Transportation Operators Committee Agenda

Date: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 from 1:00 p.m.-2:30 p.m.
Location: PSRC Central Room, 1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500, Seattle, WA 98104

1. Welcome and Introductions (1:00)

2. Action item: Approval of Meeting Summary – August 28, 2018* (1:05)

3. Discussion item: Report on PSRC Committee and Board Activities (1:10)
   Committee members report out on transit-related committees and boards since the last TOC meeting.
   The “At Work” report for the September and October Transportation Policy Board meetings is available on the PSRC website: https://www.psrc.org/tpb-meetings
   The meeting summary for the September Regional Staff Committee meeting is available on the PSRC website: https://www.psrc.org/rsc-meetings

4. Discussion item: Feedback on 2020 Project Selection* (1:15)
   PSRC staff will review the work to prepare for the 2020 project selection process and share the Regional FTA Caucus feedback received to-date.

5. Discussion item: PSRC Work Program Update* (1:30)
   In preparation for the November Transportation Policy Board meeting, PSRC will provide an update on its work program and associated data collection efforts in public transit-related areas, including special needs transportation and transportation demand management (TDM).

6. Roundtable: Highlights from Transit Agency and Ferry Operators in the Region (2:20)

7. Next Meeting: December 4, 2019

8. Adjourn (2:30)

*Supporting materials attached

Other Formats:

- Sign language, and communication material in alternative formats, can be arranged given sufficient notice by calling 206-464-7090, TTY Relay 711.
- العربية | Arabic, 中文 | Chinese, Deutsch | German, Français | French
- 한국어 | Korean, Русский | Russian, Español | Spanish, Tagalog, Tiếng việt | Vietnamese, call 206-587-4819
Transportation Operators Committee Meeting Summary

Date: August 28, 2019
Location: PSRC Board Room, 1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500, Seattle, WA 98104

Welcome and Introductions
Peter Heffernan, Chair, welcomed everyone at 10:00 a.m. Self-introductions were provided around the room and on the phone.

Approval of Meeting Summary
The summary for the June 26, 2019 meeting was approved.

Action item: King County Metro Obligation Date Extension Request
Sarah Gutschow, PSRC, provided an overview of the King County Metro request for an obligation date extension for their “Route 48 South Electrification” project from June 1, 2018 to December 31, 2019.

The TOC approved the King County Metro obligation date extension request for recommendation from the Transportation Policy Board at its next meeting on September 11, 2019.

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

Discussion item: Report on PSRC Committee and Board Activities
Committee members reported on various topics at the July Transportation Policy Board which included a presentation on the FFY 2019 Annual FTA Adjustments. There were no board or committee meetings in August. At the September TPB, it was noted that the Board will recommend projects to receive $5 million in funding for the Rural Town Centers and Corridors program. The “At Work” reports for the Transportation Policy Board Meetings are available on the PSRC website: https://www.psrc.org/tpb-meetings

There was no July or August RSC meeting. The September meeting will focus on VISION 2050. Presentations and meeting summaries are available on the PSRC website: https://www.psrc.org/rsc-meetings

Discussion item: 2019 Transit Integration Report
Maggie Moore, PSRC, shared a brief update on the development of the 2019 Transit Integration Report and schedule for completion. She reviewed that the first half of the report would focus on the collective vision for transit in the region and what is happening in the next five years; and the second half would be stories with an emphasis on what
problems the stories are addressing, and what would need to go to legislation. She indicated that next steps will include working with all the agencies to have a draft at the end of September for the TOC to review. She noted after the TOC reviews the draft, PSRC will review and then the TPB Transit Caucus will be informed of the progress at the October board meeting, with a presentation given to the TPB in November. The committee discussed the review process and asked if the timeline could be emailed to them.

For more information, contact Gil Cerise at (206) 971-3053

Discussion: Transit Agency Long Range Plan Update Cycles

Gil Cerise, PSRC, reviewed the schedule of VISION 2050 and the next RTP in relation to county/city comprehensive plan updates. He asked for feedback from transit agencies on their long-range plan update cycles and their initial thinking on the update to a 2050 planning horizon and associated transit investments.

The committee provided their agencies’ long-range plan updates, timelines and information on what the focus is or will be on the plans. The committee discussed transit investments with relation to the 2050 planning.

For more information, contact Gil Cerise at (206) 971-3053

Discussion item: Transit-related Memoranda of Agreement held by PSRC, including Regional Reduced Fare Permit and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Paratransit Eligibility

Gil Cerise, PSRC, reminded the committee from the last meeting of the request for feedback to better understand their agencies’ needs associated with the two memoranda of agreement (MOA) in order to help identify next steps and come to a resolution on the future of both agreements. He reminded the committee of the background of the two memoranda of agreement that PSRC “holds” for transit agencies and asked the committee if anyone had received any feedback from their colleagues that may be knowledgeable about them. He then introduced Kimberly Pearson, PSRC, who provided information she researched regarding the ADA MOA, which answered questions from the committee on the necessity of this MOA. The committee discussed the information received on the document and concluded, based upon feedback they received from staff familiar with the agreement, that the document has been superseded by other, more current documents and the requirements in the MOA were no longer needed or used. Pete Heffernan, Chair, indicated that next steps would include writing a short summary explaining how this MOA is no longer useful, and is superseded by other, newer documents that have current ADA requirements.971-3053

The committee then discussed the MOA for the Regional Reduced Fare Permit (RRFP) and the various aspects to having PSRC “hold” this MOA, which included that the agencies’ expectations for maintaining this MOA include a lot of operational knowledge, development of brochures and other public-facing documents that PSRC does not typically perform. Although, it was noted that impartiality is very important in these discussions, and PSRC provides this. Some members noted that the Washington State
Department of Transportation (WSDOT) might be a more appropriate place for this MOA, particularly given the latest WSDOT Public Transportation Plan, and that a conversation with WSDOT was needed to clarify certain questions that came up during the discussion. Gil, Celeste Gilman, and Don Chartock, WSDOT, would meet with the appropriate WSDOT staff and then follow up with other possible options. Another option raised would be for King County Metro to take on more of the document production and maintenance of edits to the MOA, while asking PSRC to have the more limited role of hosting task force meetings and providing impartial facilitation for the meetings.

*For more information, contact Gil Cerise at (206) 971-3053*

**Roundtable: Highlights from Transit Agency and Ferry Operators in the Region**

During the Roundtable, the committee received updates and announcements from the following attendees:

- Ray Deardorf, WA State Ferries
- Alex Krieg, Sound Transit
- Ben Smith, City of Seattle
- Darin Stavish, Pierce Transit
- Sabina Araya, Everett Transit
- Roland, Behee, Community Transit
- Steffani Lillie, Kitsap Transit
- Peter Heffernan, King County Metro

**Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

---

**Members and Alternates Present**

Peter Heffernan, King County Metro and Chair; Alex Krieg Sound Transit and Vice-Chair; *Sabina Araya, Everett Transit; *Roland Behee, Community Transit; Don Chartock, WSDOT; Ray Deardorf, WA State Ferries; Marianna Hanefeld, Special Needs Transportation Committee Chair and SNOTRAC; *Celeste Gilman, WSDOT; *Steffani Lillie, Kitsap Transit; Benjamin Smith, Seattle DOT; Darin Stavish, Pierce Transit

**PSRC Staff and Other Guests Present**

Monica Adkins, PSRC; Gil Cerise, PSRC; Sarah Gutschow, PSRC; Kelly McGourty, PSRC; Maggie Moore, PSRC; Kimberly Pearson, PSRC

*via remote participation*
2020 PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS
KEY POLICY FRAMEWORK ELEMENTS

The Project Selection Task Force will be convened between September and December 2019, formed from volunteers from each of PSRC’s four boards. The Task Force will review and make recommendations to the Transportation Policy Board on the topics identified below. Each topic has a brief description, and additional details and background on each will be provided within this document and during the meetings to assist with the Task Force discussions.

As a reminder, historically, the project selection process has been conducted in four concurrent processes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Highway Administration Funds</th>
<th>Federal Transit Administration Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STP)</td>
<td>• Urbanized Area Formula Program (5307)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)</td>
<td>• State of Good Repair (5337)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Competition</td>
<td>Regional Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Competitions</td>
<td>Earned Share Distribution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS

Funding years to program

Description:
- Two years of funding will be distributed -- FFY 2023, 2024. Per direction from the Federal Highway and Transit Administrations (FHWA, FTA) PSRC will continue to build and maintain a full 4-year TIP (2021-2024).

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 current policy focus for the project selection process, per VISION 2040, is support for centers and the corridors that serve them. As a reminder, this is currently implemented in the following manner:
- FHWA Regional competition - centers are defined as regionally designated growth and manufacturing/industrial centers.
- FHWA Countywide competitions and FTA Earned Share distribution - centers are defined as regionally designated growth and manufacturing/industrial centers, centers as designated through countywide processes, town centers, and other locally identified centers. The definition of locally identified centers is expanded to include military facilities.
• FTA Regional Competition - centers are defined as regionally designated growth centers and manufacturing/industrial centers, centers as designated through countywide processes, town centers, and other locally identified centers.

Please note: VISION 2050 is anticipated to be adopted in spring 2020, after the 2020 project selection process has begun.

Contingency Lists

Description:
• Prioritized lists of contingency projects are adopted for all competitions, should additional funds become available in the off-cycle years.

Number of regional applications

Description:
• The structure for the FHWA regional competition has been to set a limit of 36 total applications, as follows:
  • 12 from King County; 6 each from Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish Counties; 2 each from the three regional agencies (Puget Sound Clean Air Agency, WSDOT and Sound Transit)

The number of applications submitted for the FHWA countywide competitions is determined by each countywide forum. The number of total applications for the FTA regional competition has been unlimited in prior cycles.

Split of Funds Between Regional / Countywide / Earned Share Processes

Description:
Historically, once the set-asides are taken off the top of the combined pot of funds (see section below on Set-Asides), the split between the FHWA 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.

The split between the FTA regional competition and earned share distribution has historically been based on the funding formula and the percentage of funds coming to the region based on regional attributes vs. transit operating characteristics. In general, this split has been approximately 14%/86%.

Funding Limits

Description:
The 2018 project selection process for the first time set a limit on funding requests as part of the FHWA regional competition, at 50% of the annual amount available by source. No limits have been set on the maximum amount requested in FTA regional competitions, and the four countywide processes have varied in setting limits on either funding or application limits.

Pre-Determined Amounts by Source in FHWA Competition(s)

Description:
Since 2016, the amounts by funding source have been pre-determined for the FHWA regional and countywide competitions. This provides 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 for the regional competition are 60% CMAQ, 40% STP.
**SET-ASIDES**

**Preservation Set-Aside**

**Description:**
The preservation set-aside has been in place since 2012, at varying levels over the last several cycles. The 2018 preservation set-aside was approved at the following levels: for FHWA, the set-aside was 20% of STP funds, with the 5% delta from the original set-aside amount distributed among the four counties for their regular competitions. For FTA, the set-aside was 45% of the regional portion of the FTA funds. The set-aside is a fixed amount taken from the regional portion of the Seattle-Tacoma-Everett Urbanized Area (STE UZA) funds and distributed to transit agencies in the STE UZA using the earned share distribution formula.

**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.

**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 over time from the original amount of $2 million to $5 million in 2018. This competition is conducted in the year following the regular project selection process.

**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.

**Minimum Floor Adjustment**

**Description:**
Since 2003, transit agencies in the STE UZA that earn less than 1% of the total of the earned share portion of funds have received a minimum floor adjustment to bring the earned share amounts for these agencies up to the 1% amount. The adjustment is taken from the regional portion of the funds within the STE UZA and applied to these agencies for their earned share distribution. The rationale for this adjustment is to facilitate future planning for these agencies by allowing them to rely on a certain amount of FTA funding each year as a safety net for a basic level of investment. In 2016, this amount was capped at the amount identified from the final 2015 FTA allocations. In 2018, the additional provision of considering the full range of transit operations and ownership of assets when conducting the calculation was included.
PSRC Work Program

Description:
FHWA and FTA funds have been used to assist in funding PSRC’s work program since 1993 and 2004, respectively. Since 2016, the amounts approved have been $1 million of STP funds and $1.25 million of FTA funds per year.

PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA

The project evaluation criteria for PSRC funding competitions include the following components:

- Support for centers (including housing and employment)
- Safety, mobility and accessibility (for persons and freight)
- Populations served (including health and equity)
- Emissions reduction
- Project readiness

Since 2016, cost effectiveness has been included for projects requesting CMAQ funds in the FHWA competitions. This feature aligned with federal guidance on the CMAQ program, to select projects achieving the most cost effective emission reductions. In 2018, the Project Selection Task Force directed staff to enhance safety and equity in the criteria to be more explicit. In addition, given that programming is now two to three years into the future, the project readiness criterion was moved to be more of a risk/feasibility analysis and reduced to 5 points.
PSRC’s 2018 Regional FTA Competition
Project Evaluation Criteria

Guidance for PSRC’s 2018 Regional FTA Competition was adopted as part of the 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, the regional transportation plan 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;1 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 Justice2, seniors, people with disabilities, those located in highly impacted communities3 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.

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 the regional transportation plan. The Washington State Department of Ecology has identified diesel exhaust as the air pollutant most harmful to public

---

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/372/Community-Equity-Access](http://www.pscleanair.org/372/Community-Equity-Access).
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>Part 1: Category Specific Questions</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>Part 2: Technical Criteria</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>TOTAL</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 = 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 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, bicycle mobility and facilities, streetscape improvements, etc.
- Describe how the project will benefit a variety of users, including commuters, residents, and commercial users).
- 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 = 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 regional 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:
  o Eliminating vehicle trips
  o Inducing a mode shift away from single occupant vehicles (SOVs)
  o Reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT)
  o Improving traffic flow (e.g., through signal coordination or by removing a bottleneck)
  o 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 2030.

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 = 5 Points

- When will the sponsor complete all prerequisites needed to obligate the project’s requested regional funds?
- 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.

**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/or remaining work is scheduled to be completed by the obligation deadline. All funds needed to complete the phase(s) have been secured or are reasonably expected by the obligation deadline for the phase(s) requested.
Medium: A project will receive a medium score if the applicant can demonstrate that work on the prerequisites for obligation of the requested phase has begun and/or remaining work is scheduled to be completed by the obligation deadline. No funds needed to complete the phase(s) have been secured, but the sponsor has a plan demonstrating that it is reasonable for all funds for the phase(s) requested to be secured by the 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(s) will be completed by the estimated obligation deadline. No funds are secured, and the sponsor has not demonstrated it is reasonable for all funding to be secure by the obligation 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.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Transportation Operators Committee (TOC)

FROM: Gil Cerise, Program Manager

SUBJECT: PSRC Work Program Update

PSRC will be providing a brief update on its transit-related work program and associated data collection efforts to the TOC in advance of the November 14 Transportation Policy Board meeting. This update will include special needs transportation and transportation demand management update, as well as the more traditional fixed-route public transit work.

PSRC prepared a PSRC transit-related work program and shared that with transit agencies as part of its outreach to the agencies earlier this year. In addition, work programs associated with more specific transit-related topic areas: special needs transportation and transportation demand management (TDM).

PSRC plans to share the work programs and initial data gathering efforts with the Transportation Operators Committee in October. The components of the presentation will include:

- Overview of the transit-related work program, including work associated with the update of the Regional Transportation Plan to a 2050 horizon year.
- Work program, data collection efforts, and initial results to-date for special needs transportation, associated with the regional Coordinated Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan; and
- Work program, data collection efforts, and initial results to-date for TDM, associated with the region’s TDM plan.

PSRC plans to use feedback received at the October TOC meeting to assist in developing a presentation for the Transportation Policy Board.

**TOC members are encouraged to invite staff from their agencies with topic-area expertise to participate in the October 23 meeting to provide feedback on long range transit planning, special needs transportation, and/or TDM topics, as necessary.**

For additional information, please contact Gil Cerise at (206) 971-3053 or gcerise@psrc.org.