Regional FTA Caucus

January 16, 2018 • 10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
PSRC Conference Room • 1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500 • Seattle, WA 98104

10:30 1. Welcome and Introductions – Melissa Cauley, Chair

10:35 2. Public Comment

10:40 3. Action: Approve Meeting Summary*

Approve summary for the Regional FTA Caucus meeting held December 12, 2017.

10:45 4. Discussion: Upcoming Caucus Officer Elections

PSRC staff will discuss procedures and open the nominations for upcoming elections of the Caucus Chair and Vice-Chair positions. Elections will be held at the February 2018 Caucus meeting.

10:50 5. Discussion: Operating Procedures and Technical Addendum Update*

Sarah Gutschow, PSRC, will provide an overview of the current Caucus Operating Procedures and the 2013 Technical Addendum. The Caucus will then discuss draft updates to the Operating Procedures. PSRC staff reviewed the 2013 Technical Addendum and proposes replacing the current document with an FTA-funding addendum to the 2018 Policy Framework for PSRC’S Federal Funds.

11:20 6. Discussion: 2018 Project Selection Update*

Kelly McGourty, PSRC, will provide an update on the final 2018 Project Selection Task Force recommendations. The Caucus will discuss the subsequent proposed updates to the FTA Regional Competition funding criteria, and staff will provide the draft 2018 project selection calendar at the meeting.

11:50 7. Other Business

11:55 8. Next Meeting:
February 13, 2018, 10:30 a.m.-12:00 p.m.

12:00 9. Adjourn

*Supporting materials attached

For more information, contact Sarah Gutschow at (206) 587-4822 or sgutschow@psrc.org or Kelly McGourty at (206) 971-3601 or kmcgourty@psrc.org.
December 12, 2017

Members and Alternates Represented at the Table:
Melissa Cauley - Community Transit & Chair; Peter Heffernan - King County & Vice-Chair; Melinda Adams - Everett Transit; Dawn Erickson - Everett Transit; Matthew Graves - Pierce County Ferry System; Dave Morrison - King County; Krishan Aggerwal - WSDOT – Ferries; John Bernhard - WSDOT – Ferries; Monica Overby - Sound Transit; Sara Walton - City of Seattle; Lisa Wolterink - Sound Transit; Katherine Rassmussen - Community Transit

Via Phone:
Barb Hunter - Pierce Transit; Jeff Davidson - Kitsap Transit; Kirste Johnson - Sound Transit

Other Guests (for all or part of the meeting):
Eric Irelan - King County; Kenneth Wilson - Sound Transit

PSRC Staff: Sarah Gutschow, Kelly McGourty, Jeff Storrar, Monica Adkins

Welcome, Introductions, Public Comment
Public comment was provided by Alex Tsimmerman.

Approval of Meeting Summary
The summary for the October 10, 2017 meeting was approved.

Discussion: Project Selection Task Force Update
Kelly McGourty, PSRC, provided an update on recent 2018 Project Selection Task Force discussions, including a summary of the FTA funding-related decisions that the Task Force had made to date. The FFY 2021-2022 funding estimates would be based on 2017 funding levels. The Task Force decided to retain most of the project selection policies from the 2016 process, with a few changes, including prohibiting transit agencies from submitting the same project to both the FTA and FHWA funding competitions and making some minor changes to the project evaluation criteria. The Caucus discussed the proposed changes to the project evaluation criteria, including further addressing equity and safety issues and ensuring transit projects are integrated with the local system. Kelly said PSRC staff would evaluate how to make those changes to the criteria.

The minimum floor set-aside would be retained, capped at 2015 levels, with the additional consideration of purchased service. As the Task Force had requested more information regarding purchased service, the Caucus discussed different ownership and operational models for purchased services and how they may affect whether an agency would qualify to receive minimum floor funding. The Caucus recommended that staff provide a simplified definition to the Task Force, regarding ownership of assets regardless of reporting and earnings agreements among agencies, as a factor in determining eligible minimum floor agencies.

For more information, contact Kelly McGourty at (206) 971-3601

Discussion: FTA Project Tracking and Progress Reports Update
Sarah Gutschow, PSRC, presented an update on the ongoing project tracking of FTA-funded projects, including information on the status of active FTA-funded projects from PSRC’s October 2017 Progress Reports. She also provided a summary of the current obligation status of all FTA-funded projects by funding forum and FTA funding source, along with a summary document for all projects.

For more information, contact Sarah Gutschow at (206) 587-4822

Other Business
Lisa Wolterink, Sound Transit, introduced Kenneth Wilson. Kenneth is one of two new Sound Transit employees who will be working directly at the FTA’s Region 10 headquarters office on grant processing.

Sarah reviewed the 2018 FTA Caucus calendar. As there was a conflict identified for the January 9, 2018 meeting date, a Doodle poll would be sent out after the meeting to determine a new January meeting date.

*For more information, contact Sarah Gutschow at (206) 587-4822*

**Next Meeting** – January 16, 2018, 10:30 a.m. - 12:00 p.m., PSRC Conference Room
PSRC’s REGIONAL FTA CAUCUS
OPERATING PROCEDURES

Purpose
As a standing subcommittee of the Transportation Operators Committee (TOC), PSRC’s Regional Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Caucus (hereafter referred to as the Caucus) will serve as the forum for addressing all issues associated with FTA funding programs and compliance issues in the central Puget Sound region.

Primary responsibilities of the Caucus shall include:

- Developing recommendations to the TOC on the distribution of FTA formula funding apportioned to the Puget Sound region, except for PSRC’s Section 5310 funds, which are recommended by the Special Needs Transportation Committee.

- Technical and compliance issues required in, or resulting from, the approved federal transportation authorization act (currently the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act or FAST Act).

The TOC may also identify additional specific issue areas that they would like the Caucus to consider and provide input. Issues of interest identified by the Caucus will be forwarded to the TOC for possible incorporation into the Caucus annual work plan.

Actions approved by the Caucus will be forwarded as recommendations to the TOC for its consideration.

Membership
The Caucus voting membership will be comprised of PSRC member agencies providing public transportation service in PSRC’s four-county region. Those current agencies are identified below:

- Community Transit
- Everett Transit
- King County Metro
- Kitsap Transit
- Pierce County (Pierce County Ferry)
- Pierce Transit
- City of Seattle
- Sound Transit
- WSDOT (Washington State Ferries)
Agencies providing public transportation services in PSRC’s four-county region which are not PSRC members (and/or agencies located outside of the PSRC region) are invited to participate as non-voting Caucus members.

Each member may have a designated alternate. Please note, only designated members and alternates may participate at the table; all other representatives are welcome to attend as guests only.

Appointments for each member and alternate are to be provided in writing to PSRC from the appropriate department head or elected official. For transit agencies, this should be the Executive Director or other responsible official. For the cities, this could be the Mayor, Public Works Director, Transportation Department Manager or other responsible official.

Attendance
All members or their designated alternate are expected to regularly attend Caucus meetings.

Chair and Vice-Chair Elections, Terms and Responsibilities
A Chair and Vice-Chair will be elected via an open nomination process and voting by the Committee. Terms will be for a maximum of two years. The role of the chairs will be to facilitate discussions and actions by the Caucus, and to ensure equal opportunity for participation by members present. As mentioned above, the Chair will also report to the TOC on Caucus recommendations.

Meeting Schedule and Agendas
The Caucus typically meets every month on the 2nd Tuesday, from 10:30 a.m.-Noon. Scheduled meetings may be cancelled or additional meetings may be scheduled as needed, in consultation between PSRC staff and the Chair and Vice-Chair. A calendar of regularly scheduled advisory forum meetings for the year is posted on PSRC’s website and provided to each forum.

Action Items will be clearly noted on Caucus agendas, which will be distributed approximately one week prior to each meeting. In general, if an item is not on the agenda, no action will be taken. However, under some circumstances, notification may be provided to the Caucus via email, either to add an item to an upcoming agenda, or to ask for action via email vote. No actions will be voted upon without adequate advance notice to all members of the Caucus.

Recommendations

*General*

Formal recommendations to be forwarded to the TOC will be by vote, although the Caucus will strive for consensus among its members. Voting procedures will follow Robert’s Rules of Order for motions, amendments and discussion. A recommendation may be proposed by any voting member of the Caucus, but motions may not be seconded by a representative from the same agency. Voting is not weighted, and each represented agency is allowed one vote. A quorum is not required. Other recommendations pertaining solely to Caucus activities, and which will not be forwarded to the TOC for action, may be achieved either by vote or by consensus. Alternates do not participate in recommendations if the representative is present. Minority positions may be forwarded along with the majority recommendation to the TOC.
Funding Distributions

PSRC has project selection authority for FTA formula funds within three urbanized areas (UZA) in the region: Seattle-Tacoma-Everett, Bremerton and Marysville. When preparing a funding recommendation to the TOC, only those Caucus voting members providing service within a UZA — and the service is reported within that UZA to FTA’s National Transit Database - may participate in the vote for that UZA.

Subcommittees
Working subcommittees are created as needed by the Caucus. Subcommittees are assigned specific tasks and dissolved when the work is completed. Other staff in the region may be asked to serve on subcommittees to provide specific expertise or viewpoints.

Resources
With assistance from the Caucus, PSRC will prepare a 2013 Technical Addendum to the Caucus Operating Procedures, providing additional background information and details regarding the policies and procedures surrounding the distribution of PSRC’s FTA formula funds. This information is predicated on the adoption of a Policy Framework by PSRC’s Boards prior to each project selection cycle, and is subject to change. The most recent Policy Framework was adopted in 2012 and may be found at http://www.psrc.org/transportation/tip/selection. Additional details beyond what’s included in the 2012 Policy Framework may include information on the use of data from the National Transit Database and other more technical details that may be taken into consideration during any funding distribution or adjustments process. The Technical Addendum will be reviewed for necessary updates no less than every three years.
The purpose of the Technical Addendum to operating procedures for PSRC’s Regional FTA Caucus is to provide a summary description of the data and procedures the Caucus has identified to help prepare its recommendations to the Transportation Operators Committee (TOC) on public transit funding policy recommendations, and related public transit topics. The Technical Addendum is intended to be a work in progress to allow modifications over time as data needs and procedures change for addressing transit funding policy requirements.

Subject: PSRC memoranda related to the FTA 1% requirement for public transportation security and associated transit investments. These memoranda identifying the procedures followed in the region for satisfying these requirements are included in this Addendum as attachments, and are available on PSRC’s website at http://www.psrc.org/transportation/tip/triennial.

Subject: Disruption of public transit service provided by agencies eligible for minimum floor funds. An agency eligible to receive minimum floor funds—as identified in the Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds—may or may not receive a full final minimum floor amount if the agency experiences a significant disruption to the public transit service it provides, and the disruption is verified in FTA’s National Transit Database (NTD). The information on such a disruption, as described below, will be used by the Caucus to initiate a full discussion prior to preparing a recommendation to TOC.

- 20% Threshold based on verified NTD data. A substantial disruption is defined as when an agency’s total public transit service for the year—consisting of all the transit modes it operates—is 20% below its total public transit service in the year immediately prior to the year with the disruption. The 20% threshold shall be determined by comparing the following data:
  
  o The number of days the agency provided public transit service in the year of the disruption divided by the equivalent figure for the year immediately prior to the year with the disruption, and expressed as a percent. These data will be identified in the FTA NTD data as submitted by the agency, and as reviewed and verified by FTA’s NTD staff. The threshold will be met if the percentage is 20% or greater.

  o The percentage calculation will be prepared jointly by PSRC and the agency experiencing the disruption of service—using data provided by FTA’s NTD staff.
• The two year difference between NTD data and FTA actual allocations using the data. FTA allocates the funding in its formula programs based on NTD data from two years prior to the year of the allocations. E.g., FTA distributes the 2013 allocations of 5307 funds and 5309 FG funds using NTD data for 2011. An agency’s disruption in transit service in 2011 and reported in its NTD submitted for that year will appear in the 2013 FTA formula funding allocations.

• Pro-Rata Amount Option. When a disruption occurs at or above the 20% threshold and the agency also qualifies for a minimum floor adjustment in the same year, the Caucus and/or TOC may recommend to PSRC that the disruption be reflected in the FTA allocations in the following manner:

  o The minimum floor adjustment to the agency that experienced the disruption may be reduced, on a pro-rata basis, by the same percentage as the percent of disrupted service.

  o Illustration of this option: Agency X experiences a 30% disruption in the public transit service it provided in 2011 compared to 2010. The disruption is reflected in its NTD report to FTA for 2011. Agency X qualifies for a minimum floor adjustment in PSRC’s 2013 Seattle-Tacoma-Everett (STE) urbanized area (UZA) FTA funds. The Caucus and/or TOC may recommend to PSRC that Agency X receive its full 2013 final minimum floor adjustment amount, or 70% of the 2013 minimum floor adjustment due to the disruption in service.

• Any funds not programmed as minimum floor amounts due to a disruption in transit service will remain with the Regional FTA Competitive funds and distributed to projects eligible for those funds.

Subject: FTA’s required maximum 10% amount of FTA 5307 funds, by UZA, which may be programmed and expended on Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) paratransit operating projects.

• The Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds identifies the FTA requirement that up to 10% of a UZA’s 5307 funds may be programmed annually to ADA paratransit operating assistance projects. The Caucus recommendations for these funds will not exceed the 10% threshold.

• In addition, PSRC will identify the percent of 5307 funds programmed to ADA paratransit operating assistance projects, by UZA, following the completion of each year’s FTA adjustment process. The percent by UZA will be identified on the “FTA project list” documents which PSRC maintains by federal fiscal year for its FTA funds; the lists are available on PSRC’s Website at http://www.psrc.org/funding/cmaqstpfta/awards-history.
Subject: PSRC’s annual FTA adjustments & PSRC partial distributions.

- The **Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds** identifies the FTA requirement for its formula funds to be balanced annually to the actual allocated amounts approved by the federal government in FTA’s funding apportionments, and documents PSRC’s annual FTA adjustments process to satisfy the requirement.

  - In general, PSRC initiates an annual FTA adjustment for all of its MPO region’s UZAs after FTA publishes its full year apportionment. PSRC identifies the following:
    - The total of the PSRC FTA funds from the full year’s apportionments; the year’s currently programmed PSRC funds, based on estimates, by agency, by project; and the net changes needed to bring the programmed funds into balance. PSRC also identifies the process to be used, including the anticipated schedule for any Regional TIP and State TIP modifications needed, which will balance the PSRC FTA funds programmed to the year’s actual amount.

  - For the STE UZA, PSRC’s annual FTA adjustment materials includes:
    - PSRC prepares the year’s edition of the STE UZA disaggregation tool, an MS Excel workbook file, and related materials. The file contains the STE UZA portion of the FTA’s national formula calculations. The file identifies the portions of the UZA’s final FTA apportionments by two groups of data: a) regional data attributes (e.g., population, population density, low-income population), and b) public transit agency NTD data (e.g., operating and performance data). The regional attributes data are used to identify the PSRC FTA funds for the minimum floor amounts to qualifying public transit agencies, and to public transit projects recommended for Regional FTA Competitive funds. The operating and performance data are used to identify PSRC FTA funds for “earned share” funds to qualifying projects. The **2012 Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds** adopted the procedure that the amount of FTA funds for PSRC’s work program be removed “off the top,” as opposed to coming from the regional portion of the STE UZA’s funds, which had been the previous practice. Once this off the top adjustment is made, the balance remaining of the total PSRC FTA funds is distributed per the procedure outlined above. The decision on whether the 5307 funds to the PSRC work program is taken off the top of the total amount or from the regional portion only will be determined by the PSRC Boards and may change from cycle to cycle.
Agency sponsors qualifying for PSRC’s FTA funds participate in the annual FTA adjustments consistent with the published schedule and requirements identified by PSRC, including preparation of online TIP applications.

- At its discretion, PSRC prepares a partial distribution of currently programmed PSRC FTA funds in years for which FTA prepares a partial apportionment. In preparing a partial distribution, an opportunity will be allowed for agencies with programmed PSRC FTA funds to prioritize the amount of the funds to be included for each programmed project, provided the amount does not exceed the total amount currently programmed to a project.

Subject: Agreements among agencies on their NTD reported public transit service. These agreements will be referenced in this Technical Addendum when the earnings based on the NTD are different from the PSRC distribution of the funds.

- One example of this type of agreement is the 2004 agreement between Pierce County and Pierce Transit describes Pierce County’s decision to forego programming its PSRC FTA funds based on its Ferry Operations NTD data and support Pierce Transit programming the funds to its projects. The agreement also describes Pierce Transit’s decision to give its local funds to Pierce County, at a discounted amount (i.e., eighty cents of Pierce Transit funds to the County for every dollar Pierce Transit programmed of the County’s PSRC FTA funds). The agreement has been followed annually since 2004, and will continue until either agency chooses to discontinue it. To assist in implementing the agreement, PSRC identifies the earned share funds to Pierce County and to Pierce Transit as separate amounts—and minimum floor funds, when applicable—in the STE UZA disaggregation tool and related materials. The PSRC-developed funding information allows Pierce County and Pierce Transit to identify the funds generated from Ferry Operations NTD data separate from the other Pierce Transit PSRC FTA funds when programming both types of funds to projects in the Regional TIP.
PSRC’s **DRAFT 2018** Regional FTA Competition

Project Evaluation Criteria

Guidance for PSRC’s 2018 Regional FTA Competition was adopted as part of the **2016-2018 Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds**. The policy focus as adopted in the framework is to support the development of centers and the transportation corridors that serve them. The intent of this policy focus is to support implementation of VISION 2040, Transportation 2040 and the Regional Economic Strategy. For the FTA regional project competition, centers are defined as regional growth centers and manufacturing/industrial centers as identified in VISION 2040, centers as designated through countywide processes, town centers, and other locally identified centers.

Regional project evaluation criteria have been designed to implement the adopted policy focus of supporting centers and the corridors that serve them. Proposed projects will be reviewed for a variety of characteristics and impacts, including but not limited to: support for centers and compact urban development; support for the industry clusters identified in the adopted regional economic strategy, Amazing Place; support for the Regional Economic Strategy’s priority industry clusters; improved system performance and efficiency; safety; benefits to a variety of user groups; opportunities for active transportation and improved health; project readiness; and air quality/climate change benefits. In addition, sponsors have the opportunity to provide information that is not addressed in the evaluation criteria for additional consideration in the recommendation process. Per Board direction, this includes information on innovative project elements or procedures, and the process by which agencies determine the benefits of projects.

VISION 2040 was developed with attention to social equity, environmental justice, and public health. These are important elements that are also key to PSRC’s Growing Transit Communities Program, and are considered in the evaluation of projects. The criteria address the user groups that will benefit from proposed projects, including those groups identified in the President’s Order for Environmental Justice, seniors, people with disabilities, those located in highly impacted communities and/or areas experiencing high levels of unemployment or chronic underemployment. Projects are also evaluated for their provision of facilities that improve bicycle and pedestrian access to public transit and other elements that promote alternative modes of transportation. Projects are reviewed for elements such as streetscape improvements, the completion of missing links, the removal of barriers, transit service, bus shelters and other facilities. These and other types of transportation facilities and improvements provide options for choosing active modes of transportation, and consequently can provide public health benefits.

---


2. The Regional Economic Strategy identifies ten industry clusters: aerospace, business services, clean technology, information technology, life sciences and global health, maritime, military, philanthropies, tourism and visitors and transportation and logistics. Refer to PSRC’s website at http://www.psrc.org/econdev/res for more information on PSRC’s Regional Economic Strategy.

3. The President’s Order for Environmental Justice states “each Federal agency shall make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies and activities on minority populations and low-income populations.”

4. Highly impacted communities are geographic locations characterized by degraded air quality, whose residents face economic or historic barriers to participation in clean air decisions and solutions. For more information, see: http://www.pscleanair.org/priorities/Pages/equityeq.aspx.
The air quality/climate change criterion evaluates projects for their potential to eliminate single occupant vehicle trips and reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT), as well as for the promotion of alternative fuels and the reduction of idling. These elements not only have the capability to reduce traditional air pollutants, which are harmful to human and environmental health, but also to reduce emissions of the greenhouse gases which lead to climate change, both of which are called for in VISION 2040 and Transportation 2040. The Washington State Department of Ecology has identified diesel exhaust as the air pollutant most harmful to public health in Washington State, and according to the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency, the reduction of particulate matter – particularly diesel particulates – is the most important air quality challenge in the Puget Sound.

Projects will be compared to one another in order to determine the magnitude of the improvements and to arrive at a final score. Project scores of high, medium, and low are assigned for each criterion based on the magnitude of the benefits and impacts. Projects that most directly support each criterion will be rated “High.” The highest possible total score a project can receive is 100 points.

**INSTRUCTIONS**

Projects will be evaluated against the criteria based on the information and responses provided in the regional FTA application. The questions in the application were developed using the key bullet points in the criteria below. For the purpose of this Call for Projects, the term “project(s)” refers to project(s) or program(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part 1: Category Specific Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Corridors Serving Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit to Regional Growth, Manufacturing/Industrial and/or Locally Identified Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Continuity/Long Term Benefit-Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part 2: Technical Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Air Quality and Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Project Readiness/Financial Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Other Considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After all projects have been scored by PSRC staff, the Regional FTA Caucus will use the scores as a tool to help determine which projects to recommend for funding to the Transportation Operators Committee (TOC). The TOC will review and make recommendations for funding to the Transportation Policy Board (TPB), which will make the final recommendation to the Executive Board.
Part 1: Policy Criteria

A. Corridors Serving Centers = 70-75 Points

Benefit to Regional Growth, Manufacturing/Industrial and/or Locally Identified Center = 40 Points

- Describe how this project will benefit or support the existing and planned housing and employment development of a center(s). Does it support multiple centers?
- Describe how the project will support the development/redevelopment plans and activities (objectives and aims) of a center(s).
- Describe how the project provides a range of travel modes to users traveling to centers, or if it provides a missing mode.
- Describe how the project improves safe and convenient access to major destinations within the center, including enhanced opportunities for active transportation that can provide public health benefits through the following relevant areas: walkability, public transit access, public transit speed and reliability, safety & security, bicycle mobility and facilities, streetscape improvements, etc.
- Describe how the project provides a variety of users, including commuters, residents, and commercial users, those groups identified in the President’s Order for Environmental Justice, seniors, people with disabilities, those located in highly impacted communities, and/or areas experiencing high levels of unemployment or chronic underemployment.
- Describe how the project will benefit those groups identified in the President’s Order for Environmental Justice, seniors, people with disabilities, those located in highly impacted communities, and/or areas experiencing high levels of unemployment or chronic underemployment.
- Describe how the project will support the establishment of new jobs/businesses or the retention of existing jobs/businesses including those in the industry clusters identified in the adopted Regional Economic Strategy.
- Does the project promote Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) opportunities?

Guidance
Applicants should demonstrate the magnitude of the benefits provided by the project, and describe how it might support increased or sustained activity within the center. The project should have the potential to serve a variety of residents, employees, or other user groups. Health and equity are important considerations, and the applicant should describe whether it serves the transportation needs of various user groups such as those described above, which could be accomplished through provision of new or improved access, as one example. Additional resources are provided in the Call for Projects to assist sponsors in determining certain populations within their project area.

High: A high scoring project would demonstrate the following characteristics:
- Provides clear benefit to a center or centers by expanding the person and goods carrying capacity of routes leading towards the center(s);
- Demonstrates that it helps a center(s) meet its development goals (and can reference these goals);
- Improves access to the center(s) for multiple modes including nonmotorized and transit, providing opportunities for increased public health benefits;
- Serves multiple user groups, including those without full-time access to cars, those identified in the President’s Order for Environmental Justice, seniors, people with disabilities, those located in highly impacted communities, and/or areas experiencing high levels of unemployment or chronic underemployment;
- Adjacent to dense, mixed-use areas that are likely to generate significant use of the project;
- Supports the expansion or retention of employment in the center, including those within the industry clusters identified in the adopted Regional Economic Strategy;
- Promotes CTR opportunities.

**Medium**: A medium scoring project would demonstrate the following characteristics:
- Primarily benefits the development along the corridor rather than a center;
- Benefits to a center's development goals are not described in a comprehensive plan;
- Improves access to a center, but only for a few modes;
- Serves a moderate number and variety of users;
- Adjacent land uses are low-density, and therefore likely to generate limited use.

**Low**: A low scoring project would demonstrate the following characteristics:
- Has very limited benefits to a center, with the benefits not described in a comprehensive plan;
- Limited access improvements for only one mode;
- Serves a limited number and variety of users;
- Adjacent land uses are very low-density.

**System Continuity/ Long Term Benefit-Sustainability = 30-35 Points**

- Describe how this project provides a “logical segment” that serves a center, or allows users to access the system.
- Describe how the project fills in a missing link or removes barriers to a center (e.g., congestion, inadequate transit service/facilities.) Describe how this project will relieve pressure or remove a bottleneck on the Metropolitan Transportation System and how this will positively impact overall system performance.
- **Describe how the project addresses safety and security.**
- Describe how the project improves intermodal connections (e.g., between autos, ferries, commuter rail, high capacity transit, bus, carpool, bicycle, etc.), or facilitates connections between separate operators of a single mode (e.g., two transit operators).
- If applicable, describe how the project provides an improvement in travel time and/or reliability for transit users traveling to and/or within centers.
- If applicable, describe how the project increases transit use to or within centers;
- Describe how this project supports a long-term strategy to maximize the efficiency of the corridor. Describe the problem and how this project will remedy it.

**Guidance**
Applicants should demonstrate the magnitude of the benefits provided by the project, and describe how it might improve system continuity and access to centers.

**High**: A high scoring project would demonstrate the following characteristics:
- Improves a corridor in logical segments, preventing the creation of missing links or gaps, thereby improving access to a center or centers;
- Creates a new intermodal connection that provides significant system-wide performance benefits;
- Addresses critical gaps or barriers in the development of a corridor, creating greater efficiency or reliability in accessing a center;
- Removes a bottleneck that improves the overall system performance, and creates improved safety and access to a center;
- Provides a long-term solution for meeting projected travel demand for people and/or goods to a center, considering environmental issues, land use strategies, transportation efficiency, and health impacts.

Medium: A medium scoring project would demonstrate the following characteristics:
- Improves a corridor in logical segments, but provides limited improvement in accessing a center;
- Creates a new intermodal connection that provides moderate system-wide performance benefits;
- Addresses important, but not critical, gaps or barriers in the development of a corridor, and has limited improvements in efficiency or reliability in safely accessing a center;
- Provides limited relief to a bottleneck with limited improvement to overall system performance;
- Provides a short-term solution for meeting projected travel demand for people and/or goods, considering environmental issues, land use strategies, transportation efficiency, and health impacts.

Low: A low scoring project would demonstrate the following characteristics:
- Does not improve a corridor in logical segments and does not provide for improved access to a center;
- Does not create new intermodal connections;
- Addresses marginal gaps or barriers in the development of a corridor, and has very limited improvements in efficiency or reliability in accessing a center;
- Has no perceptible improvement to a bottleneck or to overall system performance;
- Does not address long-term projected travel demand, and
- Serves areas outside the Urban Growth Area.

Part 2: Technical Criteria

B. Air Quality and Climate Change = 20 Points

- Describe how the project will reduce emissions through one or more of the following:
  - Eliminating vehicle trips
  - Inducing a mode shift away from single occupant vehicles (SOVs)
  - Reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT)
  - Improving traffic flow (e.g., through signal coordination or by removing a bottleneck)
  - Converting to cleaner fuels, equipment, fuel systems and/or vehicles

Note: the application will provide specific questions for each applicable emissions reduction opportunity identified above.

High: A project will rate high if:
- It will substantially reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and other air pollutants, or will substantially reduce fine particulates from diesel exhaust; and
- The air quality benefits will occur by 2025

Medium: A project will rate medium if:
- It will moderately reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and other air pollutants, or will moderately reduce fine particulates from diesel exhaust (for example, a project that reduces VMT by shortening a vehicle trip, rather than eliminating a vehicle trip); and
- The air quality benefits will occur by 2030.

Low: A project will rate low if:
- It results in a low amount of emissions reductions; and
- The air quality benefits will occur after 2030.

Guidance
The objective of this criterion is to evaluate projects with the highest potential to reduce emissions of both traditional air pollutants as well as greenhouse gas emissions. These pollutants pose significant health risks, such as respiratory ailments, heart disease and cancer, as well as environmental risks such as damage to agriculture and Puget Sound. The application will include specific questions relevant to different types of projects to assist with this estimation.

Projects resulting in a substantial decrease in emissions will score the highest under this criterion. High scoring projects may eliminate a substantial number of trips, reduce VMT or reduce fine particulates through diesel vehicle and equipment retrofits. Converting fleets to alternative fuels may also score high under this criterion, if substantial emissions benefits will be achieved.

All projects will be evaluated based on their potential to reduce emissions. The magnitude of the emissions reductions will be a determining factor. In addition, an important factor in the evaluation will be the timing of the air quality benefits – i.e., when will the full potential emissions reductions occur. The timing of the air quality benefits is important to help the region continue to meet current and future air quality standards, as well as to assist the state in reaching the state’s greenhouse gas emissions reduction limits.

PSRC has consulted with the region’s air quality consultation partners to review the air quality criterion and the methodology for applying scores. These partner agencies include the Environmental Protection Agency, Washington State Department of Ecology, Puget Sound Clean Air Agency, Washington State Department of Transportation Air Quality Program, Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration.

PSRC has developed an “Air Quality and Climate Change Evaluation Guidance” document that provides additional background and resources regarding the estimation of emissions reductions from a variety of types and scales of transportation projects, and information on the technical tool PSRC uses to estimate emissions reductions. This guidance document is provided in the Call for Projects on PSRC’s website.
C. Project Readiness/Financial Plan = 105 Points

- When will the sponsor complete all prerequisites needed to obligate the project’s requested regional funds?
- When does the sponsor plan to obligate the requested regional funding?
- What are the amounts and sources of secured\(^5\) funding for the project?
- What are the amounts and sources of reasonably expected and unsecured funding for the project?
- Will the PSRC funding complete the project or a phase of the project?
- How reasonable is the financial plan for the requested phase(s)? Describe the funds already dedicated to the project, anticipated and reasonably expected to be secured, or unsecured at the time of the application.

Project sponsors will be asked to supply in the application a full financial budget and project schedule. Depending on the type and scale of the project, information should be provided on the following milestones: design, environmental documentation, permits issued, Right of Way approvals, final design, engineer’s estimate, etc.

Project scoring will be on a sliding scale between 0 and 10 points. Points assigned will be based on the application identifying all the prerequisites to obligating the requested PSRC FTA funds, and how many are completed or underway. The table below illustrates the sliding scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sliding Point Scale</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>All prerequisites to obligating the requested PSRC FTA funds are identified, and each prerequisite has been completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>A score of between 1 and 9 will be assigned for a project in which some, but not all, of the prerequisites to obligating the requested PSRC FTA funds have been completed. A project may be assigned only 1 point if no prerequisites have yet been completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>None of the prerequisites needed to obligating the requested FTA funds are underway, and there is reason to believe that they will not be completed by the obligation date provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guidance
Sponsors are expected to identify all of the appropriate prerequisites for the phase being requested. The more prerequisites completed, the more points will be assigned. For example, a project may receive 9 points if all but one prerequisite has been completed and the final prerequisite is underway. Fewer points will be assigned if fewer prerequisites are completed but are underway. Project phases with few prerequisites will be scaled accordingly. A few examples of how this criterion might be applied are illustrated below.

- Project 1 is requesting construction funds. Five prerequisites have been identified, with all but one complete. This project is likely to receive a score of 9-9 points, depending on the length of time to complete the remaining prerequisite.

\(^5\)Refer to PSRC’s website for more information on the definition of secured, reasonably expected to be secured, and unsecured funds: http://www.psrc.org/assets/469/FinancialConstraintGuidance.pdf
Project 2 is requesting construction funds. Five prerequisites have been identified: one is complete, one is underway, and the remaining have not yet begun. This project is likely to receive a score of 3-4 points, depending on the expected length of time to complete the remaining prerequisites.

Project 3 is requesting funds to purchase transit vehicles. This type of project is a documented categorical exclusion under NEPA, and will build on an existing bus purchase contract. There are no other prerequisites identified. This project is likely to receive a score of 10.

**High:** A project will receive a high score if the applicant can demonstrate that work on the prerequisites for obligation of the requested phase has begun and that all work will be completed by the obligation deadline. Some or all funds needed to complete the phase(s) have been dedicated to the project; if not all funds are dedicated at the time of the application, the sponsor provides a plan demonstrating it is reasonable for all funds to be secured by the obligation deadline.

**Medium:** A project will receive a medium score if work for the obligation prerequisites has not yet started but the applicant can demonstrate that it will be completed for the requested phase(s) by the estimated obligation deadline. No funding is yet dedicated for the project but the sponsor provides a plan demonstrating that all other needed funding for the requested phase will be fully secured by the estimated obligation deadline.

**Low:** A project will receive a low score if the applicant fails to demonstrate that all prerequisites for obligation of the requested phase will be met by the estimated obligation deadline. No funds are dedicated for the project and the sponsor does not demonstrate that it is reasonable for all funding to be secured by the deadline for the phase(s) requested.

**Guidance:** The focus of this criterion is to evaluate the feasibility of each project to meet the obligation and financial plan requirements of the requested phase by the estimated selected date. All requested phases must be fully funded with the PSRC grant award and other identified funding.

D. Other Considerations (no points)

Please describe any additional aspects of your project not requested in the evaluation criteria that could be relevant to the final project recommendation and decision-making process. Per PSRC Board direction, this includes information on innovative project elements or procedures, and the process by which jurisdictions determine the benefits of projects.

- Describe any additional aspects of your project not requested in the evaluation criteria that could be relevant to the final project recommendation and decision-making process.
- Describe any innovative components included in your project; these could include design elements, cost saving measures, or other innovations.
- Describe the process that your agency uses to determine the benefits of projects; this could include formal cost-benefit analysis, practical design, or some other process by which the benefits of projects are determined.