

**Draft**

**Eugene-Springfield Area  
Transportation Improvement Program**

**FY 2002 to FY 2004**

Published by  
Lane Council of Governments  
99 East Broadway, Suite 400  
Eugene, Oregon 97401-3111

April 2003

This report was financed in part by the Oregon Department of Transportation,  
the Federal Highway Administration, and the Federal Transit Administration.



## Table of Contents

Eugene-Springfield Area Transportation Improvement Program	1	
Introduction	1	
TIP Requirements	1	
ISTEA and TEA-21 Requirements	2	
Requirements of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990	3	
Development and Modification of the TIP	4	
Project Lists	5	
Federally Funded Projects	6	
Demonstration of Financial Constraint	6	
Locally Funded Projects	8	
Effects of Transportation Management Area Status	8	
Table 1	Federal Fund Application by Year	9
Table 2	Expenditures of Federal Surface Transportation Funds	10
Table 3	Listing of Projects by Agency and Year of Expenditure	11
Table 4	FY 2002-2004 TIP Fiscal Analysis Summary	13
Appendix A	Transportation Committees of Lane Council of Governments	
Appendix B	Financial Resources	
Appendix C	Air Quality Exemptions and Regionally Significant Project Description	
Appendix D	Previous Projects Funded Through Federal Surface Transportation Program Funds	



**Eugene-Springfield Area  
Transportation Improvement Program  
FY 2002 to FY 2004**

**1.0 Introduction**

The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is a listing of transportation improvements scheduled in the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area during fiscal years 2002-2004. The TIP lists federally funded and locally funded projects that comprise construction and operational improvements anticipated by local agencies and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT).

The TIP contains a four-year listing of anticipated expenditures for locally funded projects drawn from the capital improvement programs of Eugene, Springfield, Lane County, Lane Transit District, and ODOT. In addition, the TIP lists projects for which application of specific federal funds will be made in the next four years. Priorities for the use of specific federal funds are established during development of the TIP.

TIP projects are determined by the transportation needs identified in the area's long-range transportation plan, the *Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area Transportation Plan (TransPlan)*.

By adopting the TIP, the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) has selected the projects identified in Table 1, *Federal Fund Applications by Year*, for implementation and funding as scheduled. No additional action by MPC is required for the funding of these projects. The schedule of projects utilizes all of the anticipated federal funds as quickly as possible. If additional funds become available or if a project experiences an unexpected delay, MPC may select other projects from the first three years of the schedule to take advantage of the additional funds or to replace a delayed project.

**2.0 TIP Requirements**

Federal legislation requires that Lane Council of Governments (LCOG), the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Eugene-Springfield area, in cooperation with the state and transit operators, develop a TIP that is updated and approved at least every two years by MPC and the Governor. Copies of the TIP are provided to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Specific requirements for the TIP are outlined in various implementation rules developed by FHWA, FTA, and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). This section of the TIP provides a brief explanation of these requirements.

## **2.1 ISTEA and TEA-21 Requirements**

Regulations developed to help guide the implementation of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Act of 1991 (ISTEA) and the Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21) specify several requirements:

### **Time Period**

The TIP must cover a period of not less than three years, but may cover a longer period if it identifies priorities and financial information for the additional years. As a minimum, the priority list must group the projects that are to be undertaken in each of the years. The TIP must include all federally funded projects (including pedestrian walkways, bicycle transportation facilities, and transportation enhancement projects) to be funded under Title 23 and the Federal Transit Act and regionally significant projects. In addition, the TIP must be consistent with funding that is expected to be available during the relevant period, and projects in the TIP must be consistent with the long-range transportation plan. There must be reasonable opportunity for public comment prior to approval.

### **Financial Constraint**

The TIP must be financially constrained by year and include a financial plan that demonstrates which projects can be implemented using current revenue sources and which projects are to be implemented using proposed revenue sources. Only projects for which funds are reasonably expected to be available can be included in the TIP.

### **Suballocation of Funds**

ISTEA and TEA-21 require MPOs, in cooperation with the state and transit operators, to use a method of prioritizing projects, specifically those projects using Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds. The projects with the highest priority are then included in the TIP. Federal transportation funds cannot be allocated by predetermined percentages or formulas. Toward that end, LCOG staff, working with TPC staff from local jurisdictions, has developed a set of priority projects included in the TIP. The final list of projects is adopted by the MPC.

### **Relationship Between the TIP and the STIP**

The frequency and cycle for updating the TIP must be compatible with Oregon's Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) development and approval process. After approval of the TIP by MPC and the Governor, the TIP will be included without modification directly or by reference in the STIP. The

portion of the STIP in metropolitan planning area shall be developed in cooperation with LCOG.

## 2.2 Requirements of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990

On November 15, 1990, amendments to the Clean Air Act (Act) were approved by the federal government. On June 7, 1991, the EPA and the U.S. Department of Transportation issued guidance for determining conformance of transportation programs with the Act during this interim period. On July 16, 1991, these interim guidelines were provided to the MPOs in Oregon. New, final conformity guidelines were issued in November 1991.

On March 3, 1995 the Environmental Quality Commission (EQC) adopted new rules regarding the air quality conformity of transportation plans, programs and projects to federal and state implementation plans. These new rules establish criteria and procedures for determining such conformity. The state rule mirrors, and in some instances is more stringent than, the federal rule. By meeting the state standards for purposes of demonstrating air quality conformity, the federal standards are also met.

The Eugene-Springfield Air Quality Maintenance Area (AQMA) is now in a 10-year maintenance period for carbon monoxide (CO) during which the area will have to demonstrate continued compliance with the Act. There has not been an exceedance of the CO standards since 1980. Demonstration requirements in the state rule include conformity analysis for the regional transportation plan, *TransPlan*; the TIP; and projects contained in the TIP. This conformity analysis is required to show that any additions to the transportation system do not jeopardize the region's attainment and maintenance of the air quality standards. Specifically, the state rule states that demonstration of conformity for CO be consistent with the motor vehicle emissions budget.

The Eugene-Springfield AQMA is in non-attainment for particulate matter less than 10 microns (PM<sub>10</sub>). The Eugene-Springfield PM<sub>10</sub> Statewide Implementation Program established that emissions from motor vehicles are not a significant contributing factor to overall PM<sub>10</sub> emissions and concludes that control of emissions from motor vehicles is not necessary to demonstrate attainment with the PM<sub>10</sub> standards. There has not been an exceedance of the PM<sub>10</sub> standards in this area since 1987. The Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority (LRAPA) will be applying to the federal Environmental Protection Agency for a redesignation to attainment status for PM<sub>10</sub> once the legal challenge at the national level to the new federal air quality standards is resolved and the redesignation process is defined. EPA has approved and concurred that Plan and TIP conformity determinations for PM<sub>10</sub> are not required.

Conformity Analysis has been prepared on the FY 2002-2004 TIP. The results are as follows:

**Carbon Monoxide Emissions Analysis  
Central Area Transportation Study Boundary  
and TIP FY 02-04 Projects**

<i><b>Analysis Year</b></i>	<i><b>Tons/Year of Carbon Monoxide</b></i>	
	<i><b>Emissions Budget</b></i>	<i><b>Projected Emissions</b></i>
<b>1990</b>	*6021.0	
<b>2001</b>	**4517.0	2402
<b>2004</b>	" "	2275

\*1990 base year that was in attainment with the standard set forth in the Federal Register, Vol. 58, No. 232, Page 64163, December 6, 1993.

\*\*Established emissions budget based on Table 3 of the Eugene-Springfield AQMA, Request for Change in Attainment Status for Carbon Monoxide (CO), June 6, 1988.

Regional emissions analysis is required on regionally significant projects (See Table 3 and Appendix C) located within the Central Area Transportation Study (CATS) boundary. The CATS area encompasses the greater downtown Eugene area and is bounded by 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue on the north, 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue on the south, Lincoln Street on the west, and Walnut Street on the east. EPA has determined that the nature of the CO problem in the Eugene-Springfield area is limited to the CATS boundary. All transportation projects within the Eugene-Springfield AQMA are subject to the “project-level conformity” requirements.

**3.0 Development and Modification of the TIP**

The Eugene-Springfield area TIP is developed by the TPC, which is responsible for most of the technical details of the transportation planning process. The TPC assembled the TIP from the adopted capital improvement programs (CIPs) of the participating agencies.

The TPC recommends the TIP to the MPC for review and adoption. MPC, which is composed of elected or appointed officials from Eugene, Springfield, Lane County, Lane Transit District, and ODOT, conducts a public hearing and adopts the TIP on behalf of LCOG. (Membership of the TPC and the MPC is shown in Appendix A.)

The TIP may be modified by the Transportation Planning Committee and the Metropolitan Policy Committee. Deletions of local projects from the program which are provided for information purposes, moving projects from one year to another year in the TIP period or cost estimate revisions are considered to be administrative and may be made by TPC. Proposals for additions or deletions of regionally significant or federally funded projects must be approved by MPC.

#### 4.0 FY02-04 TIP Project Lists

Four tables are presented in this document. Tables 1 and 2 present lists of federally funded projects.

Table 3 lists the year of expenditure for both locally funded and federally funded projects. Table 3 lists the local projects that are consistent with *TransPlan* policy and local projects that implement *TransPlan*. Table 3 also indicates if the project is included in the regional emissions analysis for purposes of air quality conformity. Local projects that are designated *exempt* are exempt from regional emissions under the Oregon Conformity Rulings (see Appendix C). Local projects that are designated *not required* are projects considered for regional emissions analysis and are not included because the project itself is not considered to be a *regionally significant* project or is outside of the carbon monoxide maintenance area. The TPC, as the standing committee for air quality under the Oregon Conformity Rulings, has established criteria for determining regionally significant projects (see Appendix C).

Table 4 provides a summary of the demonstration of financial constraint. Financial constraint is described in more detail in Section 4.3.

In Tables 1, 2 and 3, projects are divided according to jurisdiction and fiscal year. Table 1 indicates the year of application for federally funded projects only. Projects funded in the FY 2000-2003 TIP but have not completed construction are included for information purposes only. No further action is required of MPC.

Individual projects vary enough that their descriptions are necessarily general. For street projects, all are assumed to be urban cross-section with curb, gutter, underground drainage, and sidewalks, unless otherwise noted. When provisions for bicycles are anticipated, they are specifically mentioned.

*Total* and *federal cost* columns indicate the costs for engineering, right-of-way acquisition, and actual construction, or whatever the project description indicates. Costs are only estimates, although some are more refined than others.

*Funding source* refers to the agencies expected to participate in the project. In some cases, funding agreements have not yet been finalized so agencies listed will not necessarily participate in the project listed. Note that for federally funded projects, more detail is provided in Table 1 than Table 3.

Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County have remonstrance clauses in their charters that may allow property owners to object to assessments on some types of street projects. Thus, anticipated assessments on some projects may not materialize.

The *TransPlan project number* provides an indication of the consistency of the project with the long-range plan. A number indicates that the project was specifically identified

in *TransPlan* and corresponds to its project number. Numbers preceded by letters indicate that the project was not specifically identified in *TransPlan*, but that *TransPlan* policy indicated by that letter-number combination provides primary justification for the project.

The Project Map merely provides a map of project locations. Primarily larger construction projects at a specific location are identified on the map, most transit projects, landscaping, right-of-way acquisition, and preliminary engineering aspects are not pinpointed on the map.

#### **4.1 Federally Funded Projects**

Table 1, *Federal Fund Applications by Year*, lists projects for which local agencies will be applying for certain categories of federal funds in the next four years. Table 1 is divided into years corresponding with the year in which application for funds will be made. The first year is the *FY 2002 Annual Element*, which indicates projects for which application for federal grants will be made between October 1, 2001 and September 30, 2002.

Table 1 also indicates the project description, implementing agency, year of expenditure, federal cost, total cost, and the category of federal funds. The federal funds come from two agencies: the FTA and the FHWA. An explanation of the different funding categories is included in Appendix C.

Table 2 indicates the metropolitan area's priorities for the expenditure of STP funds. The Eugene-Springfield area's STP funds are made available from ODOT. Appendix D provides a list of projects previously funded through local discretion federal aid programs.

Ten percent of the STP funds are dedicated to transportation-enhancement activities. Enhancement projects, such as water pollution control, scenic beautification, pedestrian, and bicycle projects, must go beyond what is customarily provided as environmental mitigation for road projects. Enhancement projects are submitted to ODOT as part of the metropolitan planning process. Enhancement projects will be added to the TIP when they become available.

#### **4.2 Demonstration of Financial Constraint**

As indicated earlier, ISTEA and TEA-21 require that the TIP be financially constrained by year. Specifically:

“The TIP shall be financially constrained by year and include a financial plan that demonstrates which projects can be implemented using current revenue sources and which projects are to be implemented using proposed revenue sources”

The financial plan must be developed by LCOG in cooperation with the state and the transit operator. ODOT and the Lane Transit District must provide LCOG with estimates of available federal and state funds, which LCOG must utilize in developing financial plans. Only projects for which construction and operating funds can reasonably be expected to be available may be included. Projects in the first two years of the TIP must be limited to those for which funds are available or committed. In the case of new funding sources, strategies for ensuring their availability must be identified. In developing the financial analysis, LCOG must take into account all projects and strategies funded under title 23, U.S.C., the Federal Transit Act, other federal funds, local sources, state assistance, and private participation.

Table 4 provides a summary of the financial analysis and demonstrates that the TIP is financially constrained. All revenue sources listed are current sources. Revenues in the first two years are committed, as programmed in the capital improvement programs of the local and state jurisdictions. All costs, including capital, operations and maintenance, and preservation are considered.

Meanings of the abbreviations are as follows:

A	Assessment of adjacent property owners
D	Private Developer
E	City of Eugene
F	Federal Funding
FD	Federal Demonstration Funds
HBR	Highway Bridge Replacement Funds
HCB	High Cost Bridge Projects
HES	Hazard Elimination
IOF	Immediate Opportunity Funds
LC	Lane County
LCOG	Lane Council of Governments
LTD	Lane Transit District
O	Oregon Department of Transportation
OTIA	Oregon Transportation Investment Fund (HB 2142)
RRP	Rail-Highway Protection (off-system)
RRS	Rail-Highway Protection (on-system)
S	City of Springfield
S5303	Federal Transit Act (FTA), Metropolitan Planning Program
S5309	Federal Transit Act (FTA), Capital Program
S5310	Federal Transit Act (FTA), Elderly and Persons with Disabilities
SBR	Special Bridge Replacement
SDC	System Development Charge
STF	Special Transportation Fund
STP	Surface Transportation Program Funding
STP(E)	Surface Transportation Program Enhancement Funding
TEA-21	Transportation Equity Act for the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century
TSM	Federal Transportation Systems Management Grants

### **4.3 Locally Funded Projects**

Each metropolitan area has the option of including other projects (projects not applying for federal funds) in the TIP. For purposes of providing comprehensive information for the Eugene-Springfield area, an attempt has been made to include all major transportation projects in Table 3, *Listing of Projects by Agency and Year of Expenditure*. Improvements to minor streets and maintenance activities were excluded.

The projects listed in Table 3 of the TIP are based upon the following CIPs and STIP:

- Eugene's CIP for FY 2002-2007, adopted in February 2001;
- Lane County Public Works' CIP for FY 2002-2006, adopted August 2001;
- Lane Transit District's CIP for FY 2002-2006, adopted March 2001;
- Springfield's CIP for FY 2001-2006, adopted in February 2001;
- ODOT's STIP for FY 2002-2005, scheduled for adoption January 2002.

Note that some projects included in Table 3, are also shown in Table 1. However, since the year of application for federal funds is not always the year of expenditure, the projects may not be listed in the same year in both tables.

### **4.4 Effects of Transportation Management Area Status**

LCOG is expected to be notified in October 2002 by the U.S. Department of Transportation that the Eugene-Springfield area has been designated a Transportation Management Area (TMA). The TIP process will change as a result of this designation.

The changes will include:

1. A significant increase in local discretion STP funds, possibly doubling the current allocation;
2. Direct allocation to LCOG as the area's MPO (rather than through ODOT) and,
3. Process for allocation of local STP funds may require changes to be consistent with federal regulations.

chart

table 1

chart

table 2

chart

table 3...

chart

table 3 continued

chart

table 4

