4. FUNDING STRATEGY

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents a short discussion of key funding sources that could be used to implement the recommendations in the *Woodland Transportation Infrastructure Strategic Plan (TISP)*. Funding for the capital improvements program identified in Chapter 3 will likely come from a combination of federal and state grants and loans, and from city and private sources. The projects in the TISP will need to compete with other projects at a state and regional level to establish priorities and secure resources. A strategic plan for obtaining these resources is outlined in Chapter 5.

The City depends heavily on federal and state grants to fund its capital improvements. The various grant sources are complicated by the array of federal programs earmarked for special transportation purposes, and the process and further delineation of program purposes by the state agencies responsible for transportation funding. The complexity of funding is not likely to be reduced and the array of programs is likely to change as priorities for transportation purposes change.

The remainder of this chapter identifies various funding programs for which the Woodland TSIP project could be eligible, discusses criteria used by these funding programs to identify priorities and award grants, and pairs the Woodland TISP projects with a variety of potential revenue sources.

4.2 OVERVIEW OF FUNDING CRITERIA

The following is a short discussion of the criteria used by funding programs to prioritize competitive projects and identify the best candidates for financial awards. Included in the discussion is the concept of "fundability", eligibility of projects for awards, and the timing of award programs.

"Fundability"

A project's "fundability" is a combination of factors that determine whether (and when) a project can receive an award of financial resources.

Eligibility

Each funding source has a set of eligibility criteria that must be met for a project to qualify for funding. These criteria range from congestion to safety, connectivity, and economic benefit. The characteristics of each project determine the specific funding for which it is eligible. Many projects qualify for funding from multiple sources.

Timing

Project-specific timelines for obtaining funding and the start of project construction cannot be accurately projected. The availability of funds and complex multi-source funding of the various projects are primary factors in determining whether and when projects will be funded. For example, projects eligible for funding from multiple sources will go through a separate funding process for each.

Projects themselves may also dictate the timing of funding. A single project may be divided into phases that may or may not be funded simultaneously. Multiple projects on a capital improvements list can also be interdependent—i.e., completion of one project may be

necessary before construction of another can begin. In addition, the hierarchy of need on a prioritized list may change several times before a project is finally funded.

4.3 FUNDING SOURCES

Most of the Recommended Improvements meet eligibility criteria for multiple funding sources. Funding sources, the type of projects funded, and the eligible Recommended Projects are discussed below. Funding sources that do not qualify for these projects are not included in this discussion.

4.3.1 Federal Funding

Federal grants for local transportation improvements are available from the Federal government primarily through the Surface Transportation Program (STP), although other funding programs are available. Typically, funding is provided through the STP for projects on any Federal-aid highway, bridge projects on any public road, transit capital projects, and intracity/intercity bus terminals and facilities. Eligible entities include states, counties, cities, and transit authorities. Funding programs are administered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and the U.S. Economic Development Administration (EDA).

Federal pass-through monies for highway improvements are given to WSDOT for distribution through four State entities—the Transportation Improvement Board (TIB), Public Works Board (PWB), Community Economic Revitalization Board (CERB), and the Department of Community Trade and Economic Development (CTED).

4.3.2 State Funding

Legislative Appropriations

Legislative transportation appropriations for Local Programs (Program Z) and Highway Improvements (Program I) are funded by federal grants, state revenues and the proceeds of bond sales and a number of other minor sources. The funds distributed to a city the size of Woodland are a small percentage of the total amount of funds available; therefore, Woodland would likely receive grants from these programs only once every several years.

Loan Programs

Public Works Board (PWB)

The Public Works Board administers four loan programs for transportation projects, and the Recommended Improvements are eligible for two of these.

- *Trust Fund Pre-Construction Loan*. This low-interest loan pays for the pre-construction phase of facilities projects—final engineering, land acquisition, and financing.

  Eligible Uses: Pre-construction activities such as final engineering, land acquisition and financing.

  Eligible CIP Projects: All projects.

- *Trust Fund Construction Loan*. This low-interest revolving loan allows local governments to finance critical facilities projects such as road repair, replacement and improvements. Interest rates typically range from 0.5% to 2% depending on local match.

Eligible Uses: Construction of critical facilities, including replacement, improvements and road repair.

Eligible CIP Projects: All projects.

Grant Programs

Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board (FMSIB)

- *Freight and Rail Infrastructure Improvements.* This program is for capital improvements related to railways. The qualifying factor for the Woodland rail-related project is the reduction in impacts to the community that would be affected by increased rail traffic. Since significant increases in rail traffic are anticipated along the BNSF mainline, this program may provide a source of funding. Another qualifying factor is tonnage of freight movement affected.

  Eligible Uses: Mitigation of increased rail traffic on communities.

  Eligible CIP Projects:

  - Scott Crossing, Segment 1

Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)

- *STP Hazard Elimination Safety.*

  Eligible Uses: Safety improvements in hazardous areas that eliminate or reduce motor vehicle casualties and danger to pedestrians and bicyclists.

  Eligible CIP Projects:

  - I-5/SR 503 interchange area
  - Scott Crossing, Segment 1
  - Scott Crossing, Segment 2
  - Scott Crossing, Segment 3
  - SR 503, Goerig Street to Evergreen Lane

- *STP Railway / Highway Crossings.* Funding for railroad grade-separation improvements is available from Railway-Highway Grade Crossing Program. This program is intended to reduce the number of fatalities and injuries at public highway rail grade crossings through the elimination of hazards and/or the installation/upgrade of protective devices at railway/highway crossings.

  Eligible Uses: Railroad and highway safety improvements, including new crossings. Federal participation is 90 percent with a 10 percent local match.

  Eligible CIP Projects:

  - Scott Crossing, Segment 1

- *Local Government Traffic Engineering Services.* These grants focus on safety problem areas, signing/signal application, and flow problems. For example, they provide assistance with microcomputer application programs for signalization.

  Eligible Uses: Intersection improvements.

  Eligible CIP Projects:

  - Dike Road/Schurman Way roundabout
  - I-5 / SR-503 interchange vicinity
  - Scott Crossing, Segment 3
  - SR 503, Goerig Street to Evergreen Lane

Transportation Improvement Board (TIB)

The Transportation Improvement Board (TIB) provides the local match for federal grants through the following programs.

- *Urban Arterial Program (UAP).* The UAP receives a portion of the 1.7 cents distributed into the Urban Arterial Trust Account from the state's Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax.

  Eligible Uses: Development and improvement of arterials.

  Eligible CIP Projects:

  - Dike Road/Schurman Way roundabout
  - I-5 / SR-503 interchange vicinity
  - Scott Avenue Crossing, Segment 1
  - Scott Avenue Crossing, Segment 2

- *Urban Corridor Program (UCP).* UCP projects are typically larger and often cross jurisdictional boundaries, requiring a great deal of coordination. TIB provides grants for roadway projects that increase mobility, support economic development and provide environmentally responsive solutions.

  Eligible Uses: Large projects that expand capacity and support economic development.

  Eligible CIP Projects:

  - Dike Road/Schurman Way roundabout
  - Scott Avenue Crossing, Segment 1
  - Scott Avenue Crossing, Segment 2
  - SR-503, Goerig Street to Evergreen Lane

- *Urban Sidewalk Program (USP).* Funds for the Urban Sidewalk Program are shared with the Small City Program. Grants fund sidewalk projects that improve safety and connectivity.

  Eligible Uses: Pedestrian and bicycle safety and connectivity.

  Eligible CIP Projects:

  - I-5 / SR-503 interchange vicinity
  - Scott Avenue at Old Pacific Highway
  - SR-503, Goerig Street to Evergreen Lane

Community Trade and Economic Development Department (CTED)

The Community Trade and Economic Development Department administers Community Development Block Grants (CDBG).

- General Purpose. General Purpose grants fund infrastructure projects that benefit low and moderate income communities.

  Eligible Uses: Streets and sidewalks.

  Eligible CIP Projects:

  - Dike Road/Schurman Way roundabout
  - I-5 / SR-503 interchange vicinity
  - Scott Avenue, Segment 1
  - Scott Avenue, Segment 2
  - SR-503, Goerig Street to Evergreen Lane

4.3.3 Regional Funding

Community Economic Revitalization Board (CERB)

- *Local Infrastructure Finance Tool (LIFT).* This funding tool is dependent on formation of a Transportation Benefit District, as described in Section 5.3. TBDs are independent taxing districts that provide local governments the option of imposing voter-approved taxes and fees to fund transportation improvements. The maximum award per project is $1,000,000 per year for up to 25 years.

  Eligible Use: Payment on GO bond debt for infrastructure improvements within the TBD that address existing or future congestion levels.

  Eligible CIP Projects: All GO bond-financed projects within a TBD that address congestion and capacity.

4.3.4 Local Funding

Transportation Impact Fees (TIF)

The City could become partners with private developers by adopting Traffic Impact Fees (TIFs) to increase funding of capital improvements. Presently, the City of Woodland does not have a TIF, though it does assess fees for sewer, water, parks, schools, police, and fire.

TIFs would impose a charge on any new real estate development that increases traffic flow, including expansion of existing uses and conversion of a building use from a use with low-traffic intensity to higher intensity (e.g., a professional office building converted to a drive-through bank). Under Washington law, the City would need to develop a methodology that justifies the amount and application of the TIF and adopt it by ordinance.

The fee must be reasonably related to new development and proportional to the impact of new development on the transportation system. The revenues can be spent only for the transportation purposes they were collected for, and cannot be used for improvements that remediate an existing deficiency. The money must be spent in a reasonable amount of time and cannot be used for operations and maintenance.

Since Woodland is growing, a TIF could produce significant revenue to use as a match for larger grants.

Eligible Uses: Capital improvements.

Eligible CIP Projects: New private development.

Land-owner Financing – Latecomer Agreements & Local Improvement Districts (LID)

Latecomer Agreements

Some of the roadway improvements or portion of them may be financed by either requiring land owners (or prospective developers) to pay for the improvements. If a single developer pays the entire cost of building a project that will benefit a number of nearby vacant properties, the City may be able to enter into a Latecomer Agreement with the developer (and affected land owners), collect a proportionate fee from the affected properties when they develop, and credit the money back to the original developer.

Agreements of this nature are few because the original development must be large enough to afford the original investment in roadways, and to be able to front the money for the construction. The affected parties—the City, developer, and owners of the nearby property—must agree on a formula to distribute the cost of the roadway to all of the parties.

Local Improvement Districts (LID)

Another means of obtaining funds for improvements is to establish a local improvement district (LID). The property owners who benefit from the improvements ask to borrow money from the City to build the project. As a condition, the City would obtain an agreement from the affected property owners to repay the loan, associated interest and administrative costs over the next 10 years. In both scenarios, properties that benefit from the transportation improvement pay for it. In either of these methods, those properties that benefit from the transportation improvement pay for it.

General Obligation Bonds

Within its bonding limitations, the City can issue general obligation (GO) bonds to construct transportation improvements and repay the bonds with special property tax assessments. It can issue two types of GO bonds—non-voted and voted.

Non-voted bonds do not require a vote of the electorate, but the amount of the outstanding bonds is limited to 1.5% of the City's assessed value. The City may not assess additional property taxes to repay these bonds. It has to use its general property tax revenues; therefore, by issuing bonds it reduces the amount of cash available annually for other city uses.

In 2007, the City's Assessed Value is $449,287,628, so the maximum bonds it could issue would be $6,739,314 for non-voted bonds and $4,492,876 for voted bonds, as shown in Table 4-1. This limitation applies to all uses of GO bonds issued by the City.

Table 4-1 General Obligation Bonding Limits

Type of GO Bond	Assessed Value 2007	Tax Limit	GO Limit	Outstanding	Balance
Non-Vote	$449,287,628	1.50%	$6,739,314	($955,674)	$5,783,640
Vote	$449,287,628	1.00%	4,492,876		4,492,876
Total		2.50%	$11,232,191	($955,674)	$10,276,517

The City has $955,674 outstanding in non-voted bonds as of December 31, 2006. This year the remaining bond capacity is approximately $10.3 million. As the City repays current bonds and as the assessed value increases, the bonding limit in dollars also increases.

Eligible Uses: Capital improvements.

Eligible CIP Projects: All projects.

4.3.5 Other Funding

In additional to federal and state funding available for roadway improvements related to railroad crossing protection and/or grade-separation, funding may also be secured from BNSF to design and construct the Scott Avenue railroad overcrossing improvement (Segment 1). Under federal administrative requirements railroads are obligated to provide a minimum 5 percent contribution for projects involving the elimination of existing grade crossings where active warning devices are in place or where an improvement project is to be installed by a State regulatory agency.[2] Active warning devices in the form of gates, lights and bells are currently in place at the existing Scott Avenue grade crossing.

[2] Telephone conversation with Kirk Fredrickson, WSDOT Rail Office, December 9, 2008.

5. IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

This chapter outlines a strategy for implementing the projects identified in the *Woodland Transportation Infrastructure Strategic Plan (TISP)* including both the pursuit of funding and the development of individual projects from engineering concepts through construction. Included in the chapter is:

- A project implementation timeline based on the general phasing of recommendations presented in Chapter 3 in Capital Improvements Program.
- An Action Plan that outlines recommended activities for the first three years after plan adoption. This Action Plan is a three-year, renewable or rolling short-term strategy that can be regularly monitored for progress and updated as tasks are completed.
- A discussion of actions necessary to establish a Transportation Benefit District (TBD) to include the study area. The ability to form TBD's was granted in 2007 by the Washington State Legislature for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, improving, providing, and funding transportation improvements within the TBD.
- Highlights of a suggested on-going public involvement strategy to both provide public input on the Action Plan and project development as they are implemented, and to maintain on-going support of and interest in the recommendations of the *TISP*.

5.1 OVERVIEW OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

Key activities that must occur to develop any transportation infrastructure project are dependent on the availability of funding and typically include:

- Secure funding and conduct refinement planning and preliminary engineering to address in far greater detail issues that could not be address or resolved at the level of detail for a strategic plan such as the TSIP
- Conduct final engineering to prepare construction bid documents based on the "Basis of Design" established during preliminary engineering.
- Conduct permitting and environmental scoping activities that would also be based on detailed, project-specific requirements as determined through the refinement planning and preliminary engineering process. Examples might include identification of specific locations and conditions of hazardous materials sites that must be addressed or avoided during construction, or permitting and mitigation for potential wetlands impacts should it not be possible to avoid these.
- Secure funding for right-of-way acquisition (where necessary) and construction.
- Undertake bidding and construction activities including engineering oversight and management to ensure successful project delivery.

The general order and priority of project implementation is identified and discussed in Chapter 3 under the Capital Improvements Program. The priority list of projects is briefly summarized below to give structure, focus and direction to the discussion of a project implementation strategy. It should be noted, however, that should funding become available for projects out of sequence with the list, nothing in the Woodland TISP should preclude such implementation.

- Phase I - Short term (1 – 5 years):
  - Dike Road at Schurman Way (this project could be constructed as part of the reconstruction of Schurman Way for which the City is seeking short-term funding to replace failing roadway sections)
  - Scott Avenue Crossing (Segment 2 including the I-5 undercrossing at grade and Segment 3 including the improvement of the intersection of Scott Avenue with Old Pacific Highway)
  - SR 503 interim improvement from Hillshire Drive to Gun Club Road (funded by WSDOT earmark)
  - Improvement to the I-5 interchange at Dike Road to provide two single lane roundabouts (funded by Wal-Mart mitigation)
- Phase II - Mid term (5 – 10 years)

o Scott Avenue Crossing (Complete project if segments 1 and 3 are not implemented during the short-term, or implement Segment 1 including overcrossing of BNSF)

o Pekin Road extension under Scott to connect with Port Way

o SR-503 Hillshire Drive to Evergreen Lane (full width improvement building on the interim project constructed during the short-term)

o SR-503 at Goerig Street and Scott Avenue (these intersection improvements should be done at the same time as the ultimate SR 503 widening project.).

- Phase III - Long term (10 – 20 years)

o I-5/SR-503 Interchange and vicinity

5.2 ACTION PLAN

As noted above, the Woodland TISP Action Plan is intended to identify specific activities and agency responsibilities for moving the TISP's recommendations forward towards implementation. The focus of the Action Plan is on the first three years after adoption of the TSIP and includes the activities needed to move early projects towards construction, while setting the stage for ultimate implementation of longer-term projects. This action plan should be monitored and updated annually by dropping off activities from the first year that have been completed and adding activities that need to be addressed in the new third year. An assignment of implementation responsibilities with supporting budgets should be included with the Action Plan as it is regularly updated to ensure that its proscribed actions are successfully carried out.

5.2.1 Year One Activities

Year one activities assume adoption of the Woodland TISP in October of 2008. Activities to be undertaken during the first year from November 2008 to October 2009 would include the following:

1. Identify project champions and advocates, and determine resources available to advance project implementation.
   - Project champions – Principally responsible for the delivery of the implementation plan, leading lobbying efforts, and leading public communication efforts. Champions should include: the City of Woodland, Cowlitz County, and

the CW-COG. (Note: this list could expand to include other jurisdictions, if they join the TBD governing board).

- Project advocates – Assist the champions in lobbying efforts and public communication efforts. Advocates could include: the economic development council, chambers of commerce, school district, port districts, other cities, businesses, hospitals, unions, and other community organizations.
- Project resources – Assist project champions in updating plans, reviewing timelines, revising cost estimates, research, etc. Resources could include: City and County transportation staff, WSDOT staff, FHWA staff, BNSF staff, environmental agency regulatory staff, etc.

2. Get the recommendations of the TSIP on the Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO)'s list of regionally-approved transportation improvement projects.

   Most transportation infrastructure projects of a magnitude similar to those identified in the Woodland TISP are likely to be funded only if they are included in a regional or state prioritized list that is reviewed and updated frequently by the appropriate agencies. The jurisdictions involved in this effort need to meet with representatives of the RTPO (the Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Council of Governments) and ensure that the projects are included on the list of priority projects for the RTPO region. Should jurisdictions decide to form a Transportation Benefit District (TBD), projects outlined in the TBD must be on the regional or state priority list in order to be funded through the TBD. More information about the TBD process is provided later in this chapter.

3. Establish a Transportation Benefit District.

4. Develop a Legislative approach focused on both state and federal legislators and key staff.

   The legislative process for state and federal entities typically runs simultaneously in order to line up funding from all parties at the appropriate time. The easy part is making the case for funding transportation projects to the legislators and their key staff members (legislative director, transportation legislative assistant, and local field staff). Tracking the appropriations process and continually maintaining a relationship with the legislators and their staff to ensure that the projects survive the committee appropriations mark up process presents more of a challenge. Briefly stated: "Showing up is half the battle". Just as the squeaky wheel tends to be the one that gets fixed, the appropriations legislators pay attention to projects they have heard about more than once and from more than one entity. A city advocating for its project is one thing, but when the legislators meet with councils of governments, economic development councils, chambers of commerce, employers, health care institutions, emergency responders, schools, community groups, unions, etc. and they are all mentioning that they too support the city's project, it makes it much easier for the legislators to support it too because the project has such a broad support base.

   - <u>Development of lobbying timelines and designation of target state legislators</u>

     Each year, state legislators have approximately two to five months to accomplish the business of the State of Washington. While they are in session in Olympia, groups typically do not receive more than fifteen to thirty minutes to meet with their legislator and the legislator's staff. This is why it is important to begin meeting with legislators and their staffs much earlier to advocate funding of a

specific project. To maximize the use of time, schedule appointments with multiple legislators (who are on committees of relevant jurisdiction) in a single day and try to schedule a joint visit with the two representatives and senator who represent the primary district where the project(s) will be constructed. The steps outlined below under "Timeline of Activities" are recommended to garner support for project funding from state legislators:

- Development of lobbying timelines and designation of target federal legislators

  The steps to lobbying federal legislators are very similar to state legislators but the timelines are slightly different. Federal legislators are in session most of the year, however they are given significant breaks, particularly in late July, throughout August, and over the Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays. While it is rare to get more than fifteen to thirty minutes to meet with the federal legislators in Washington, DC, while they are in district a typical meeting lasts approximately one hour. Meetings can be extended if special tours or other circumstances require additional time. This is why it is important to touch bases with the local field staff and district scheduler to get on the radar screen as soon as possible. Meeting with federal legislators requires that field staff prepare a briefing memorandum for each district meeting. The more information provided on the front end to the local field staff about the purpose of the meeting, the meeting format, who will be attending, what the federal legislator will be expected to do or speak about, if special attire is needed, etc. the more favorable the field staff views the project because it makes filling out the briefing memorandum much easier. The steps outlined below under "Timeline of Activities" are recommended to garner support for project funding from the federal legislators:

Timeline of Activities:

August through September 2008

1. Given the timing, it may not be possible to schedule a meeting with the federal delegation at this time. However, it will be important to touch bases with the local field staff to discuss the project(s) and get the requests on their radar screen.
2. Contact the transportation legislative assistants for each of the federal legislators in the Washington, DC offices and request appropriation application forms or find out if there are any forms needed to fill out to assist in making a formal request for a transportation appropriation.

October through December 2008

1. Project champions should schedule meetings with the two state representatives and the senator who represents the district. Since these meetings will be held in the district and not during session, the legislators typically have more time and can meet for one to two hours at a time. To maximize use of time, it may be wise to schedule a joint meeting with the district legislators and the Governor's Southwest Washington Liaison Officer to familiarize them with the project history, priorities, costs, etc. and to ask for input on persons to target for lobbying during the legislative session, as well as any other tips they may have for working the project through the system. Consider scheduling a bus tour of the proposed project areas so the legislators can see the conditions on the ground. Invite project advocates to accompany the bus tour. Also, encourage project advocates to mention support for the project when they meet with the legislators throughout the year as well and provide the advocates with lobbying materials for their meetings too.

2. Typically the federal appropriations showdown occurs between October and December each year. At the conclusion of the session, federal legislators return to their respective districts to report on the achievements of the Congress to their constituents. Project education of the state legislators, business and other community members should be occurring so that as they meet with federal legislators during this time, they can also indicate support for the project(s) as advocates. The project partners, TBD governing body, and others will be trying to schedule a joint meeting with the district legislators and the Governor's Southwest Washington Liaison Officer to familiarize them with the project history, priorities, costs, etc. and to ask for their input on who to target for lobbying during session and any other tips they may have for working the project through the system. They will also be trying to schedule a bus tour of the proposed project areas so the legislators can see the conditions on the ground. Invite the federal legislators to accompany the bus tour. However, it is more likely the federal legislator may choose to wait until August recess to attend a tour.

January 2009

1. Submit formal request for funding of the transportation project(s) and schedule appointments to visit with key legislators on the transportation, capital budget, and economic development committees in Olympia. If the two representatives and senator who represent the district in which the project(s) will be constructed are not also on the committees of jurisdiction, then schedule appointments or a joint meeting with them. They may be able to work through their caucus if they are not on the appropriate committee to help get attention paid to the projects by the other committee members.
2. Submit drafts of the formal appropriations requests to the local field staff and the transportation legislative assistant for the federal legislators and request assistance in "polishing" the request - it aids in getting the staff thoroughly grounded in the project(s) and also helps instill a small sense of ownership of the request.

February and March 2009

1. Project champions should schedule meetings in Olympia with the legislators and staff from throughout Southwest Washington. Also, meet with the Governor's Southwest Washington Liaison Officer to reiterate the importance of the project(s) and update the Liaison Officer on the status of the request and lobbying efforts to date. Again, encourage project advocates to mention support for the project when they meet with the legislators as well and provide the advocates with lobbying materials too.
2. During February, submit a formal appropriations request to the legislative director, transportation legislative assistant and the local field staff of the federal legislators. Set an appointment with the Washington State federal delegation to meet with them in Washington, DC. Those who make the effort to show up in person or have a lobbyist that shows up in person in Washington, DC, have a stronger chance of receiving appropriations. When scheduling the appointment, ask the staff to assist in identifying additional key federal legislators on the committees of jurisdiction to also meet with while project champions are in Washington, DC.

March or April 2009

1. Project champions should meet in Washington, DC with the Washington State federal delegation and other key legislators and/or the senior staff - legislative director and transportation legislative assistant to make the fifteen minute strong

pitch for inclusion of the project(s) in the appropriations bill. Leave the one-page lobbying piece for the staff – they will refer back to it as needed and it will have contact information on it if they need to ask follow up questions.

April and May 2009

1. If the State Legislative session is long, contact the staff of the key legislators and the district legislators every two weeks by phone or email to ensure the project has not fallen off the radar screen and to get any updates from them on the appropriations process and committee mark up results. Assuming the project survives the process and ends up in the appropriations bill, contact the Governor's Southwest Washington Liaison Officer to encourage the Governor to sign the bill. Find out when the bill signing will take place and make every effort to be there to show support for the passage of the bill and to personally thank the Governor and the legislators for their help in securing the funding, but also to remind them that this is a phased project and that additional funding will be needed to complete future phases. Attend any post-legislative session meetings with the district legislators when they return to their district to update constituents on the successes and failures of the legislative session. Be sure to publicly thank the district legislators for their efforts and remind the district legislators as well as the public that this is a phased project and that additional funding will be needed to complete future phases.

May to June 2009

1. Contact the transportation legislative assistants from the federal delegation and check in at regular intervals (about every three to four weeks) on the progress of inclusion of the requests in the appropriations bill. Let the staff know the outcome of the state legislative appropriations process, especially if a project requires both state and federal funding and the state funding is passed. In June, submit a request for a meeting with the federal legislator over the August recess to the local field staff and district scheduler for the federal legislators and meet with them during August recess.

June and July 2009

1. Debrief the successes and failures of the state appropriations process amongst the project champions, TBD governing body, and other appropriate agencies to review the plan, update the lobbying materials, and to outline steps needed to increase likelihood of success.

July to August 2009

1. August recess is typically the best time meet with federal legislators. To maximize use of time, it may be wise to schedule a joint meeting with the federal legislators and invite the state district legislators and the Governor's Southwest Washington Liaison Officer to meet to familiarize them with the project history, priorities, costs, etc. and to show strong state support for the project(s). Consider scheduling a bus tour of the proposed project areas so the federal and state legislators can see the conditions on the ground. Some state legislators may miss this opportunity but would appreciate a tour later. Invite project advocates to accompany the bus tour. Also, encourage project advocates to mention support for the project when they meet with the federal legislators throughout the year as well and provide the advocates with lobbying materials for their meetings too.

August, September, and October 2009

1. Project champions should make presentations to the project advocates and various business and community groups that supported the project previously, as well as

outreach to new groups to garner additional support. The presentations should give a brief history and project outline, discuss the successes from the last appropriations cycle, outline the funding requests that will be sought in 2010 and finally, solicit project advocates for the next round of funding requests. Finally, ensure that the next round of projects are on the RTPO and state lists.

2. Contact the transportation legislative assistants from the federal delegation and check in at regular intervals (about every three weeks) on the progress of inclusion of the requests in the appropriations bill.

October to December 2009

1. After the round of appropriations is completed, federal legislators will return to their districts. Either schedule a meeting with project champions or have project champions make every effort to attend the public meetings and thank the federal legislators for their efforts. Remind the federal legislators it is a multi-phased project and that you will be back to request funding for the next phase. It shows the public that the legislators are working on the local project(s) and serves to help re-educate the federal legislators and the public about the project(s). Also, debrief the successes and failures of the federal appropriations process amongst the project champions, TBD governing body, and other appropriate agencies to review the plan, update the lobbying materials, and to outline steps needed to increase likelihood of success.

5.2.2 Year Two Activities

Year two activities for implementation of the Woodland TISP would generally be undertaken during the second year after plan adoption from November 2009 to October 2010. These activities would include the following:

Timeline of Activities:

November and December 2009

1. The project champions should schedule meetings with the two state representatives and the senator who represents the district. Since these meetings will be held in the district and not during session, the legislators typically have more time and can meet for one to two hours at a time. To maximize use of time, it may be wise to schedule a joint meeting with the district legislators and the Governor's Southwest Washington Liaison Officer to familiarize them with the project history, priorities, costs, etc. and to ask for their input on who to target for lobbying during session and any other tips they may have for working the project through the system.

January 2010 – October 2010

1. To secure state legislative support and appropriations, repeat the process from Year 1.
2. Submit drafts of the formal appropriations requests to the local field staff and the transportation legislative assistant for the federal legislators and request assistance in "polishing" the request - it aids in getting the staff thoroughly grounded in the project(s) and also helps instill a small sense of ownership of the request. Repeat the same process from Year 1 starting in January.

5.2.3 Year Three Activities

Year three activities for implementation of the Woodland TISP would generally be undertaken during the third year after plan adoption from November 2010 to October 2011. These activities would include the following:

Timeline of Activities:

November 2010 – October 2011

1. To secure state legislative support and appropriations, repeat the process from Years 1 and 2.

October 2011

1. At this point it is recommended that the TBD governing body, jurisdictions, and appropriate agencies meet to reassess the short term goals for Phase I of the improvement projects and make any adjustments necessary to the timelines, costs estimates, etc.

5.2.4 Outlying Year Activities

Highlights of activities that could be undertaken during years 4, 5 and further into the future are summarized below. This list should be updated annually based on progress towards securing funding and implementing the recommendations of the *Woodland TISP*.

Timeline of Activities:

- November 2011 – October 2012 – Repeat the Process from Year 1, 2, and 3.
- November 2012 – October 2013 – Repeat the Process from Year 1, 2, 3, and 4.
- June and July 2013 – The TBD governing board, project partners, advocates, and appropriate agencies should conduct a full review of the Phase I – Short Term (0-5 years) improvement projects to assess the progress toward obtaining funding and completion of projects listed as short term. This review should include public input. It may be necessary to update the plan, the 5 – 10 year goals, timelines, cost estimates, etc. Be sure to evaluate changes in traditional funding sources (i.e. gas tax) to identify new sources of funding should the traditional sources no longer be viable.

5.3 POSSIBLE TDB FORMATION

The Washington State Legislature has granted municipalities the ability to form Transportation Benefit Districts (TBD) for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, improving, providing, and funding transportation improvements within the TBD. The formation of a TBD is meant to be a tool for local jurisdictions to use to fund local transportation improvements, as TBDs are independent taxing districts with a specific focus on addressing transportation system needs..

Necessary steps in the formation of a TBD include the following:

- **Step 1. Determine Eligibility**

  A review of relevant statutes, particularly Chapter 36.73 RCW, as well as a checklist of items to consider as jurisdictions move forward with the TBD process can be found at http://www.awcnet.org/tbd. The basic questions to consider from the checklist include:

  - Are you eligible to create a TBD?

- Are the TBD boundaries consistent with the revenue options to be imposed?
- Do you need an interlocal agreement?
- Is the TBD funding qualifying transportation improvements?
- Have you conducted the proper notice and public hearings?
- Have you identified the proper revenue options?
- Have you adopted the proper ordinance?
- Is the administration of the TBD in place?
- Have you notified the appropriate revenue collection agencies?

Eligible projects need to be necessitated by existing or reasonably foreseeable congestion levels to qualify for funding under a TBD. TBDs may be created if a public vote on the revenue generation options is passed.

- **Step 2. Establishment of a TBD**

Cowlitz County or the City of Woodland may propose forming a TBD by ordinance and may include other cities, ports, transit districts, etc. through interlocal agreements. TBDs are meant to be flexible and responsive to local needs so the boundaries may be less than county or city wide. As a result, representatives from the municipalities will need to meet, agree on boundary designation, draft interlocal agreements and pass the ordinance. The interlocal agreement will define the governing body of the TBD which must include at least five members, including at least one elected official from each of the participating municipalities in the agreement. The ordinance is required to find that a TBD is in the public interest, define the boundaries, describe the transportation improvement(s) sought, and explain the proposed tax, fee, charge, etc. that will be used by the TBD to generate revenue to fund the proposed improvement(s).

The deadline to impose revenue generating options without a vote of the people which included an annual vehicle fee of $20.00 or transportation impact fees (TIF) on commercial and industrial buildings, but not residential buildings, expired in January 2008. As a result, the TBD has several revenue options available, albeit subject to voter approval. These options include:

- Property taxes – a one (1) year excess levy or an excess levy for capital purposes
- Up to a 0.2% sales and use tax
- Up to $100 annual vehicle fee per vehicle registered in the district (this option has some additional requirements to meet in order to institute it)
- Vehicle tolls (this option also has some additional requirements to meet in order to institute it)

It is important to remember that once revenue rates have been established, voter approval is required to raise revenue rates. The TBD is allowed to utilize gifts, grants, and donations as well as it's own generated revenue sources.

- **Step 3. Establishment of Interlocal Agreements (ILA)**

  First, the municipalities participating in the ILA need to determine the priority of transportation improvements. TBDs are allowed to fund any transportation improvement named in an existing regional or state transportation plan. Improvements, maintenance and preservation of city streets, county roads, state highways, high capacity transit, public transportation, transportation demand management and other projects in a regional transportation planning organization (RTPO) plan or state plan can be funded by a TBD. This is why priority project designation on the RTPO project list is important and should occur prior to the designation of the TBD.

  Next, the municipalities that participate in the ILA will need to decide how to share the revenue generated. Although the revenue is not required to be spent as it is collected, the governing body of the TBD is required to develop a plan that specifies how and when the funds are anticipated to be used. It is usual practice to collect funds for a specific period and then fully fund larger projects or use the funds as the local match for state or federal funds. The TBD law is flexible to allow the municipalities to decide whether revenue will be shared according to population, number of vehicles in the jurisdiction, by priority on the project list, a combination of these, or whatever agreement the jurisdictions reach.

- **Step 4. Public Notice and Voter Approval**

  In addition to any other notices required by law, jurisdictions involved in creating a TBD must publish a notice of a hearing to establish a TBD at least once and it must be published at least ten (10) days or more before the hearing in the generally circulated newspaper within the TBD proposed boundaries. The notice is required to identify the specific transportation improvement(s) that will be funded or provided by the TBD.

  Obtaining voter approval is often challenging unless a consistent and strong effort to educate the public about the priority transportation project(s), project costs, the TBD process, the TBD boundaries, and a clear explanation of the revenue generation option that is implemented. See section D for recommended methods for continually educating the public about the need, projects, costs, etc.

- **Step. 5 Operation of the TBD**

  The governing body oversees the operation of the TBD in accordance with the ILA. One of the operating requirements of the TBD is that an annual report must be distributed that includes an update on the status of project costs, revenues, expenditures, and construction schedules. Additional information on administrative requirements and determination of the appropriate revenue collecting agencies can be found at http://www.awcnet.org/tbd. The governing body is required to institute a material change policy should circumstances arise that impede project completion and financing. The material change policy must address costs, scope, schedule, the extent of the change that needs involvement by the governing body and how the governing body intends to resolve the change. A public hearing must be held to obtain public input on how to resolve cost changes, if the project costs exceed the original costs by more than 20 percent.

  Once the projects within the TBD scope are completed and payment of debt service has been completed, then the TBD must be dissolved.

5.4 ON-GOING PUBLIC INFORMATION AND INVOLVEMENT

To support the implementation of the recommendations in the Woodland TISP and/or to meet the requirements associated with Transportation Benefit District formation, an on-going public involvement and information effort must be maintained. Key elements of this effort would include:

- Understanding the need for on-going public information, input and education about priority projects and funding needs. This is particularly important to secure local, state and federal funding.
- Building broad support through coalitions at the local, regional, state, and federal levels
- Highlights of a recommended on-going public information and involvement approach

Each of these key elements for an on-going public involvement effort are discussed below.

5.4.1 Public Information, Input and Education about Priority Projects and Funding Needs

Significant effort was expended to involve the public in the creation of the priority list of projects to complete over the next twenty years in the City of Woodland. However, to ensure timely and successful implementation of the *TISP*'s recommendations, on-going communication and dialog with the public is crucial. As the community grows and traffic levels increase it will be important to regularly reiterate the reasons for pursuing these projects, the intended timeline for the projects, the costs, the benefits, and other pertinent information. "Not another study – we want action!" is a frequent message heard by state and federal legislators. It will be important to point out throughout the implementation and construction phases that a study is finally being acted upon. It should be pointed out often that people can take pride in seeing the construction on the ground and know that it is part of the plan the community helped to generate to solve local transportation problems.

In addition to providing general or project-specific information about the TISP and its implementation process, the on-going public involvement effort will be critical to obtaining the funding needed to implement each of the recommended projects. This support will be needed to assure state and federal legislators that the projects in the TISP have broad public support and approval and merit funding from state and federal sources. This support will help the city and/or WSDOT obtain the grants and other resources necessary to establish a viable funding program. Support will also be crucial to create a TBD and adopt a funding mechanism.

To establish support for funding and implementing the projects in the *Woodland TISP*, extensive effort will need to be undertaken to engage large employers, local businesses, chambers of commerce, the economic development council, emergency response agencies, community organizations, unions, and other active entities including minority groups. In this effort it will be important to:

- Continuously re-educate the community about the transportation challenges faced today, as well as those anticipated to come as a result of growth.
- Continuously re-educate the community about the transportation infrastructure strategic planning process that was undertaken to generate the final plan which included a prioritized list of projects based on community input.
- Show the natural alliance of economic development resulting from construction and operation of transportation projects.

- Show how local concerns were addressed in the planning process.
- Reiterate the importance of cultivating a local source of funding that will be used to solve local transportation problems.
- Recruit additional business and community advocates to help persuade others to support establishing local funding mechanisms as well as also being advocates to persuade state and federal legislators to support project funding in the appropriations process.

5.4.2 Build Broad Support and Coalitions

The development of broad support for implementation of the Woodland TISP should include the establishment of local and regional coalitions that provide project "champions" from the City, County, and local interest groups. Additionally, a single sheet "flyer" that can be used for lobbying purposes and which contains a concise and consistent message about the projects in the TISP, should be prepared.

5.4.2.1 Designation of Project "Champions"

Having a well laid plan does no good without a core group of project "champions" to take ownership of the implementation plan. The project champions are functionally the lead spokespeople for the project(s). The champions are the leaders in lobbying federal and state legislators for funding, they provide oversight of the implementation plan, they assume responsibility for maintenance of public education about the project, and they assist with the evaluation of progress and making adjustments as needed to ensure that project funding sources line up at the appropriate time.

Champions should be elected leaders within the City of Woodland, Cowlitz County, and the Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Council of Governments (CWCOG). However, if possible, primary leadership should be demonstrated by the City of Woodland and Cowlitz County. State and federal legislators tend to be persuaded when these jurisdictions are working in tandem, "speaking the same language", and the impetus for the project(s) comes from those who will be most affected by the project(s).

Additional champions could potentially be recruited through the CWCOG, the Port of Woodland, the Woodland School District, and others. Again, since these projects will occur in Woodland, the responsibility to fight for the projects falls primarily on the City of Woodland in close cooperation with Cowlitz County.

Champions help recruit project advocates who support the project(s) and who also lobby state and federal legislators as they meet with them. Potential project advocates could be recruited from organizations such as the economic development council, chambers of commerce, major employers who support the project(s), etc. Project advocates assist with public education efforts through presentations and word of mouth through their organizations and personal networks. Once projects are on the regional or state priority list and state legislators are on board, the sooner the state legislators can be advocating for funding from federal legislators for specific projects. The bottom line is, the more jurisdictions, organizations, and people that are advocating for the same project(s), the more likely it is to be successful in the appropriations process.

5.4.2.2 Development of Lobbying Flyer

While it may be possible to talk with the legislators at length when they are not in session and briefly when they are in session, it is important to leave the legislator and their staff with a concise and precise lobbying piece. The project is much more likely to be funded if the

funding source is identified and the exact amount of funding needed is justified. The lobbying piece should be not more than one double sided page. It should outline the project's:

- Proponent and/or beneficiary
- Exact title
- Amount of financial request
- History leading to current status
- Purpose
- Description of current request
- Timeline
- Benefits
- Partners and supporters
- Contact Information
- Informational graphics that can assist in making the case

5.4.3 On-going Public Involvement Approach

The following is a short timeline that lays out key tasks for on-going public involvement during the implementation phase of the Woodland TISP. Additionally, it is recommended that the jurisdictions, champions, TBD governing body, and/or other appropriate agencies should incorporate the projects and timelines into other larger plans to ensure both eligibility for funding and to keep these projects "front and center" in the areawide planning and development process.

Annually August to October

It is strongly suggested that project champions regularly make presentations to the public, businesses, and community groups to outreach and re-educate the public about the project(s), update the public on the current status of the projects, outline future activities, and provide outreach to new groups to garner additional support. The presentations should give a brief history and project outline, discuss the successes from the last appropriations cycle, outline the funding requests that will be sought in the next funding cycle and, finally, solicit project advocates for the next round of funding requests.

Throughout the Year

Throughout the year, additional methods of communication should be employed to reach out to people who do not necessarily attend public meetings or presentations. In order to adequately inform the public and receive input, the following methods are suggested:

- Hold community forums
- Mail an informational newsletter or brochure to households within the proposed TBD boundaries
- Send press releases to local print and news media
- Make presentations to local community organizations such as the chamber of commerce, economic development council, etc.
- Post informational kiosks in areas frequented by residents within the municipality such as shopping centers, department stores, grocery stores, libraries, etc.
- Post the information on a website

5.5 CONTINGENCY PLANS IF PROJECTS NOT FUNDED WHEN ANTICIPATED

Jurisdictions, project champions, and the TBD governing body should endeavor to maintain communication with legislative staff to predict if political factors will impede timely resolution of the appropriations process. They should also endeavor to maintain communications with the relevant agencies such as WSDOT, FHWA, etc. to try to predict funding fluctuations and should continue to evaluate changes in traditional funding sources (i.e. gas tax) to identify new sources of funding should the traditional sources no longer be viable. This factor may be significant as technological advances shift automobile and transit vehicles from gas to other forms of energy.

Communication with WSDOT, FHWA, and other agency staff can help determine if funds must be utilized within a specified timeframe or can be "on hold" until the match requirements are met.

Should funding expire before the match can be obtained, the project champions, jurisdictions, and TBD governing body should meet to reassess the status of current projects, update plans and lobbying materials for the next appropriations cycle. Champions and jurisdictions can step up appropriations tracking and communication efforts by checking in with legislative staff every two weeks.

5.5.1 Re-assessment of Successes and Items to be Pursued

Short-Term Improvements (Phase 1, 0 – 5 Years)

Each year after adoption of the *TISP*, the jurisdictions, project champions, TBD governing body, and appropriate agencies will need to re-evaluate the projects in the Short-Term Phase (Phase 1) and make any minor adjustments as needed.

After three years, the jurisdictions, project champions, TBD governing body, and appropriate agencies will need to meet to reassess the short term goals for Phase 1 of the improvement projects and make any adjustments necessary to the timelines, costs estimates, or other variables

At the end of five years, the jurisdictions, project champions, TBD governing body, and appropriate agencies should conduct a full review of the progress made in implementing Phase 1 – Short Term (0-5 years) improvement projects. This review should focus on progress toward obtaining funding for projects and note the completion of those projects included in the short-term program. This review should include public input. Based on the findings of this review, it may be necessary to update the plan, refine the 5 – 10 year goals, and, perhaps the 10 – 20 year goals, and to modify timelines, cost estimates, and other project elements based on events that have occurred during the five year period.

After completion of Phase 1, significant effort should be made to communicate the shift into Phase 2. Lobbying materials should have updated content and a new visual look that is consistent in theme but has different elements.

Mid-Term Improvements (Phase 2, 5 – 10 Years):

During Phase 2, the jurisdictions, project champions, TBD governing body, and appropriate agencies should re-evaluate the projects in Phase 2 and make any minor adjustments as needed on an annual basis.

In year eight, the jurisdictions, project champions, TBD governing body, and appropriate agencies will need to meet to reassess the short term goals for Phase 2 of the improvement projects and make any adjustments necessary to the timelines, costs estimates, or other variables.

At the end of 10 years, the jurisdictions, project champions, TBD governing body, and appropriate agencies should conduct a full review of the Phase 2 (5-10 years) improvement projects to assess the progress toward obtaining funding and completing the projects listed as mid-term. This review should include public input. Based on the findings of this review, it may be necessary to update the plan, refine the 10 – 20 year goals, and to modify timelines, cost estimates, and other project elements based on events that have occurred during the preceding five year period.

After completion of Phase 2, again significant effort should be made to communicate the shift into Phase 3. Lobbying materials should have updated content and a new visual look that is consistent in theme but has different elements to reflect the remaining projects to be implemented.

Long-Term Improvements (Phase 3, 10 – 20 Years):

During Phase 3, the jurisdictions, project champions, TBD governing body, and appropriate agencies should re-evaluate the projects in Phase 3 and make any minor adjustments as needed on an annual basis.

After fifteen years, the jurisdictions, project champions, TBD governing body, and appropriate agencies will need to meet to reassess the short term goals for Phase 3 of the improvement projects and make any adjustments necessary to the timelines, costs estimates, and other project elements.

After twenty years, the jurisdictions, project champions, TBD governing body, and appropriate agencies should conduct a full review of the Phase 3 (10-20 years) improvement projects to assess the progress toward obtaining funding and completion of projects listed as long term. This review should include public input. Based on the findings of this review, it may be necessary to update the plan, refine the long-term goals, and to modify timelines, cost estimates, and other project elements based on events that have occurred during the preceding time period.

5.5.2 Maintenance of Public Support

In the event that implementation of project recommendations cannot occur on the timeline identified in the Woodland TSIP, it will be important to engage in regular and open communication with the public to maintain and increase public support of the projects. Throughout the public education efforts, care should be taken to clearly but succinctly explain:

- Project(s) background/history including reminding the public that this plan was developed based on community generated priorities.
- State and federal funding timelines
- Funding formulas (percentages of federal, state, and local funds) needed for projects to move forward
- Any unanticipated events or failures to obtain funding within time constraints
- Project construction timelines and reasons for any modifications that may occur from the original timeline.
- Benefits of the project(s)
- Any relevant environmental issues or hazardous materials issues
- Any opportunities for providing additional input in the process

- Any opportunities to help advocate for projects with the media, state, and federal legislators

APPENDIX A

Project Cost Estimates

FINAL COST ESTIMATES FOR RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENTS

Project	Cost
SR503 Minimum Project	$870,000
SR503 Hilshire to Evergreen	$6,300,000
SR503 Option 3B	$3,800,000
I5/SR503 Interchange Option 6 (With Scott)	$8,000,000
Dike Road Option 3B	$2,400,000
Scott Ave Option 4D	$47,300,000
Scott Ave Option 4D 1st Segment	$16,400,000
Scott Ave Option 4D 2nd Segment	$29,700,000
Scott Ave Option 4D 3rd Segment	$1,700,000
Pekin Road Option 1	$7,300,000

SR 503 Minimum Project

SR 503 Minimum Road Widening	UNITS	QTY	UNIT COST	BASE COST
Mobilization	LS	1	10%	$44,507
Traffic Control	LS	1	5%	$20,605
Temporary Stormwater and Erosion Control	LS	1	3%	$12,363
Roadway Excavation Including Haul	CY	3890	$20	$77,800
Crushed Surfacing Base Course	CY	2720	$25	$68,000
Hot Mix Asphalt	Ton	3120	$80	$249,600
Signing	LS	1	$5,000	$5,000
Utility Relocation	LS	1	$10,000	$10,000
Striping	LF	17000	$0.10	$1,700
ROW	LS	1	$5,000	$5,000
Estimated Construction Cost Subtotal				$494,575
Sales Tax			8%	$39,566
Contingency (30%)			30%	$160,242
Construction Total				**$694,383**
Preliminary and Construction Engineering Total	LS	1	25%	**$173,596**
			Total	**$870,000**

SR 503 Widening Only

SR 503 Hilshire to Evergreen	UNITS	QTY	UNIT COST	BASE COST
Mobilization	LS	1	10%	$232,263
Traffic Control	LS	1	5%	$105,574
Temporary Stormwater and Erosion Control	LS	1	5%	$105,574
Roadway Excavation Including Haul	CY	6820	$20	$136,400
Crushed Surfacing Base Course	CY	4775	$25	$119,375
Hot Mix Asphalt	Ton	5378	$80	$430,240
Cement Concrete Traffic Curb & Gutter	LF	8870	$30	$266,100
Cement Concrete Sidewalk	SY	5453	$50	$272,650
Landscaping	LS	1	$40,000	$40,000
Signing	LS	1	$10,000	$10,000
Storm Sewer Pipe	LF	8870	$70	$620,900
Storm Inlets	EACH	30	$2,500	$75,000
Stormwater Treatment	LS	1	6%	$119,518
Utility Relocation	LS	1	$10,000	$10,000
Bicycle Lane Markings	EACH	35	$250	$8,750
Striping	LF	25500	$0.10	$2,550
ROW	LS	1	$1,020,750	$1,020,750
Estimated Construction Cost Subtotal				$3,575,644
Sales Tax			8%	$286,052
Contingency (30%)			30%	$1,158,509
Construction Total				**$5,020,205**
Preliminary and Construction Engineering Total	LS	1	25%	**$1,255,051**
			Total	**$6,300,000**

SR503 Option 3B

SR 503 Option 3B	UNITS	QTY	UNIT COST	BASE COST
Mobilization	LS	1	10%	$142,370
Traffic Control	LS	1	5%	$64,714
Temporary Stormwater and Erosion Control	LS	1	5%	$64,714
Roadway Excavation Including Haul	CY	2590	$20	$51,800
Crushed Surfacing Base Course	CY	1812	$25	$45,300
Hot Mix Asphalt	Ton	2160	$80	$172,800
Cement Concrete Traffic Curb & Gutter	LF	3675	$30	$110,250
Cement Concrete Sidewalk	SY	2450	$50	$122,500
E Scott Avenue/ Lewis River Road Signal	LS	1	$400,000	$400,000
Landscaping	LS	1	$10,000	$10,000
Storm Sewer Pipe	LF	3675	$70	$257,250
Storm Inlets	EACH	14	$2,500	$35,000
Stormwater Treatment	LS	1	6%	$73,261
Utility Relocation	LS	1	$5,000	$5,000
Bicycle Lane Markings	EACH	20	$250	$5,000
Pavement Legend: Signal Crosswalk Markings	EACH	25	$200	$5,000
Striping	LF	11160	$0.10	$1,116
ROW	LS	1	$578,000	$578,000
Estimated Construction Cost Subtotal				$2,144,075
Sales Tax			8%	$171,526
Contingency (30%)			30%	$694,680
Construction Total				**$3,010,281**
Preliminary and Construction Engineering Total	LS	1	25%	**$752,570**
			Total	**$3,800,000**

I5/SR503 Intersection 8 Lane Section (Option 6)	UNITS	QTY	UNIT COST	BASE COST
Mobilization	LS	1	10%	$400,017
Traffic Control	LS	1	5%	$188,687
Temporary Stormwater and Erosion Control	LS	1	1%	$37,737
Roadway Excavation Including Haul	CY	6946	$20	$138,920
Crushed Surfacing Base Course	CY	4862	$25	$121,550
Hot Mix Asphalt	Ton	7207	$80	$576,560
Embankment Compaction	CY	3340	$18	$60,120
Cement Concrete Traffic Curb & Gutter	LF	7586	$30	$227,580
Cement Concrete Sidewalk	SY	2787	$50	$139,350
Traffic Signal	EACH	4	$400,000	$1,600,000
Landscaping	LS	1	$50,000	$50,000
Signing	LS	1	$50,000	$50,000
Storm Sewer Pipe	LF	7586	$70	$531,020
Storm Inlets	EACH	31	$2,500	$77,500
Stormwater Treatment	LS	1	4%	$145,144
Utility Relocation	LS	1	$10,000	$10,000
Bicycle Lane Markings	EACH	40	$250	$10,000
Pavement Legend: Signal Crosswalk Markings	EACH	150	$200	$30,000
Striping	LF	60000	$0.10	$6,000
ROW	LS	1	$120,200	$120,200
Estimated Construction Cost Subtotal				$4,520,386
Sales Tax			8%	$361,631
Contingency (30%)			30%	$1,464,605
Construction Total				**$6,346,621**
Preliminary and Construction Engineering Total	LS	1	25%	**$1,586,655**
			Total	**$8,000,000**

Dike Road Option 3B

Dike Road Option 3B	**UNITS**	**QTY**	**UNIT COST**	**BASE COST**
Mobilization	LS	1	10%	$122,251
Traffic Control	LS	1	10%	$102,875
Temporary Stormwater and Erosion Control	LS	1	5%	$51,438
Removing Asphalt Conc. Pavement	SY	1590	$10	$15,900
Roadway Excavation Including Haul	CY	1810	$20	$36,200
Crushed Surfacing Base Course	CY	1270	$25	$31,750
Hot Mix Asphalt	Ton	1645	$80	$131,600
Cement Concrete Paving (Truck Apron)	CY	130	$250	$32,500
Cement Concrete Traffic Curb & Gutter	LF	5335	$30	$160,050
Cement Concrete Sidewalk	SY	3275	$50	$163,750
Signing	LS	1	$15,000	$15,000
Storm Sewer Pipe	LF	4000	$70	$280,000
Storm Inlets	EACH	20	$2,500	$50,000
Stormwater Treatment	LS	1	8%	$76,204
Utility Relocation	LS	1	$10,000	$10,000
Bicycle Lane Markings	EACH	20	$250	$5,000
Pavement Legend: Signal Crosswalk Markings	EACH	100	$200	$20,000
Striping	LF	8000	$0.10	$800
ROW	LS	1	$39,440	$39,440
Estimated Construction Cost Subtotal				$1,344,758
Sales Tax			8%	$107,581
Contingency (30%)			30%	$435,702
Construction Total				**$1,888,040**
Preliminary and Construction Engineering Total	LS	1	25%	**$472,010**
			TOTAL	**$2,400,000**

Scott Ave Option 4D

Scott Avenue Crossing Option 4D	UNITS	QTY	UNIT COST	BASE COST
Mobilization	LS	1	10%	$2,297,119
Traffic Control	LS	1	5%	$1,083,547
Temporary Stormwater and Erosion Control	LS	1	1%	$216,709
Roadway Excavation Including Haul	CY	11690	$20	$233,800
Crushed Surfacing Base Course	CY	13194	$25	$329,850
Hot Mix Asphalt	Ton	17725	$80	$1,418,000
Embankment Compaction	CY	78550	$18	$1,413,900
Retaining Walls	SF	74220	$50	$3,711,000
Cement Concrete Traffic Curb & Gutter	LF	10215	$30	$306,450
Cement Concrete Sidewalk	SY	5108	$50	$255,400
Rail crossing Structure	SF	5640	$400	$2,256,000
I-5 Structure	SF	23250	$400	$9,300,000
Traffic Signal	EACH	2	$400,000	$800,000
Landscaping	LS	1	$20,000	$20,000
Signing	LS	1	$25,000	$25,000
Storm Sewer Pipe	LF	10215	$70	$715,050
Storm Inlets	EACH	35	$2,500	$87,500
Stormwater Treatment	LS	1	4%	$757,280
Utility Relocation	LS	1	$10,000	$10,000
Bicycle Lane Markings	EACH	30	$250	$7,500
Pavement Legend: Signal Crosswalk Markings	EACH	105	$200	$21,000
Striping	LF	32040	$0.10	$3,204
ROW	LS	1	$1,641,990	$1,641,990
Estimated Construction Cost Subtotal				$26,910,299
Sales Tax			8%	$2,152,824
Contingency (30%)			30%	$8,718,937
Construction Total				**$37,782,060**
Preliminary and Construction Engineering Total	LS	1	25%	**$9,445,515**
			Total	**$47,300,000**

Scott Avenue Crossing Option 4D - 1st Segment Station 13+55 to Station 32+50	UNITS	QTY	UNIT COST	BASE COST
Mobilization	LS	1	10%	$721,987
Traffic Control	LS	1	5%	$340,560
Temporary Stormwater and Erosion Control	LS	1	1%	$68,112
Roadway Excavation Including Haul	CY	5585	$20	$111,700
Crushed Surfacing Base Course	CY	4475	$25	$111,875
Hot Mix Asphalt	Ton	3930	$80	$314,400
Embankment Compaction	CY	42995	$18	$773,910
Retaining Walls	SF	48620	$50	$2,431,000
Cement Concrete Traffic Curb & Gutter	LF	4060	$30	$121,800
Cement Concrete Sidewalk	SY	2030	$50	$101,500
Rail crossing Structure	SF	5640	$400	$2,256,000
Landscaping	LS	1	$7,000	$7,000
Signing	LS	1	$5,000	$5,000
Storm Sewer Pipe	LF	4060	$70	$284,200
Storm Inlets	EACH	15	$2,500	$37,500
Stormwater Treatment	LS	1	4%	$241,278
Utility Relocation	LS	1	$4,000	$4,000
Bicycle Lane Markings	EACH	10	$250	$2,500
Pavement Legend: Signal Crosswalk Markings	EACH	32	$200	$6,400
Striping	LF	11370	$0.10	$1,137
ROW	LS	1	$1,396,600	$1,396,600
Estimated Construction Cost Subtotal				$9,338,459
Sales Tax			8%	$747,077
Contingency (30%)			30%	$3,025,661
Construction Total				**$13,111,197**
Preliminary and Construction Engineering Total	LS	1	25%	**$3,277,799**
			Total	**$16,400,000**

Scott Avenue Crossing Option 4D - 2nd Segment Station 32+50 to Station 50+00	UNITS	QTY	UNIT COST	BASE COST
Mobilization	LS	1	10%	$1,510,243
Traffic Control	LS	1	5%	$712,379
Temporary Stormwater and Erosion Control	LS	1	1%	$142,476
Roadway Excavation Including Haul	CY	3655	$20	$73,100
Crushed Surfacing Base Course	CY	7004	$25	$175,100
Hot Mix Asphalt	Ton	12140	$80	$971,200
Embankment Compaction	CY	35555	$18	$639,990
Retaining Walls	SF	20800	$50	$1,040,000
Cement Concrete Traffic Curb & Gutter	LF	5380	$30	$161,400
Cement Concrete Sidewalk	SY	2690	$50	$134,500
I-5 Structure	SF	23250	$400	$9,300,000
Traffic Signal	EACH	2	$400,000	$800,000
Landscaping	LS	1	$8,000	$8,000
Signing	LS	1	$15,000	$15,000
Storm Sewer Pipe	LF	5380	$70	$376,600
Storm Inlets	EACH	15	$2,500	$37,500
Stormwater Treatment	LS	1	4%	$501,084
Utility Relocation	LS	1	$4,000	$4,000
Bicycle Lane Markings	EACH	15	$250	$3,750
Pavement Legend: Signal Crosswalk Markings	EACH	23	$200	$4,600
Striping	LF	17540	$0.10	$1,754
ROW	LS	1	$271,800	$271,800
Estimated Construction Cost Subtotal				$16,884,476
Sales Tax			8%	$1,350,758
Contingency (30%)			30%	$5,470,570
Construction Total				**$23,705,804**
Preliminary and Construction Engineering Total	LS	1	25%	**$5,926,451**
			Total	**$29,700,000**

Scott Avenue Crossing Option 4D - 3rd Segment Station 50+00 to Intersection	UNITS	QTY	UNIT COST	BASE COST
Mobilization	LS	1	10%	$80,857
Traffic Control	LS	1	5%	$38,140
Temporary Stormwater and Erosion Control	LS	1	1%	$7,628
Roadway Excavation Including Haul	CY	2450	$20	$49,000
Crushed Surfacing Base Course	CY	1715	$25	$42,875
Hot Mix Asphalt	Ton	1655	$80	$132,400
Embankment Compaction	CY	0	$18	$0
Retaining Walls	SF	4800	$50	$240,000
Cement Concrete Traffic Curb & Gutter	LF	775	$30	$23,250
Cement Concrete Sidewalk	SY	390	$50	$19,500
Traffic Signal	EACH	1	$150,000	$150,000
Landscaping	LS	1	$5,000	$5,000
Signing	LS	1	$5,000	$5,000
Storm Sewer Pipe	LF	775	$70	$54,250
Storm Inlets	EACH	5	$2,500	$12,500
Stormwater Treatment	LS	1	4%	$20,713
Utility Relocation	LS	1	$2,000	$2,000
Bicycle Lane Markings	EACH	5	$250	$1,250
Pavement Legend: Signal Crosswalk Markings	EACH	23	$200	$4,600
Striping	LF	4650	$0.10	$465
ROW	LS	1	$59,000	$59,000
Estimated Construction Cost Subtotal				$948,428
Sales Tax			8%	$75,874
Contingency (30%)			30%	$307,291
Construction Total				**$1,331,593**
Preliminary and Construction Engineering Total	LS	1	25%	**$332,898**
			Total	**$1,700,000**

Pekin Road Option 1

Pekin Road Option 1	**UNITS**	**QTY**	**UNIT COST**	**BASE COST**
Mobilization	LS	1	10%	$338,033
Traffic Control	LS	1	3%	$94,776
Temporary Stormwater and Erosion Control	LS	1	4%	$126,367
Roadway Excavation Including Haul	CY	5520	$20	$110,400
Crushed Surfacing Base Course	CY	3867	$25	$96,675
Hot Mix Asphalt	Ton	3395	$80	$271,600
Embankment Compaction	CY	26200	$18	$471,600
Retaining Walls	SF	24660	$50	$1,233,000
Cement Concrete Traffic Curb & Gutter	LF	2425	$30	$72,750
Cement Concrete Sidewalk	SY	1213	$50	$60,650
Drainage	LS	1	$20,000	$20,000
Stormwater Treatment	LS	1	2%	$61,945
Utility Relocation	LS	1	$15,000	$15,000
Striping	LF	10870	$0.10	$1,087
Pekin Crossing Structure	SF	4136	$180	$744,480
ROW	LS	1	$411,900	$411,900
Estimated Construction Cost Subtotal				$4,130,263
Sales Tax			8%	$330,421
Contingency (30%)			30%	$1,338,205
Construction Total				**$5,798,889**
Preliminary and Construction Engineering Total	LS	1	25%	**$1,449,722**
			Total	**$7,300,000**