area Improvements: SE Jennifer Street Multi-use Path
- Gladstone Historic Trolley Trail Bridge Construction
- NE Halsey Street Complete Street: 192nd Avenue - 201st Avenue
- NW Division Street Complete Street: Gresham-Fairview Trail - Birdsdale Avenue

- OR 212/224 Sunrise Hwy Phase 2: Bike/Ped Facilities and Interchange Improvements (CON)
- Smart SW 185th Avenue ITS and Better Bus Project
- Westside Trail Segment 1 - King City
- Outer Halsey and Outer Foster (ITS Signal Improvements)
- NE Glisan St: 82nd Avenue Multimodal Safety and Access
- NE MLK Jr Blvd Safety and Access to Transit
- NE Prescott St: 82nd Ave Multimodal Safety and Access
- Red Electric Trail East of SW Shattuck Rd
- W Burnside Green Loop Crossing
- Cedar Creek/Ice Age Tonquin Trail: Roy Rogers - OR 99W
- North Dakota Street (FannoCreek) Bridge Replacement
- Bridge Crossing of Hwy. 26 by the Westside Trail
- Beaverton Creek Trail: Merlo Road Improvements
- Cedar Mill Better Bus and Access to Transit Enhancements

2028 – 2030 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 – Project Development Applications
 (alphabetical by nominating agency)

Project name:	Lakeview Blvd - Jean Rd to McEwan Rd
Applicant:	City of Lake Oswego
Amount requested:	\$983,000
Description:	Requested funds to design 3,500 feet long widening of Lakeview Boulevard for two 14-foot shared use lanes with an 8-foot sidewalk on one side separated by stormwater planter and curb.
Project phase(s):	Planning/Project Development
Evaluation notes:	No evaluators comments.
Outcomes ratings:	
<i>Equitable Transportation</i>	GOOD
<i>Safe System</i>	GOOD
<i>Climate Action and Resilience</i>	GOOD
<i>Mobility Options</i>	GOOD
<i>Thriving Environment</i>	BETTER
<i>Overall</i>	GOOD

Project name:	Railroad Avenue Multiuse Path: 37th Avenue to Linwood Avenue
Applicant:	City of Milwaukie
Amount requested:	\$2,707,217
Description:	Develop buffered pedestrian/bicycle multiuse path adjacent to Railroad Avenue from 37th Avenue to Linwood Avenue in Milwaukie, Oregon. Multiuse path will connect existing sidewalks at 37th Avenue, Linwood/Harmony Avenue, and intersecting side streets.
Project phase(s):	Project development
Evaluation notes:	Liked the ties between the project and building future transit service and how the project will serve students who use the corridor for bus service. While the project is not located on/as high injury corridor, recognition there are injuries/crashes in the proximity.
Outcomes ratings:	
<i>Equitable Transportation</i>	BETTER
<i>Safe System</i>	BEST
<i>Climate Action and Resilience</i>	BETTER
<i>Mobility Options</i>	BETTER
<i>Thriving Environment</i>	BETTER
<i>Overall</i>	BETTER

Project name:	NE 223rd Ave: NE Glisan to NE Marine Dr Safety Corridor Planning
Applicant:	Multnomah County
Amount requested:	897300

Description:	On NE 223rd Ave in Fairview and Wood Village, develop a corridor safety plan that inclusively engages the community in identifying priorities and evaluating design alternatives. Advance readiness for priority construction projects to fill complete street gaps and install safety countermeasures.
Project phase(s):	Planning, project development
Evaluation notes:	As a project development application, was scored for activities mentioned in the application but understand that these may not be actualized in the final design.
Outcomes ratings:	
<i>Equitable Transportation</i>	BEST
<i>Safe System</i>	BEST
<i>Climate Action and Resilience</i>	BEST
<i>Mobility Options</i>	BEST
<i>Thriving Environment</i>	BEST
<i>Overall</i>	BEST

Project name:	OR99E (McLoughlin Boulevard) 10th Street to Tumwata village: Shared-Use Path and Streetscape Enhancements Project Development
Applicant:	City of Oregon City
Amount requested:	\$3,832,341
Description:	Complete a Type, Size, and Location (TS&L) analysis for the construction of an externally supported shared-use path and complete design for streetscape reconfiguration on McLoughlin Boulevard, which will include widened sidewalks, curb extensions, improved crossings, and new green spaces.
Project phase(s):	Planning, Project Development
Evaluation notes:	No evaluators comments.
Outcomes ratings:	
<i>Equitable Transportation</i>	BETTER
<i>Safe System</i>	BETTER
<i>Climate Action and Resilience</i>	BETTER
<i>Mobility Options</i>	BETTER
<i>Thriving Environment</i>	BETTER
<i>Overall</i>	BETTER

Project name:	SW 175th Design: SW Condor Lane to SW Kemmer Road
Applicant:	Washington County
Amount requested:	\$2,593,196
Description:	Project development for SW 175th Avenue will include data collection, environmental studies, preliminary engineering, and right-of-way identification to realign the roadway between SW Cooper Mountain Lane and SW Siler Ridge Lane.

Project phase(s):	Project development
Evaluation notes:	No evaluators comments.
Outcomes ratings:	
<i>Equitable Transportation</i>	GOOD
<i>Safe System</i>	GOOD
<i>Climate Action and Resilience</i>	GOOD
<i>Mobility Options</i>	GOOD
<i>Thriving Environment</i>	GOOD
<i>Overall</i>	GOOD

2028 – 2030 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 – Construction Applications

(alphabetical by nominating agency)

Project name:	Beaverton Downtown Loop: SW Hall Blvd – 3rd St to 5th St
Applicant:	City of Beaverton
Amount requested:	\$4,649,687
Description:	Design and construct complete street on SW Hall Blvd between 3rd Street and 5th Street with raised cycle track, shared bike/ped or island-style bus stop, new marked crosswalks and curb ramps, upgraded signals and street lighting, new inlets and vegetated stormwater management facilities, and pavement grind and inlay.
Project phase(s):	Construction
Evaluation notes:	Would like to see more transit priority on a high capacity transit route. Would like to see more discussion of why the project scope includes more landscaping instead of more bus priority.
Outcomes ratings:	
<i>Equitable Transportation</i>	BETTER
<i>Safe System</i>	GOOD
<i>Climate Action and Resilience</i>	BETTER
<i>Mobility Options</i>	BEST
<i>Thriving Environment</i>	BETTER
<i>Design</i>	BETTER
<i>Overall</i>	BETTER

Project name:	Clackamas Industrial Area Improvements: SE Jennifer Street Multi-use Path
Applicant:	Clackamas County
Amount requested:	\$7,228,290
Description:	Design and construct new multimodal infrastructure to fill in gaps including new sidewalk segments, ADA ramps, and multi-use path. Network gaps will be filled along the northern side of SE Jennifer Street, from SE 106th Avenue to SE 122nd, a small gap along the western edge of SE 122nd Avenue, and a small gap on the southern side of SE Jennifer just west of 120th.
Project phase(s):	Construction
Evaluation notes:	Project seeks to address well documented problems and clearly demonstrates most vulnerable and lowest income residents would be served by project. Clear demonstration of community and business support. The project speed is very high and would be beneficial to pedestrian and bicycle safety to consider, but the project does aim to address safety risks for people walking and biking and the design classification of the facility will likely be updated to Industrial Street. Project only includes basic stormwater management and no green infrastructure. Concern that segment between 114 th and 120 th only has bike lane on one side.
Outcomes ratings:	

<i>Equitable Transportation</i>	BETTER
<i>Safe System</i>	GOOD
<i>Climate Action and Resilience</i>	GOOD
<i>Mobility Options</i>	BETTER
<i>Thriving Environment</i>	BEST
<i>Design</i>	BETTER
<i>Overall</i>	BETTER

Project name:	Gladstone Historic Trolley Trail Bridge Construction
Applicant:	City of Gladstone
Amount requested:	\$8,721,932
Description:	This project rebuilds the historic Trolley Trail Bridge to span the Clackamas River, connecting Gladstone to the north with Oregon City to the south.
Project phase(s):	Construction
Evaluation notes:	There was extensive involvement of a Community Advisory Committee and Technical Advisory Committee, as well as clear changes to the project design from community involvement related to the alternatives. Hits all priorities. This project does create more access to jobs and a regional center for an equity focus area by active transportation. While no local TSAP, the project provides a safe alternative to avoid two separate high injury intersections for active transportation users. Meets standards for typical rail path. Ideally would be wider and have mode separation. Meets width requirements generally, but could be better in path design and completing gaps. Portland Avenue is still missing facilities so gap not totally closed. Ideally would connect to bike facilities on the north side, to the trail to the east, or at least some on-street treatments (e.g. striping, sharrow, signage) on Clackamas Boulevard to the west or Portland Avenue to the north. Not clear on the landing designs. Identified and mitigated environmental concern, and design within constraints. Demonstrates good financial stewardship.
Outcomes ratings:	
<i>Equitable Transportation</i>	BEST
<i>Safe System</i>	BETTER
<i>Climate Action and Resilience</i>	BEST
<i>Mobility Options</i>	BETTER
<i>Thriving Environment</i>	BETTER
<i>Design</i>	BEST
<i>Overall</i>	BETTER

Project name:	NE Halsey Street Complete Street: 192nd Avenue - 201st Avenue
Applicant:	City of Gresham

Amount requested:	\$9,420,793
Description:	Construct new sidewalks and a cycle track on both sides of the street for pedestrians and bicyclists. Add center turn lane to create a 3-lane configuration and construct an enhanced mid-block crossing.
Project phase(s):	Construction
Evaluation notes:	No evaluators comments.
Outcomes ratings:	
<i>Equitable Transportation</i>	BETTER
<i>Safe System</i>	BEST
<i>Climate Action and Resilience</i>	BETTER
<i>Mobility Options</i>	BETTER
<i>Thriving Environment</i>	BETTER
<i>Design</i>	GOOD
<i>Overall</i>	BETTER

Project name:	NW Division Street Complete Street: Gresham-Fairview Trail - Birdsdale Avenue
Applicant:	City of Gresham
Amount requested:	\$4,067,496
Description:	Construct a sidewalk and a cycle track on both sides of the street to improve safety for pedestrians and bicyclists.
Project phase(s):	Construction
Evaluation notes:	Project fills critical gap. Identified in Active Transportation Plan which included equity and safety measures. Health disparities identified, including high levels of diabetes. Fills gap to improve access to transit.
Outcomes ratings:	
<i>Equitable Transportation</i>	BEST
<i>Safe System</i>	BETTER
<i>Climate Action and Resilience</i>	BEST
<i>Mobility Options</i>	GOOD
<i>Thriving Environment</i>	BETTER
<i>Design</i>	BEST
<i>Overall</i>	BEST

Project name:	OR 212/224 Sunrise Hwy Phase 2: Bike/Ped Facilities and Interchange Improvements (CON)
Applicant:	City of Happy Valley
Amount requested:	\$12,026,118
Description:	Construct bike and pedestrian facilities on south side of OR 212 and construct second southbound vehicle turn lane at intersection of OR 212/224.
Project phase(s):	Construction

Evaluation notes:	<p>Added turn lanes are predicted to reduce delay by 5 seconds, could lead to an improvement for transit mobility, increased access to various 2040 designations and access for people living in the five identified mobile home parks.</p> <p>Pedestrian and bike gaps remain on either end of project extent and no clear vision for active transportation in the corridor.</p> <p>Project may increase traffic volumes and will increase crossing width by adding turn lanes. Some of the project's bike and pedestrian elements do not have enough vertical separation for a highway facility this project is located on.</p> <p>Consideration or discussion of tradeoffs of the following design and safety features were not presented in the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • narrowing traffic lanes to add more separation • leading pedestrian interval • high visibility crosswalks <p>Lastly, the project did not indicate results of a safety audit indicating that turn lanes are the best solution to improve safety (e.g. speed could be a major factor).</p> <p>Could not find any public input specific to this project. Based on material provided and described, there appeared to be strong opposition to bike elements in general.</p>
Outcomes ratings:	
<i>Equitable Transportation</i>	BEST
<i>Safe System</i>	GOOD
<i>Climate Action and Resilience</i>	BETTER
<i>Mobility Options</i>	GOOD
<i>Thriving Environment</i>	BEST
<i>Design</i>	GOOD
<i>Overall</i>	BETTER

Project name:	Smart SW 185th Avenue ITS and Better Bus Project
Applicant:	City of Hillsboro
Amount requested:	\$4,572,738
Description:	Construction of an AI-powered interconnected traffic signal and rail controller system implementing Transit Signal Priority and constructing a Better Bus slip lane on the SW 185th Avenue and W Baseline Road intersection.
Project phase(s):	Construction
Evaluation notes:	Provided a discretionary transit point. Public involved in prioritizing corridor for improvements for Washington County Transit Study and Regional HCT Strategy. Baseline/185th identified in the TSAP and project does include one section of protected bike intersection. Project replaces existing facilities when redoing the existing curbs. While there

	are transit signal priority elements and a one-side protected bike intersection, the vast majority of this project is signal timing to reduce delay for vehicles. The bicycle facility remains substandard and the sidewalk the bare minimum. Responses to design questions and reference to design classification indicates vehicles should be accommodated but are currently prioritized. Cost is due to not making trade-offs.
Outcomes ratings:	
<i>Equitable Transportation</i>	GOOD
<i>Safe System</i>	GOOD
<i>Climate Action and Resilience</i>	BEST
<i>Mobility Options</i>	BETTER
<i>Thriving Environment</i>	BETTER
<i>Design</i>	GOOD
<i>Overall</i>	GOOD

Project name:	Westside Trail Segment 1 - King City
Applicant:	City of King City
Amount requested:	\$7,841,343
Description:	The project will construct a new multi-use path along with new street connections, pedestrian crossings, and new roundabout between the Tualatin River and Beef Bend Road. The multi-use trail construction consists of approximately 4,100 linear feet of multi-use trail, adjacent soft surface/equestrian trail. The street connections include sidewalks, raised pedestrian crossings for the multi-use trail at SW Capulet Lane, SW Fisher Road, and SW River Lane. Extend and connect roadways between SW Cordelia Terrace and SW 137th Avenue, SW Montague Way and future River Lane. Lastly construct new roundabout at intersection of SW Fischer Road, SW 137th Avenue, and SW Watson. Extend roadway from roundabout to each existing road. Construct new alignment of SW 137th Ave and SW Watson to accommodate roundabout configuration. Install permanent landscaping, signage and striping, and roadway illumination system along/for street connections and utility relocations
Project phase(s):	Construction
Evaluation notes:	Social vulnerability index disparity identifies proximity of 3 mobile home locations. Great public engagement and documentation. Project provides redundant route in event of flooding.
Outcomes ratings:	
<i>Equitable Transportation</i>	BETTER
<i>Safe System</i>	BETTER
<i>Climate Action and Resilience</i>	BETTER
<i>Mobility Options</i>	GOOD

<i>Thriving Environment</i>	GOOD
<i>Design</i>	BETTER
<i>Overall</i>	GOOD

Project name:	Outer Halsey and Outer Foster (ITS Signal Improvements)
Applicant:	Portland Bureau of Transportation
Amount requested:	\$4,416,999
Description:	The project will add ITS signal improvements along the project area. It will implement speed management timing, freight signal priority, and intelligent transportation system technology. With upgrades to signal interconnect communication and advanced transportation signal controllers, these signals will be ready for implementation of next generation transit signal priority timing.
Project phase(s):	Construction
Evaluation notes:	While transit signal priority is noted as a possible next step, these areas are not noted in the cities Enhance Transit Concept Plan (except for a segment on Foster from 82nd to 122nd). This is a vehicle improvement project that could potentially be used for transit in the future. Narrative says project came from community comments and is in RTP and Transportation System Plan (TSP). Signals are in TSP but unconstrained for outer Halsey and Foster. These projects and description in RTP are more around active transportation improvements not part of this project for the Foster portion. Intelligent Transportation Systems is focus of Halsey project. Documentation of community comments would have been helpful to provide support to either. Includes pedestrian features but not of highest design according to classification and does not include bike or transit features. Responses to design questions indicate pedestrian priority, but not bike or transit, reduces speed of vehicles but increases reliability though not focus of classification. Would've liked to know why no bike or TSP features and further discussion of tradeoffs.
Outcomes ratings:	
<i>Equitable Transportation</i>	BETTER
<i>Safe System</i>	BETTER
<i>Climate Action and Resilience</i>	GOOD
<i>Mobility Options</i>	BEST
<i>Thriving Environment</i>	BETTER
<i>Design</i>	GOOD
<i>Overall</i>	GOOD

Project name:	NE Glisan St: 82nd Avenue Multimodal Safety and Access
Applicant:	Portland Bureau of Transportation
Amount requested:	\$7,577,698
Description:	The project will reorganize travel lanes from 82nd Avenue to I-205, add new separated bicycle lanes from 80th Avenue to 102nd Avenue,

	improve bus priority approaching 82nd Avenue, and provide enhanced crossings at key intersections. The project includes enhanced crossings at 84th Avenue, 90th Avenue, and 92nd Avenue, and includes sidewalk widening from 92nd Avenue to I-205. The existing pedestrian and bike crossing at 87th Avenue will be further enhanced, and the signals at both entrances to I-205 will be modified.
Project phase(s):	Construction
Evaluation notes:	Adds buffered bike facilities, widens sidewalks, adds Business Access Transit lanes, crossings/access to transit. Part of multiple plans and priority of 82 nd Avenue coalition. Widening to optimal width, bike lanes with more separation, enhanced.
Outcomes ratings:	
<i>Equitable Transportation</i>	BEST
<i>Safe System</i>	BEST
<i>Climate Action and Resilience</i>	BEST
<i>Mobility Options</i>	BEST
<i>Thriving Environment</i>	BETTER
<i>Design</i>	BEST
<i>Overall</i>	BEST

Project name:	NE MLK Jr Blvd Safety and Access to Transit
Applicant:	Portland Bureau of Transportation
Amount requested:	\$4,879,517
Description:	New enhanced crossings and signal modifications along NE MLK Jr Blvd (NE Hancock to NE Lombard St) at key locations. In addition to enhanced pedestrian crossings, the project will improve intersection lighting.
Project phase(s):	Construction
Evaluation notes:	Safe Routes to School priority investment routes were informed by a huge engagement effort and identified by schools themselves. Project represents the value of investing in crossing improvements on high crash network for pedestrians.
Outcomes ratings:	
<i>Equitable Transportation</i>	BEST
<i>Safe System</i>	BEST
<i>Climate Action and Resilience</i>	BETTER
<i>Mobility Options</i>	BETTER
<i>Thriving Environment</i>	BEST
<i>Design</i>	BETTER
<i>Overall</i>	BEST

Project name:	NE Prescott St: 82nd Ave Multimodal Safety and Access
Applicant:	Portland Bureau of Transportation

Amount requested:	\$7,732,932
Description:	This project will redesign Prescott Street to increase crossing access, signals, and bike lanes. It implements a priority project from the Building a Better 82nd Ave Plan and supports the future 82nd Avenue FX transit project.
Project phase(s):	Construction
Evaluation notes:	Crossings, access to transit, affordable housing access are barriers addressed by project. Project is part of multiple plans and priority of 82 nd Avenue coalition. Bike up and over at transit stops supports transit efficiency and reliability by reducing bike/bus conflict. But stop redesign does not include transit signal priority.
Outcomes ratings:	
<i>Equitable Transportation</i>	BEST
<i>Safe System</i>	GOOD
<i>Climate Action and Resilience</i>	BETTER
<i>Mobility Options</i>	BETTER
<i>Thriving Environment</i>	BETTER
<i>Design</i>	BEST
<i>Overall</i>	BEST

Project name:	W Burnside Green Loop Crossing
Applicant:	Portland Bureau of Transportation
Amount requested:	\$3,938,250
Description:	The project will add a signalized crossing for pedestrians and bicyclists (and serving future Green Loop) on W Burnside Street at Park Ave to connect the North and South Park Blocks, serve food cart pod, and provide access to the Darcelle XV Plaza. Additionally, the project adds a bus and bike lane eastbound from Park Ave to 3rd Ave connecting to the Burnside Bridge, including needed modification at 4th Ave signal to enable retention of protected left turn into Old Town / Chinatown.
Project phase(s):	Construction
Evaluation notes:	No evaluators comments.
Outcomes ratings:	
<i>Equitable Transportation</i>	BETTER
<i>Safe System</i>	BEST
<i>Climate Action and Resilience</i>	GOOD
<i>Mobility Options</i>	BETTER
<i>Thriving Environment</i>	BETTER
<i>Design</i>	BETTER
<i>Overall</i>	BETTER

Project name:	Red Electric Trail East of SW Shattuck Rd
Applicant:	Portland Parks and Recreation
Amount requested:	\$7,677,446
Description:	Construction of an off-street paved regional trail between SW Shattuck Rd and SW Fairvale Ct, including street crossing at SW Shattuck Rd and safe routes to Hayhurst Elementary School and Pendleton Park in Portland.
Project phase(s):	Construction
Evaluation notes:	Identified as priority in Transportation System Plan. Makes improvements to address mobility barriers for seniors and people with disabilities. Is a safe routes to school project. Lots of public engagement.
Outcomes ratings:	
<i>Equitable Transportation</i>	GOOD
<i>Safe System</i>	BETTER
<i>Climate Action and Resilience</i>	GOOD
<i>Mobility Options</i>	GOOD
<i>Thriving Environment</i>	GOOD
<i>Design</i>	BEST
<i>Overall</i>	GOOD

Project name:	Cedar Creek/Ice Age Tonquin Trail: Roy Rogers - OR 99W
Applicant:	City of Sherwood
Amount requested:	\$8,860,030
Description:	Design and construction of a regional trail between SW Pacific Highway, SW Edy Road, and SW Roy Rogers Road.
Project phase(s):	Construction
Evaluation notes:	No evaluators comments.
Outcomes ratings:	
<i>Equitable Transportation</i>	GOOD
<i>Safe System</i>	BEST
<i>Climate Action and Resilience</i>	GOOD
<i>Mobility Options</i>	BEST
<i>Thriving Environment</i>	GOOD
<i>Design</i>	BETTER
<i>Overall</i>	GOOD

Project name:	North Dakota Street (FannoCreek) Bridge Replacement
Applicant:	City of Tigard
Amount requested:	\$8,000,000
Description:	Replace bridge with bike lanes and sidewalk.
Project phase(s):	Construction
Evaluation notes:	Demonstrated the project is in a high equity needs area, good public engagement and connects people to jobs. Considered a gap in the regional trail because it is a substandard facility and does not provide safe bike and pedestrian crossing of the trail. The project increases resilience for both seismic and flooding.
Outcomes ratings:	
<i>Equitable Transportation</i>	BEST
<i>Safe System</i>	GOOD
<i>Climate Action and Resilience</i>	BEST
<i>Mobility Options</i>	GOOD
<i>Thriving Environment</i>	BETTER
<i>Design</i>	BETTER
<i>Overall</i>	BETTER

Project name:	Bridge Crossing of Hwy. 26 by the Westside Trail
Applicant:	Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation District
Amount requested:	\$6,000,000
Description:	Construct a 12' wide multi-use trail bridge over US-26 eliminating out of direction bicycle and pedestrian routes.
Project phase(s):	Construction
Evaluation notes:	No evaluators comments.

Outcomes ratings:	RFFA
<i>Equitable Transportation</i>	BETTER
<i>Safe System</i>	BETTER
<i>Climate Action and Resilience</i>	BETTER
<i>Mobility Options</i>	BETTER
<i>Thriving Environment</i>	BETTER
<i>Design</i>	BEST
<i>Overall</i>	BETTER

Project name:	Beaverton Creek Trail: Merlo Road Improvements
Applicant:	Washington County
Amount requested:	\$6,640,700
Description:	Design and construct a multi-use trail on the south side of Merlo Road between Tualatin Nature Park and 170th Ave. to close a key gap in the Beaverton Creek Trail.
Project phase(s):	Construction
Evaluation notes:	No evaluators comments.
Outcomes ratings:	RFFA
<i>Equitable Transportation</i>	BETTER
<i>Safe System</i>	BEST
<i>Climate Action and Resilience</i>	BEST
<i>Mobility Options</i>	BEST
<i>Thriving Environment</i>	BETTER
<i>Design</i>	BEST
<i>Overall</i>	BEST

Project name:	Cedar Mill Better Bus and Access to Transit Enhancements
Applicant:	Washington County
Amount requested:	\$5,252,300
Description:	The Cedar Mill Safe Access to Priority Transit Corridors project scope includes transit signal priority improvements, enhanced pedestrian crossings, and lane reconfigurations along Cornell and Barnes roads within the Cedar Mill Town Center.
Project phase(s):	Construction
Evaluation notes:	Noted as a safety location in Beaverton SPIS. Key intersection on high injury corridor map. Positive bikes on sidewalk at that key intersection is a safety improvement. However, project not addressing bike gap; bus improvements take from bike and pedestrian facilities and removing street trees rather than vehicle lanes. Bike improvement drops cyclists into a substandard facility. Would've liked discussion on why those trade-offs were made and why the bike gap was left.
Outcomes ratings:	

<i>Equitable Transportation</i>	BETTER
<i>Safe System</i>	GOOD
<i>Climate Action and Resilience</i>	BEST
<i>Mobility Options</i>	BEST
<i>Thriving Environment</i>	BETTER
<i>Design</i>	BETTER
<i>Overall</i>	BEST

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

External Reviewers:

Lewis Lem – Port of Portland

Kate Lyman – TriMet

Metro staff:

Ted Leybold – Planning, Development and Research Department Deputy Director

Jean Senechal-Biggs – Resource Development Section Manager

Summer Blackhorse

Grace Cho

Ally Holmqvist

Monica Krueger

Gabriela Lopez

Lake Strongheart McTighe

Noel Mickelberry

Blake Perez

Eliot Rose

Sincerest appreciation for Jake Lovell for the Step 2 evaluation data collection, analysis, and data review efforts and to Jeremy Kwok-Choon, former Metro intern, for Step 2 application compilation and summaries.

If you picnic at Blue Lake or take your kids to the Oregon Zoo, enjoy symphonies at the Schnitz or auto shows at the convention center, put out your trash or drive your car – we’ve already crossed paths.

So, hello. We’re Metro – nice to meet you.

In a metropolitan area as big as Portland, we can do a lot of things better together. Join us to help the region prepare for a happy, healthy future.

Stay in touch with news, stories and things to do.

oregonmetro.gov/news

Follow oregonmetro



Metro Council President

Lynn Peterson

Metro Councilors

Ashton Simpson, District 1

Christine Lewis, District 2

Gerritt Rosenthal, District 3

Juan Carlos González, District 4

Mary Nolan, District 5

Duncan Hwang, District 6

Auditor

Brian Evans

600 NE Grand Ave. Portland,

OR 97232-2736

503-797-1700