Regional Project Evaluation Committee (RPEC)

September 22, 2017 • 9:30 – 11:00 a.m.
PSRC Board Room • 1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500 • Seattle, WA 98104

9:30 1. **Introductions and Announcements** – Don Cairns, Chair

2. **Public Comment**

3. **Approve Meeting Summary for July 28, 2017***

4. **Transportation Policy Board Debrief**
   The ‘At Work’ report for the Transportation Policy Board meeting on Thursday, September 14, 2017 is available on the PSRC website at [http://www.psrc.org/about/boards/tpb/tpb-at-work/](http://www.psrc.org/about/boards/tpb/tpb-at-work/).

   Staff will provide a status report on the final delivery for 2017. In addition, staff will provide a report on 2018 federal funding.

   Staff will summarize the discussions to date on the key issues for the 2018 project selection process. Staff will also provide a report on the first meeting of the Project Selection Task Force. The next items to discuss beginning in September will include project readiness and balancing by year, and other criteria elements.

10:55 9. **Other Business**

10. **Next Meeting:**
   October 27, 2017, 9:30-11:00 a.m., PSRC Board Room

11:00 11. **Adjourn**

*Supporting materials attached

For more information, contact Kelly McGourty, Program Manager, at (206) 971-3601 or kmcgourty@psrc.org.

---

Sign language and communication material in alternate formats can be arranged given sufficient notice by calling (206) 464-7090 or TTY Relay 711. 中文 | Chinese, 한국어 | Korean, Русский | Russian, Español | Spanish, Tagalog, Tiếng việt | Vietnamese call 206-587-4819.
## RPEC Attendance Roster (Members and Alternates at the Table)

**Date:** July 28, 2017 9:30am - 11:30am - (Extended Time)

**NOTE:** Members are invited to sit at the table and vote. Alternates may sit at the table and vote when the member is absent. All other Alternates and Guests are invited to attend and sit in the gallery. This roster is for attendance purposes only and should be marked by all members and alternates present at the table, regardless of voting status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King County (3)</td>
<td>Paul Carlson</td>
<td>Snohomish County (2)</td>
<td>Doug McCormick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Heffernan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steve Thomsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Oxholm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Janice Fahnig (Alt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wes Edwards (Alt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gina Hortillosa (Alt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Greene (Alt.)</td>
<td>Everett (1)</td>
<td>Max Phan (Alt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jay Osborne (Alt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Tarry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michelle Allison (2nd Alt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Melinda Adams (Alt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle (3)</td>
<td>Jim Storment</td>
<td>Other Cities/Towns (2)</td>
<td>Eddie Low, Bothell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sara Walton (Phone)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeff Elekes, Lynnwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jude Willcher</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rob English, Edmonds (Alt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Conway (Alt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kamal Mahmoud, Mill Creek (Alt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dawn Schellenberg (Alt.)</td>
<td>WSDOT-NW Region (1)</td>
<td>Azim Sheikh-Taheri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gabrielle Sivage (Alt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Prestrud (Alt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue (1)</td>
<td>Eric Miller</td>
<td>WSDOT-Oly Region (1)</td>
<td>Neal Campbell (Phone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toni Finco (Alt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>JoAnn Schueler (Alt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Cities/Towns (5)</td>
<td>Don Cairns, Chair, Redmond</td>
<td>WSDOT-Pub Transp (1)</td>
<td>Stan Suchan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malia Andrews, Burien</td>
<td></td>
<td>Don Chartock (Alt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Marcinke, Snoqualmie</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rick Singer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Seitz, Renton</td>
<td>WSDOT-WS Ferries (1)</td>
<td>Leslie Riff (Alt. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingrid Guub, Auburn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Krishan Agarwal (Alt. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chad Bieren (Alt.), Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Bernhard (Alt. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheldon Lynne (Alt.), Issaquah</td>
<td>Kitsap Transit (1)</td>
<td>Steffani Little (Phone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant (Alt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeff Davidson (Alt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kris Overleece (Alt.), Kenmore</td>
<td>Pierce Transit (1)</td>
<td>Barb Hunter (Phone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kytyasha Sowers (Alt.), Shoreline</td>
<td>Community Transit (1)</td>
<td>Darin Stavig (Alt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap County (1)</td>
<td>David Forte</td>
<td></td>
<td>Melissa Cauley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeff Shea (Alt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kathryn Rasmussen (Alt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremerton (1)</td>
<td>Tom Knuckey</td>
<td>King County Metro (1)</td>
<td>Lisa Shafer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shane Weber (Alt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Matt Hansen (Alt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milenka Hawkins-Bates (Alt. 2)</td>
<td>Sound Transit (1)</td>
<td>Lisa Wolterink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chal Martin (Alt. 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monica Overby (Alt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Cities/Towns (1)</td>
<td>Barry Loveless, Bainbridge Island</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kirste Johnson (Alt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Dorsey (Alt.), Port Orchard</td>
<td>Port of Seattle (1)</td>
<td>Karen Kitto (Alt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce County (2)</td>
<td>Leticia Neal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Geri Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brian Stacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan McFarland (Alt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matt Graves (Alt.)</td>
<td>Port of Tacoma (1)</td>
<td>Deirdre Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clint Ritter (Alt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jason Jordan (Alt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma (2)</td>
<td>Josh Diekmann</td>
<td>Port of Everett (1)</td>
<td>Graham Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dan Soderlind</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Kekotka (Alt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dana Brown (Alt.)</td>
<td>Port of Bremerton (1)</td>
<td>Fred Salisbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brennan Kidd (Alt.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>VACANT (Alt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Cities/Towns (1)</td>
<td>Russ Blount, Vice Chair, Fife</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suquamish Tribe (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Burlingame (Alt.), Steilacoom</td>
<td>PSCAA (1)</td>
<td>Andrew Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Gatz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VACANT (Alt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muckleshoot Tribal Cncl (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Puyallup Tribe (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NON-VOTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Dane - BPAC Chair (Phone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shawn Phelps - BPAC V-Chair (Alt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Boonsrisipal - RTOC Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Bloodgood - RTOC Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer Hass - TDM SC Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carol Cooper - TDM SC Vice Chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rev. 05/05/2017
Members and Alternates Represented at the Table
(See attached Attendance Roster)

Other Guests and Alternates (for all or part of the meeting):
Sophie Glass, KRCC; Kyle Butler, City of Kirkland (via phone); PSRC Staff: Monica Adkins, Sarah Gutschow, Charlie Howard, Kathryn Johnson, Kelly McGourty, Jeff Storrar

Introductions, Public Comment, and Announcements
There were two public comments from individuals (Alex Tsimmerman, Marguerite Richard).

Approval of Meeting Summary
The summary for the June 23, 2017 RPEC meeting was approved as submitted.

Transportation Policy Board Debrief
The ‘At Work’ reports for the Transportation Policy Board meetings on Thursday, July 13, 2017 are available on the PSRC website at http://www.psrc.org/about/boards/tpb/tpb-at-work/

Report: 2017 Delivery Update
Staff provided a status report on progress towards meeting the 2017 delivery target.

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

Report: Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)
Staff provided a status report on the schedule and process for the TAP competition, to be released soon.

For more information, contact Jeff Storrar, (206) 587-4817

Discussion: 2018 Project Selection Process
Staff walked through the schedule for the Project Selection Task Force and the process for reviewing key issues related to the 2018 process. The discussion focused on the consideration of expanding the use of cost effectiveness in the criteria; funding limits, splits, etc.; set-asides; and the Rural Town Centers and Corridors Program. A summary of the RPEC and countywide group discussions on these topics will be provided in September.

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

Other Business
There was no other business.

Next meeting: September 22, 2017, 9:30-11:00 a.m., PSRC Board Room
The Project Selection Task Force will be convened this fall, to provide direction and make recommendations on the policies and procedures for the 2018 project selection process. RPEC and the countywide committees are asked to provide feedback on a few key elements of the project selection process, as input to the Task Force discussions.

The following provides background information on the key elements to be reviewed by the upcoming Project Selection Task Force. Items discussed in July are highlighted in red; these discussions will be summarized for the committee in September. Items planned for discussion at the September meeting are highlighted in orange. Additional items will be incorporated for future meetings.

**ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS**

**Funding years to program**

*Description:*

Two years of funding will be distributed -- FFY 2021, 2022. Per direction from FHWA/FTA and as discussed during the last cycle, PSRC will continue to build and maintain a full 4-year TIP (2019-2022).

**Funding Estimates**

*Description:*

Funding estimates will be determined by the Project Selection Task Force, in coordination with WSDOT, FHWA and FTA. Note that these funds extend beyond the FAST Act.

**Policy Focus**

*Description:*

The Project Selection Task Force will be asked to recommend retention of the policy focus of support for centers and the corridors that serve them, utilizing the existing centers framework. As a reminder, this is implemented in the following manner:

- FHWA Regional competition - centers are defined as regionally designated growth and manufacturing/industrial centers; *(for the 2018 process, existing designated centers are presumed).*
- FHWA Countywide competitions - centers are defined as regionally or locally identified centers, and the definition of locally identified centers is expanded to include military facilities.

**Contingency Lists**

*Description:*

No changes are anticipated to be made to this process, to adopt prioritized list of contingency projects for all competitions.

**Number of regional applications**

*Description:*

It is presumed that the existing structure of a limit of 36 total applications for the regional competition will be maintained, as follows:

- 12 King; 6 each Kitsap, Pierce, Snohomish; 2 each from regional agencies
Discussion:
PSRC will take a sense of the committee on this topic for feedback to the Task Force.

Split of Funds Between Regional / Countywide Competitions
Description:
Historically, once the set-asides are taken off the top of the combined pot of funds, the split between the regional and countywide competitions is set at 50%. For the last several cycles, this has resulted in a total of 33% to the regional competition and 67% to the countywide competitions.
Discussion:
PSRC will take a sense of the committee on this topic for feedback to the Task Force.

Funding Limits
Description:
Committee members have requested a discussion on setting limits on the maximum amount requested in the regional competition. Data on amounts requested and awarded over the last few cycles will be presented at the meeting. Attached is the summary data provided on this topic in July. In addition, preliminary analysis indicates the draft amounts by funding source available for the 2018 regional competition are approximately $21 million of STP ($10.5 million of STP per year) and $28.5 million of CMAQ ($14.2 million of CMAQ per year).
Discussion:
PSRC will take a sense of the committee on this topic for feedback to the Task Force.

Pre-Determined Amounts by Source in Competition(s)
Description:
In 2016, a new feature was added to pre-determine the amount of STP and CMAQ funds in the regional and countywide competitions. This provided greater certainty to applicants within each process as to the amount of funds available by source, particularly given the inclusion of cost-effectiveness in the CMAQ criteria. The percentage amounts in 2016 for the regional competition were 60% CMAQ, 40% STP.
Discussion:
PSRC will take a sense of the committee on this topic for feedback to the Task Force.

SET-ASIDES

Preservation Set-Aside
Description:
The preservation set-aside has been in place since 2012, and was reduced in 2016 from 25% of STP funds to 20%. The 5% difference was distributed among the four counties for their regular competitions. It is anticipated this topic will continue to be a highly debated policy discussion at the Project Selection Task Force -- the debate has centered around the fact that preservation is a top priority in the region, but questioning whether this should be funded locally or with PSRC’s limited federal funds.
**Discussion:**
PSRC will take a sense of the committee on this topic for feedback to the Task Force – specifically, whether or not to continue the set-aside. The Task Force may request additional data for their deliberations, which has been difficult to produce in any meaningful way in the past. The most relevant available data points may be from the expenditure information provided by cities and counties for the Transportation 2040 update:

- Amount of backlog to bring city/county roads up to a PCI of 70 = $8.7 billion (roughly half of this amount is from one county)
- Average annual city/county expenditures required to maintain the system to a PCI of 70 = $248 million (assumed to be carried forward each year through 2040 in the plan)

We anticipate future discussions with RPEC and the countywide groups on this topic.

**Bicycle / Pedestrian Set-Aside**

**Description:**
The bicycle/pedestrian set-aside has been in place since 1993, and has been retained over the years at 10% of the total estimated FHWA funds, distributed in the countywide processes. The original rationale for the set-aside was that these types of projects were less competitive and had a more difficult time obtaining funding; since then, the rationale has focused on the policy priority of these investments and the needs around the region.

**Discussion:**
PSRC will take a sense of the committee on this topic for feedback to the Task Force – specifically, whether or not to continue the set-aside. As part of their deliberations for the 2016 process, the Task Force was provided the following data:

- In recent cycles, about half of the set-aside funding has been applied towards sidewalks and bicycle lanes
- Since 1992, 47% of PSRC-funded roadway projects have also included bicycle/pedestrian elements – with the trend increasing greatly over the last decade
- In addition to the set-aside distributed at the countywide level, several bicycle/pedestrian projects have been funded through the regional competition over the last several cycles

Depending on additional information requested by the Task Force, there may be additional conversations on this topic in the future.

**Rural Town Centers & Corridors Program**

**Description:**
The RTCC Program has been in place since 2003, and the set-aside – taken from the regional portion of funding – has increased from $2 million to $3 million. This has been a well-received program, but over the past few cycles issues have been raised regarding the modest size of this pot compared to the needs of these smaller rural communities.

**Discussion:**
PSRC proposes to review and refresh this program, given that it has been 14 years since the original study and pilot program. We will continue conversations with internal and external staff on some of the key issues, including eligibility, funding needs, etc. Thus far we have heard support for retaining the program, with varying thoughts on improvements. More information will be provided prior to the Task Force taking up this issue.
Kitsap Distribution Methodology

**Description:**
The procedure to distribute the Kitsap Countywide population share from the total STP funds available, before any other set-asides, has been in place since 1995. The rationale behind this methodology has been that Kitsap County agencies are not eligible to receive CMAQ funds, due to the boundaries of the region's air quality maintenance areas, so the application of their population share is only to STP funds rather than the total pot of funds. This distribution methodology helps to balance that differential.

**Discussion:**
PSRC was directed to research alternate ways of addressing equity, fairness and/or this “normalization” of funding for Kitsap County projects for the 2018 process. PSRC staff plans to engage the Kitsap County elected officials on this topic prior to the Task Force meetings. More information will be provided at a future meeting.

## PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA

Future committee discussions will be held regarding details of the project evaluation criteria, however, to date no significant changes have been requested or deemed necessary. One topic that has arisen for current discussion is the potential interest by the Task Force to expand the use of cost-effectiveness beyond the CMAQ program.

### Cost-Effectiveness

**Description:**
In 2016, cost-effectiveness was incorporated into the air quality criterion for CMAQ projects. This was considered a pilot at that time, but comments to date indicate support for this procedure. PSRC will do a more complete evaluation of the outcomes particular to CMAQ and will report out at the July meeting. However, the previous Project Selection Task Force expressed an interest in expanding our evaluation of cost-effectiveness more broadly.

**Discussion:**
RPEC and the countywide groups are asked to provide feedback in anticipation of this request, specifically to incorporate some element of cost-effectiveness more broadly in the project selection process. Research into processes conducted by other MPOs around the country was conducted in 2016, and the key element that would need to be incorporated would be some pre-determined measure by which to perform a calculation - for example, congestion (as measured by travel speed, delay, vehicle miles traveled, etc.) safety (accident data) or usage (transit ridership, density, etc.). Initial discussions have yielded some relevant points regarding the difficulties of applying this concept, as well as information on existing processes by which projects are selected for submittal. Further conversations may occur on this topic, depending on the interest expressed by the Task Force.

### Project Readiness

**Description:**
The evaluation of project readiness and the financial plan for projects is still an integral component of PSRC’s project tracking program. The new component to address as part of the 2018 project selection process is the selection of awards by year, to meet the requirements of a balanced TIP by year and by funding source.
Discussion:
As closure to the balancing exercise conducted earlier this year, in June 2017 staff provided a proposal for how we remain nimble and flexible should project schedules become delayed, to ensure our annual delivery targets continue to be met. This information will be provided once again in September.

To assure balance of the 2021-2022 funds awarded by year, staff proposes to utilize the information that will be provided in each application regarding project readiness and the achievement of specific milestones as a starting point for the assignment of awards by fiscal year. We anticipate there will be nuances to this determination, which will require further discussion during committee deliberations. Additional information will be provided in September, but as stated under Funding Limits above, the preliminary draft amounts available per year are $10.5 million of STP per year and $14.2 million of CMAQ per year.

Remaining Criteria
No significant changes to the evaluation criteria have been requested or deemed necessary thus far in discussions. Please refer to the attached document for the 2016 version of the regional evaluation criteria, for further discussion in September.
Funding Limits – Background Data

Summary of Regional FHWA Requests (2014 & 2016):
- Requests varied from $692,000 to $18.3 million
  - Average request was between $3.1 million to $5.3 million
    - Less than $1 million = 5.8 %
    - $1 to $5 million = 42.6 %
    - $5 to $10 million = 32.3%
    - Over $10 million = 19.3 %
      - ✓ 2014 = 4 agencies ~ represented 42% of funding requested
      - ✓ 2016 = 7 agencies ~ 51% of funding requested

Summary of Regional FHWA Awards (2014 & 2016):
- 32 awards, which varied from $200,000 to $13.0 million
- Average award was between $3.9 million to $4.9 million
  - Less than $1 million = 6% of awards and ~ .80% of funding
  - $1 to $5 million = 56% of awards and ~ 35% of funding
  - $5 to $10 million = 34% of awards and ~ 54% of funding
  - Over $10 million = 3% of awards and ~ 10% of funding
2016 Regional Project Evaluation Criteria
For PSRC’s FHWA Funds

INTRODUCTION

As described in the adopted 2016 Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds, the policy focus for the 2016 project selection process 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 regional project competition, centers are defined as regional growth centers and manufacturing/industrial centers as identified in VISION 2040, and designated by PSRC.

Regional project evaluation criteria have been designed to implement the adopted Policy Framework and the policy focus of supporting designated regional growth and manufacturing/industrial 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 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 public 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 jurisdictions determine the benefits of projects.

Criteria Updates for 2016

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. This priority has also been continued in the current federal transportation act, Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST) and is reflected in the Air Quality and Climate Change criterion. In addition, cost-effectiveness is now incorporated into the air quality scoring process for projects requesting funds from the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program, consistent with federal guidance.

Further, 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

---

1 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/econdevriages for more information on PSRC’s Regional Economic Strategy.

2 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.”

3 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/equityej.aspx.
chronic underemployment. The criteria also address the provision of facilities that improve walkability, bicycle mobility, and access to public transit. These and other types of transportation facilities and improvements provide options for choosing active modes of transportation, and consequently can provide public health benefits.

**INSTRUCTIONS**

There are three project categories: projects within a regional growth center, projects within a manufacturing/industrial center, and projects on a corridor serving centers. Since these categories represent three distinct types of projects that all support existing and new development in centers, sponsors are asked to pick the category that best fits their project. Projects will then be scored using the corresponding criteria under Part 1. In addition, the evaluation criteria under Part 2 will be applied to all projects.

The objective of the regional evaluation criteria is to review and rate similar types of projects. Projects will be compared to one another within their category in order to determine the magnitude of the improvement 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. Projects from all three categories will be ranked together based upon total points received.

Projects will be evaluated against the criteria based on the information and responses provided in the regional application found in the Call for Projects. The questions in the application were developed using the key bullet points in the criteria. Sponsors will be asked on the regional application to select one funding source, Surface Transportation Program (STP) or Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ); the point values of the criteria below differ depending on which funding source is selected (refer to the table below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 1: Category Specific Questions</th>
<th>STP</th>
<th>CMAQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A: Designated Regional Growth Centers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Growth Center Development</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit to the Regional Growth Center</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation within the Regional Growth Center</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part 2: Criteria for all Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D: Air Quality/Climate Change</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E: Project Readiness/Financial Plan</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After all projects have been scored by PSRC staff, the Regional Project Evaluation Committee (RPEC) will use the scores as a tool to help determine which projects to recommend for funding to the Transportation Policy Board (TPB), which will make the final recommendation to the Executive Board.

### Part 1: Category Specific Questions

**A. DESIGNATED REGIONAL GROWTH CENTERS = 70 POINTS STP, 40 POINTS CMAQ**

**A1. Regional Growth Center Development = 30 Points STP, 16 Points CMAQ**

- Describe how the project will support the existing and planned housing/employment densities in the regional growth center.
- Describe how the project will support the development/redevelopment plans and activities (objectives and aims) of the center. Please provide a citation of the corresponding policies and/or specific project references in a subarea plan or in the comprehensive plan.
- 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.

**High:** A project will receive a high rating if it clearly supports a significant amount of existing and/or planned population/employment activity in the center, including employment within the industry clusters identified in the adopted Regional Economic Strategy, and implements specific policies or projects identified for the center in an adopted plan.

**Medium:** A project will receive a medium rating if it supports a moderate amount of existing and/or planned population/employment activity in the center, including employment within the industry clusters identified in the Regional Economic Strategy, and implements adopted general or programmatic policies for the center.

**Low:** A project will receive a low rating if it supports a limited amount of existing and/or planned population/employment activity in the center, and is consistent with the development goals for the center.

**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. A wide variety of projects, such as new or improved pedestrian and bicycle routes, roadway projects, system management programs, and transit service enhancements could expand or improve person and goods carrying capacity within the center, thereby supporting increased housing and employment activity in a regional growth center. Applicants should describe the benefits provided by the project to the specific industry clusters identified in the Regional Economic Strategy. Improving the ability of a business to draw its workforce and customer base from a wider area throughout the region, or improved travel time for commuters or goods delivery are examples of how a project might benefit the retention or establishment of new jobs or businesses.

The applicant should describe how the proposed project would implement the policies and objectives identified for the center, and provide documentation of the relevant policies. For example,
a jurisdiction may have a comprehensive plan policy that states that roadways within the regional growth center, or specific segments of an identified street, should be redeveloped into multimodal, pedestrian friendly facilities. Proposed projects that introduce or advance additional transportation modes on existing roadways, such as new or improved sidewalks, landscaping, pedestrian crossings, bicycle lanes, and/or bus facilities, would accomplish this objective. Another example might be a subarea plan that calls for better circulation in the center through improved cross-street connections and reduction in length of city blocks. A project proposing to create a new cross-street for more direct access to center services, where none previously existed, may meet this goal.

**A2. Benefit to the Regional Growth Center = 20 Points STP, 12 Points CMAQ**

- Describe how the project remedies a current or anticipated problem (e.g. congestion, incomplete sidewalk system, inadequate transit service/facilities, modal conflicts and/or the preservation of essential freight movement).
- Describe how the project will benefit various user groups, including the following: commuters, residents, 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.

**High:** A project will receive a high rating if it would remedy a significant and clearly demonstrated problem, and would benefit a large number and variety of users (including the groups identified above).

**Medium:** A project will receive a medium rating if it would remedy a moderate problem, and would benefit a moderate number and variety of users.

**Low:** A project will receive a low rating if it would remedy a minor problem or condition, and would benefit a limited number and variety of users.

**Guidance:** The project should clearly identify the problem being remedied, and its impact on the center. For example, how does the project address a significant problem clearly identified in plans or programs such as an area with reported accidents or other safety incidents, an area with significant congestion, or other identified issues? The project should have the potential to serve a large number and 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.

**A3. Circulation Within the Regional Growth Center = 20 Points STP, 12 Points CMAQ**

- Describe how the project improves safe & convenient access to major destinations within the center, such as completing a physical gap or providing an essential link in the transportation network for people and/or goods.
- Describe how the project will improve circulation within the center and enhance 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, bicycle facilities, streetscape improvements, traffic calming, etc. Describe how the
project provides users (e.g. employees, residents, customers) a range of travel modes or provides a “missing” mode.

- If the project has a parking component, describe how it has been designed to be compatible with a pedestrian oriented environment, including any innovative parking management tools.

**High:** A project will receive a high rating if it significantly improves access and circulation within the regional growth center, provides a variety of travel modes and opportunities for increased public health benefits through active transportation improvements, and employs innovative design or parking management.

**Medium:** A project will receive a medium rating if it moderately improves circulation within the center, provides moderate travel benefits for more than one mode, and provides moderate opportunities for active transportation.

**Low:** A project will receive a low rating if it improves circulation to a limited degree within the center, and provides benefits for a single mode with limited opportunities for active transportation.

**Guidance:** The applicant should describe how the proposed project provides access to destinations within the center such as sports or recreation facilities, arts venues, employment concentrations, government centers, transportation hubs, and freight facilities. Multimodal projects that consider the needs of pedestrians, public transit, bicycles, and automobiles have positive benefits for a wider variety of users than do projects focusing on a single mode. These projects also provide opportunities for active transportation that can lead to public health benefits.

The applicant should describe how the project will enhance circulation within the regional growth center, for example by providing a link, missing mode, multimodal program, transportation demand management (TDM) or intelligent transportation systems (ITS). For example, projects that include TDM activities designed to mitigate travel disruptions during the construction of a project and/or to encourage desired use and performance upon the project’s completion may influence travel behavior and provide long-term benefits. Projects completing networks and providing critical connections that did not exist previously will tend to score higher than those that do not.

Large expanses of surface parking can have a negative effect on the pedestrian environment because it increases the distances between active uses and disrupts streetscapes. Applicants with projects that have a parking component should describe how it has been designed to be compatible with a pedestrian oriented environment. Examples can be seen in structured parking that can minimize the surface area devoted to parking in regional growth centers, and street parking that can help to buffer pedestrian walkways from traffic on streets, while providing convenient access to businesses. Spaces reserved for carpools and vanpools can also minimize the overall amount of required parking, enhancing the pedestrian environment.
B. MANUFACTURING/INDUSTRIAL CENTERS = 70 POINTS STP, 40 POINTS CMAQ


- Describe how the project will benefit or support the development plans and activities of the manufacturing/industrial center. Please provide a citation of the corresponding policies and/or specific project references in a subarea plan or in the comprehensive plan.
- 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.
- Describe how the project will benefit various user groups, including the following: commuters, residents, 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.

High: A project will receive a high rating if it clearly supports a significant amount of existing and/or planned employment activity in the center, including employment within the industry clusters identified in the adopted Regional Economic Strategy, implements specific projects or policies identified for the center, and benefits a variety of user groups (including the groups identified above).

Medium: A project will receive a medium rating if it supports a moderate amount of existing and/or planned employment activity in the center, including employment within the industry clusters identified in the adopted Regional Economic Strategy, implements adopted general or programmatic policies for the center, and would benefit a moderate number and variety of users.

Low: A project will receive a low rating if it supports a limited amount of existing and/or planned employment activity in the center, is consistent with the development goals for the center, and would benefit a limited number and variety of users.

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. Applicants should describe the benefits provided by the project to the specific industry clusters identified in the Regional Economic Strategy. Improving the ability of a business to draw its workforce and customer base from a wider area throughout the region, or improved travel time for commuters or goods delivery are examples of how a project might benefit the retention or establishment of new jobs or businesses. The project should have the potential to serve a large number and 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.

B2. Mobility and Accessibility Benefit – 30 Points STP, 15 Points CMAQ

- Describe how the project provides and/or enhances opportunities for freight movement.
• Describe how the project completes a physical gap, provides an essential link, or removes a barrier in the Freight & Goods component of the Metropolitan Transportation System.
• Describe how the project improves safety and reduces modal conflicts to help achieve a seamless system.
• Describe how the project improves access for one or more modes to major employment sites.
• Describe how the project provides opportunities for active transportation that can lead to public health benefits.
• Describe how the project promotes Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) and other TDM opportunities.

High: A project will receive a high rating if it provides improvements for freight movement resulting in a significant reduction in travel time and/or increased safety and efficiencies (such as through the provision of a new link or removal of a barrier, separation with other modes, the promotion of CTR and TDM activities, etc.), and improves access to employment for a variety of modes and provides opportunities for active transportation.

Medium: A project will receive a medium rating if it provides improvements for freight movement resulting in a moderate reduction in travel time and/or increased safety and efficiencies, improves access to employment for one or more modes, and provides modest opportunities for active transportation.

Low: A project will receive a low rating if it provides limited improvements for the movement of freight and access to employment in the center, with limited opportunities for active transportation.

Guidance: Sponsors should describe the benefits of the project in terms of time savings, circulation within the center, safety, mode share, and improved public health through active transportation. Examples could include: a grade separation of roadway and rail line that removes a bottleneck or improves the travel time for moving goods, and improves pedestrian and bicycle safety; an ITS project that significantly improves people and goods movement, and provides information on travel; or transit-supportive investments that improve transit use among employees and customers. Projects that include TDM activities designed to mitigate travel disruptions during the construction of a project and/or to encourage desired use and performance upon the project’s completion may influence travel behavior and provide long-term benefits.

C. CORRIDORS SERVING CENTERS = 70 POINTS STP, 40 POINTS CMAQ

C1. Benefit to Regional Growth or Manufacturing/Industrial Center = 40 Points STP, 25 Points CMAQ

• Describe how this project will benefit or support the housing and employment development in a regional growth center(s) and/or employment growth in a manufacturing/industrial center(s). Does it support multiple centers? Please provide a citation of the relevant policies and/or specific project references in a subarea plan or in the comprehensive plan.
• Describe how the project provides or benefits a range of travel modes to users traveling to/from centers, or if it provides a missing mode.
• Describe how the project will benefit various user groups, including the following: commuters, residents, 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 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.

**High:** A project will be rated high if it clearly supports a significant amount of existing and/or planned population and/or employment activity in one or more centers, including employment within the industry clusters identified in the adopted Regional Economic Strategy; provides benefits to a range of travel modes or provides a missing mode to or from a center, and provides benefits to a variety of user groups, including the groups identified above.

**Medium:** A project will be rated medium if it supports a moderate amount of existing and/or planned population and/or employment activity in one or more centers, including employment within the industry clusters identified in the adopted Regional Economic Strategy, and provides benefits to a moderate number and variety of user groups and modes.

**Low:** A project will be rated low if it has limited benefits to a center and provides benefits for a single mode and for a limited number and variety of user groups.

**Guidance:** Applicants should demonstrate the magnitude of the benefits provided by the project, and describe how it might support increased or sustained activity within one or more centers. A wide variety of projects, such as new or improved pedestrian and bicycle routes, roadway projects, system management programs, and transit service enhancements could expand or improve person and goods carrying capacity to or from a center, thereby supporting increased housing and employment activity. Applicants should describe the benefits provided by the project to the specific industry clusters identified in the Regional Economic Strategy. Improving the ability of a business to draw its workforce and customer base from a wider area throughout the region, or improved travel time for commuters or goods delivery are examples of how a project might benefit the retention or establishment of new jobs or businesses. Applicants should also explain how the improvement to the corridor is benefiting a variety of modes traveling to and from the center.

The project should have the potential to serve a large number and variety of residents, employees, or other user groups traveling to and from one or more regional centers. 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.

**C2. System Continuity/Long-Term Benefit and Sustainability = 30 Points STP, 15 Points CMAQ**

- Describe how this project supports a long-term strategy to maximize the efficiency of the corridor, including TDM activities and ITS improvements that use advanced technologies or innovative approaches to improve traffic flow. Describe the problem and how this project will remedy it.
- Describe how this project provides a “logical segment” that links to a regional growth or manufacturing/industrial center.
- Describe how the project fills in a missing link or removes barriers to/from a center.
• 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 this project improves safety and/or reduces modal conflict, and provides opportunities for active transportation that can lead to public health benefits.

High: A project will be rated high if it provides significant improvements to the efficiency of a corridor leading to one or more regional centers, for people and/or freight, resulting in a significant reduction in travel time and/or increased safety and efficiencies (e.g., through the provision of a missing link or removal of a barrier, provision of TDM activities or ITS improvements, provision of safe opportunities for active transportation, and/or other long-term strategies to address an identified problem).

Medium: A project will be rated medium if it provides moderate improvements to the efficiency of a corridor leading to one or more regional centers, resulting in a moderate reduction in travel time and/or increased safety and efficiencies (such as by addressing but not completing a gap in the system, providing modest opportunities for active transportation, or by providing shorter-term improvements along the corridor).

Low: A project will be rated low if it provides limited and/or short term improvements to the efficiency of a corridor, provides limited benefit to an identified problem and provides limited opportunities for active transportation.

Guidance: Applicants should describe the benefits of the project in terms of time savings, safety, completing gaps in the system, overcoming of barriers, provision of active transportation that can lead to public health benefits, etc. Projects that provide system continuity and long-term benefits could include new dedicated transit facilities, completion of the final multimodal gap in arterial improvements leading to a center, removing a bottleneck for freight movement to and from a center, ITS components that improve traffic flow and provide travel information, etc. Projects that include TDM activities designed to mitigate travel disruptions during the construction of a project and/or to encourage desired use and performance upon the project’s completion may influence travel behavior and provide long-term benefits. Projects completing networks and providing critical connections that did not exist previously will tend to score higher than those that do not.

Part 2: Questions for All Projects

D. AIR QUALITY / CLIMATE CHANGE = 20 POINTS STP, 50 POINTS CMAQ

• Describe how the project will reduce emissions, particularly of diesel particulates, 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.
• For CMAQ projects only: What is the anticipated useful life of the project?

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

**High:** A project will rate high if it will substantially reduce fine particulates from diesel exhaust, or will substantially reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and other air pollutants, and the air quality benefits will occur by 2025.

**Medium:** A project will rate medium if it will moderately reduce fine particulates from diesel exhaust, or will moderately reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and other air pollutants (for example, a project that reduces VMT by shortening a vehicle trip, but does not eliminate a vehicle trip); and the air quality benefits will occur by 2030.

**Low:** A project will rate low if it results in a limited amount of emissions reductions; and the air quality benefits will occur after 2030.

CMAQ Projects

**High:** A project will rate high if the combination of emissions reductions, useful life and amount requested results in a strong cost-effective usage of CMAQ funds.

**Medium:** A project will rate medium if the combination of emissions reductions, useful life and amount requested results in a moderate cost-effective usage of CMAQ funds.

**Low:** A project will rate low if the combination of emissions reductions, useful life and amount requested does not result in the cost-effective usage of CMAQ funds.

**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, with increased emphasis on the reduction of diesel particulate emissions. These pollutants pose significant health risks, such as an increase in 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. Particular to CMAQ funded projects, the criterion is further revised to incorporate cost-effectiveness, and projects will score high if they demonstrate a cost-effective reduction of emissions.

For STP funding requests, 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 a significant amount of VMT or reduce fine particulates through diesel vehicle and equipment retrofits or the reduction of diesel truck idling (e.g. along a freight corridor). Converting fleets to alternative fuels may also score high under this criterion, if substantial emissions benefits will be achieved. Projects eliminating vehicle trips would generally be expected to produce greater emissions reductions than projects solely reducing VMT, but as mentioned above, the magnitude of the project and the timing of the anticipated benefits will play a role in the final score.

For CMAQ funding requests, projects will be evaluated on their emissions reduction potential as described above, as well as their useful life and the amount of funding requested. Projects resulting in the most cost-effective reduction of emissions will score the highest. The formula for calculating cost-effectiveness is as follows:

\[
\frac{(\text{CMAQ $ requested} / \text{Useful life})}{\text{Emissions reduced}}
\]
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. The “Air Quality and Climate Change Evaluation Guidance” provides additional background and resources regarding the estimation of emissions reductions from a variety of types and scales of transportation projects, data on useful life from the Federal Highway and Transit Administrations, 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.

E. PROJECT READINESS/FINANCIAL PLAN = 10 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 funding for the project?
- What are the amounts and sources of reasonably expected and unsecured funding for the project?
- Will the funds complete the project or a phase of the project?

Project sponsors will be asked to supply a full financial budget and project schedule in the application. Depending on the type and scale of the project, information should be provided on the following project milestones: environmental documentation, permits, Right of Way approvals, percent design completed, contract dates, etc.

**High:** A project will receive a high score if the applicant can demonstrate that all prerequisites for obligation of the requested phase have been met at the time the competition application is submitted; the sponsor plans to obligate funds by June 2018; all other needed funding for the requested phase is fully secured at the time the competition application is submitted; and the requested regional funding will be sufficient to complete the project.

**Medium:** A project will receive a medium score if the applicant can demonstrate that all prerequisites for obligation of the requested phase will be met by the estimated obligation date; the sponsor plans to obligate funds by June 2019; all other needed funding for the requested phase will be fully secured by the estimated obligation date; and the requested regional funding will be used to complete certain phases of the project (but not the entire project).

**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 date, and the sponsor plans to obligate funds after June 2019.

**Guidance:** The emphasis of this category is to rate projects based upon the sponsor’s ability to obligate requested regional funds at the earliest possible time, as demonstrated by having completed all applicable prerequisites for obligation and securing all needed funding to complete the project or phase of the project.

---

4 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/SecuredUnsecured.pdf](http://www.psrc.org/assets/469/SecuredUnsecured.pdf)
F. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS (NO POINTS)

Project sponsors have the opportunity to describe additional aspects of the project that are not addressed in the evaluation criteria that could be relevant to the final recommendation and decision-making process. Per Board direction, this includes information on innovative project elements or procedures, and the process by which jurisdictions determine the benefits of projects. A report will be provided to the Board for future consideration of these topics.

- 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.