STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 01-____ FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) TO APPROVE TRI-MET'S FY 01 APPROPRIATIONS

DATE: November 16, 2000 Presented by: Mike Hoglund

PROPOSED ACTION:

This resolution would amend the MTIP to approve obligation of new federal funds appropriated to five Tri-Met sponsored projects in FY 01. The projects include the Interstate MAX LRT extension, construction of the Milwaukie Transit Center, Wilsonville to Beaverton Commuter Rail design, improvement of the Pioneer Courthouse Visitor Center/Tri-Met Information Office, and ongoing support for the Tri-Met Jobs Access program.

EXISTING LEGISLATION

Federal regulations stipulate that federal transportation funds appropriated under the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) must be included in an approved, conformed, financially constrained MTIP before they can be obligated.

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

The MTIP currently approves obligation of various Tri-Met projects that rely on federal funding. The FY 01 Congressional appropriation allocates a variety of funds for ongoing support for several of these projects. Under federal planning regulations, the additional funds must be included in the MTIP before FTA can approve grants submitted by Tri-Met to access the federal funds. All the projects addressed in this resolution have been previously endorsed and the resolution deals only with approval of newly appropriated dollars. The projects and new funds are shown in Exhibit A of the resolution.

The most significant appropriation is $7.5 million of Section 5309 New Start funds for the Interstate MAX LRT extension project. These funds are the first installment of appropriations established in the Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) between the region and FTA. The total FFGA amount is for $257.5 million of New Start funding.

The second appropriation addressed in this action is $1.5 million of Section 5309 funds for construction of the Milwaukie Transit Center. This appropriation was anticipated in Metro Resolution No. 00-2980A, which:

1) approved obligation of up to $4.0 million of federal funds for construction of the Milwaukie Transit Center;
2) approved reallocation of $1.5 million of funds left over from the PSU Transit Center to the Milwaukie project; and
3) programmed $650,000 of Section 5309 funds appropriated to the project in FY 00.

Total federal funds now appropriated to the Milwaukie Transit Center is therefore $3.65 million. Under Metro Resolution No. 00-2980A, another $350,000 of future federal appropriations to the project are authorized for obligation. This resolution addresses the FY 01 appropriation for information purposes only.

The third appropriation is another $1.0 million of Section 5309 New Start funds for design of the Wilsonville to Beaverton Commuter Rail project. These funds supplement $1.0 of regional STP funds allocated in the FY 2000 MTIP for environmental analysis of the project and $500,000 of New Start funds appropriated to the project in FY 00. Conformity of the project recently received joint FHWA/FTA approval. With the current funds, total federal funds allocated to the project come to $2.5 million.

The fourth appropriation is $400,000 of Section 104, Transportation and Community and System Preservation program funds for enhancement of the Pioneer Courthouse Square Information Office shared by Tri-Met and the Portland Oregon Visitors Association (POVA). Regional funds to begin the improvement were approved in the FY 2000 MTIP. These funds enable completion of the Information Center reconstruction to fully accommodate both programs in the building.

The fifth appropriation approved for programming in this resolution is the combination of FY 00 ($850,000) and FY 01 ($1,840,000) Section 3037 funds for Tri-Met's Jobs Access and Reverse Commute Program. These funds have a 50 percent local match. The program objectives were approved in June 1999 by Metro Resolution No. 99-2799A. In general, the program objectives are to provide new, traditional transit services, social services outreach and allied non-traditional, non-SOV travel demand management strategies to address low income, employment-related transportation needs.

The Resolution ~~, which also~~ provided authority to program all subsequent Jobs Access appropriations ~~to the program~~ administratively. The current appropriations are therefor referenced in this resolution for information purposes only. -Resolution 99-2799A, moved by the City of Gresham, also stipulates that TPAC and JPACT should revisit the program after the first year of appropriations to determine whether its expansion would be appropriate to include additional "transit hub" improvements. Federal appropriations to the program are running about $600,000 above sums so far requested by Tri-Met. This Resolution therefor approves amendment of the Jobs Access program to include a Rockwood Transit Hub in Gresham, or elsewhere, in light of the funding windfall. ~~The current appropriations are referenced in this resolution for information purposes only. In general, the program objectives are to provide new, traditional transit services, social services outreach and allied non-traditional, non-SOV travel demand management strategies to address low income, employment-related transportation needs.~~

ADMINISTATIVE CONSIDERATIONS

MTIP Financial Constraint. All funds addressed in this resolution have been appropriated and their inclusion in the MTIP maintains financial constraint of the MTIP.

Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Financially Constrained System. The Interstate MAX and Milwaukie Transit Center projects are included in the 2000 RTP as specific line item projects in the

financially constrained RTP project list. The Commuter Rail project was amended into the 1995 Financially Constrained network and is included in the 2000 RTP Financially Constrained network. The Pioneer Courthouse Square Project appropriation was not anticipated in the RTP but is encompassed within the RTP's general identification and approval of regional TDM initiatives. The Tri-Met Jobs Access program is specifically endorsed in RTP Chapter 1.3.3, Policy 5.2. As program funds were approved in the MTIP prior to adoption of the RTP, funding is not identified as a future needed resource in the Financially Constrained System project list.

Conformity Status. The Interstate MAX and Wilsonville to Beaverton Commuter Rail projects are included in the financially constrained system used to conform the 1995 RTP, as amended, the FY 2000 MTIP, and the 2000 RTP (conformity pending). The Milwaukie Transit Center is exempt by rule, but its effect on local circulation in Milwaukie was modeled as part of both the approved 1995 RTP/2000 MTIP Conformity determination quantitative analysis and the 2000 RTP analysis, whose federal approval is pending. The Pioneer Courthouse Square Information Office is exempt by rule. The Jobs Access Program is new transit service and TDM activity and is also exempt by rule.

BUDGET IMPACT

None.

TW:rmb
C\Resolutions\2001\BS 1479\1479ASR.doc

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) TO APPROVE TRI-MET'S FY 01 APPROPRIATIONS	)))))	RESOLUTION NO. 01-____ Introduced by Councilor Jon Kvistad, JPACT Chair

WHEREAS, The region has previously approved various Tri-Met sponsored projects and programs, including the IMAX LRT extension, the Milwaukie Transit Center, the Wilsonville to Beaverton Commuter Rail project, Pioneer Courthouse Information Center Reconstruction and the Tri-Met Jobs Access and Reverse Commute program, for obligation of federal funds in the MTIP; and

WHEREAS, Congress has approved support for these five projects in the FY 01 appropriations bill, for the amounts shown in Exhibit A of this Resolution; and

WHEREAS, Tri-Met grant applications to obligate the newly appropriated federal funds cannot be approved by FTA until the MTIP is amended to program the appropriations for obligation; and

WHEREAS, The current action merely adds money to currently approved projects; and

WHEREAS, All the projects are currently identified in a conformed, financially constrained MTIP and STIP; and

WHEREAS, Resolution 99-2799A conditioned approval of the Tri-Met's Jobs Access Program to direct that TPAC and JPACT consider addition of new projects and transit hubs after the first year of the program; and

WHEREAS, Tri-Met and Gresham have been negotiating over the past year with respect to establihsing a Rockwood Transit Hub as part of the program; and

WHEREAS, total three year appropriation to the Jobs Access program are nearly $600,000 in excess of the $3.0 million anticipated by Tri-Met (federal share); now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. The MTIP is amended to approve obligation of the project sums shown in Exhibit A.

2. The Executive Officer is authorized to request amendment of the STIP to reflect this action and to coordinate administrative details with staff of ODOT, Tri-Met and others.

3. Amendment of the Jobs Access program, in light of higher than anticipated program revenues, to establish a Rockwood Transit Hub, or such other transit hubs as may be deemed by Tri-Met to be viable and consistent with the Jobs Access program, is approved, contingent on a report to TPAC and JPACT regarding any such adopted revisions.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this ___ day of _____, 2001.

_____
, Presiding Officer

Approved as to Form:

_____
Daniel B. Cooper, General Counsel

TW:rmb
C\Resolutions\2001\BS1479\1479A res.doc

Tri-Met FY 01 Appropriations
(Including FY 00 Jobs Access Program Funds)

	FUND TYPE	MATCH RATIO	WORK PHASE	FEDERAL DOLLARS	TOTAL DOLLARS	YEAR
IMAX LRT Extension	5309	0.7966	capital	$7,500,000	$9,415,014	FY 01
Milwaukie Transit Center	5309	0.8	capital	$1,500,000	$1,875,000	FY 01
Wilsonville to Beaverton Commuter Rail	5309	0.08	capital	$1,000,000	$1,250,000	FY 01
Pioneer Square Information Center	TCSP	0.8	capital	$400,000	$500,000	FY 01
Jobs Access Program FY 00	3037	0.5	capital	$850,000	$1,700,000	FY 01
Jobs Access Program FY 01	3037	0.5	capital	$1,840,000	$3,680,000	FY 01

TW:rmb
c\Resolutions\2001\BS1479A\Ex A to Res.xls

M E M O R A N D U M

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736
TEL 503 797 1700 | FAX 503 797 1794

METRO

Date: December 6, 2000

To: JPACT

From: Andrew C. Cotugno, Planning Director

Subject: ***2002-2005 MTIP Process and Criteria***

At the December 14 meeting, JPACT is scheduled to approve the release of the public review draft of the process and project selection criteria that apply to the development of the 2002-2005 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). Release of that information for a 30 day public review period is now tentatively scheduled for December 18, 2000. Action on approving the process and initiating a solicitation of projects is tentatively scheduled for mid-January, at the conclusion of public review. Tentative dates for these actions and a proposed schedule for the full MTIP process is attached.

This memorandum summarizes the key procedural and policy discussions that have been discussed to date and highlights remaining or new issues that warrant JPACT and Metro Council attention before materials can be released for public review. Those remaining or new issues are highlighted in ***bold and italics*** and are recommended for discussion at the December 14 meeting. JPACT members may, of course, raise any other issues related to the process.

Also attached for your review are the criteria used from the last MTIP update. JPACT and the Metro Council have generally concurred that the existing criteria should again be applied, but a few modifications have been suggested. Those modifications are discussed below.

Background

Funding in FY 02 and FY 03 has already been allocated in the current MTIP (FY 2000-2003). The current update is concerned with adjusting the first two years of programming, and allocating new funding expected in FY 04 and FY 05. About $25-$38 million is anticipated to be available.

Of this amount, approximately $10-$15 million will be CMAQ funds which are generally limited to alternative mode projects which improve air quality, and $15-$23 million will be STP funds, which are available to all projects.

Issues and Guidance

2002-2005 MTIP Goals. Program goals have been recommended in order to provide a clear direction for the process and the program. Recommended goals are:

- Establish a clear, simple, and understandable process that minimizes procedural hurdles while maintaining broad-based citizen participation.
- Fund the most critical projects that provide a clear public benefit.
- Emphasize projects and programs that most efficiently manage demand and enhance the operation of the existing transportation infrastructure. Look for low-cost projects that have large benefits.
- Continue to allocate funds to implement the 2040 Growth Concept.
- Consider funding logical project phases or projects that complete an obvious gap in the system. This includes projects where preliminary engineering (PE) has previously been allocated.
- Emphasize project implementation either through direct funding or leveraging other potential revenue sources.
- Support projects that can be delivered in the timeframe of the FY 2002-2005 STIP.

Criteria and Project Ranking. JPACT and the Metro Council Transportation Committee have previously recommended that the ranking criteria remain the same as they were for the last allocation. However, the 150% list projects may need to be re-ranked and any new projects must be ranked. The existing criteria are attached for review. JPACT specifically asked to review the criteria and the project selection process. Finally, an environmental justice (EJ) review of the proposed program will be required. Metro staff will provide a method and the information to address EJ concerns prior to project selection phase of the MTIP.

Specifically, two requests to modify the criteria have been made and warrant JPACT discussion:

- ***Revise the technical ranking point system to increase the number of points for "2040 Support" from 40 to 60 out of a possible 100. Conversely, reduce the other categories (effectiveness, cost/benefit, safety) from 60 to 40.***
- ***Add to the administrative criteria the results of Metro's culvert inventory to determine if a project modifies a key culvert related to endangered salmon or steelhead.***
- ***Consider a method to recognize the truck (freight?) benefits of projects.***

The first revision is intended to strengthen the policy choice that the flexible federal funds allocated through this process are primarily intended to leverage the implementation the 2040

Growth Concept. The policy choice recognizes other funds (local, state, and other federal) are available for other aspects of the transportation system.

The second revision recognizes that better information is now available to discern projects that are "fish friendly."

Priorities 2000 150% List. This issue remains unchanged from last month. The recommendation is to utilize the "150%" list from the last allocation process. Approximately $42 million worth of projects from around the region were highly ranked, yet un-funded. TPAC has suggested that those projects be considered a "base" package, including Preliminary Engineering (PE) phases of projects that were funded from the last process. JPACT and the Metro Council Transportation Committee have previously concurred with TPAC and recommended that 2002-2005 MTIP allocation should first consider the un-funded 150% list that resulted from the 2000-2003 MTIP process.

New Projects. This issue has been further defined from last month. JPACT and the Metro Council Transportation Committee have previously recommend that opportunities for new projects to the 150% list be "cautiously" allowed as "adds." Also, any new projects should come from the Financially Constrained System of the 2000 RTP or been the result of a recently completed planning activity (e.g., the Gateway Regional Center Plan). Substitute projects should also meet or exceed Metro's requirements for public involvement.

The general guidelines for adding new projects are:

- Limit the overall dollar amount and number of candidate projects in order to keep the program manageable.
- Maintain flexibility to add or drop projects based on local and regional priorities or to address changing conditions and current needs.

Generally, new or substitute projects may be submitted on behalf of eligible sponsors from the following agencies or jurisdictional groups:

- Metro
- Tri-Met
- DEQ
- ODOT
- Port of Portland
- City of Portland
- Washington County and its cities
- Clackamas County and its cities
- Multnomah County and its cities

Two new policy recommendations were discussed at TPAC to further clarify submission of new projects.

- ***Projects must be submitted with an accompanying letter documenting the approval action of an eligible jurisdiction's elected council or from an agency's council or board.***
- ***A "cautious" submittal of additional projects has been defined as a net of two new projects plus a few lower-cost projects if projects are removed from the existing 150% list.***

The first request, to require a letter of documentation, is to ensure adequate and open discussion of the project submittals by elected or appointed officials and the public. The second change defines "cautious" and allows for low-cost/big-bang projects to be added without penalty. While not defined by TPAC, "a few lower-cost projects" would imply perhaps not more than three projects that total no more than $500,000.

Limited Access Highways. At their November meeting, JPACT indicated a preference for not funding projects on limited access highways (freeways). TPAC asked for clarification as to whether this constituted a restriction on freeway-related preliminary engineering (PE), freeway interchange projects or freeway projects admitted by local governments as one of their few allowed "add" projects. TPAC recommended:

- ***Freeway-related Preliminary Engineering, interchange construction or expansion projects submitted by local governments as one of their few allowed added projects be considered through this allocation process.***

Big Projects v. Small Projects. Past allocations have generally funded projects that are less than $6 million, even when resources have been greater. The alternative is to spread the money to smaller projects or do a combination program of various project sizes. TPAC again recommends remaining flexible on this issue, meaning to allow locals to decide their own priorities. JPACT has previously concurred with TPAC and has suggested remaining flexible on this issue. It seems there is interest in seeing the potential differences between a number of medium sized projects compared to an approach similar to what was done for the 2000-2003 MTIP where money was allocated primarily to smaller projects. Such an alternative can be developed during the program development phase of this effort.

As noted, following JPACT and Metro Transportation Committee discussion on these issues, a packet summarizing the process recommendations for comment will be prepared and distributed. An actual process proposal, including the final criteria and a solicitation packet, is tentatively scheduled for JPACT and the Metro Council action in January. Metro is scheduled to solicit for projects from mid-January to March 1.

MH:rmb
C\JPACT\12-14-00\4_MTIP Process memo.doc

METRO

2002-2005 MTIP
KEY MILESTONES*

The table identifies proposed milestones related to the 2002-2005 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program update. All dates are tentative and subject to change. Please call the Metro Hotline at 797-1900, option 3, or the Metro web site at www.metro-region.org for updated times and dates for hearings and meetings.

Tentative Schedule	
September 25, 2000	Public Notification to Kick-Off Process
December 18, 2000	Initiate 30-day Public Review on Process and Criteria
January 5, 2000	Proposed TPAC Action on Process and Criteria
January 16, 2001	Proposed Public Hearing on Criteria; Close Public Review Period
January 18, 2001	Proposed JPACT and Metro Council Action on Criteria and Process
January 19-March 2, 2001	Project Solicitation Period
March 2001	Rank Projects
April 2001	Release Technical Ranking and Draft Program
April/May 2001	Public Outreach/Program Revision
June 1, 2001	TPAC Recommendation on Final Program
June 2001	Proposed Public Hearings and JPACT/Metro Council Adoption on Funding Allocation
Summer 2001	• Air Quality Conformity Public Review and Action • OTC Submittal • Final Action on 2002-2005 Full MTIP

MH:rmb
JPACT\12-14-00

*This table does not reflect a joint schedule in cooperation with ODOT's development of the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). As that information becomes available, the table will be revised. However, as has occurred in the past, in order to simplify information review and outreach opportunities, the MTIP and STIP development processes will be combined to the degree possible.

BOULEVARD DESIGN
TECHNICAL CRITERIA

I. 2040 IMPLEMENTATION

Goal: Support implementation of 2040 priority land uses. (40 points)

See 2040 Criteria at end.

II. EFFECTIVENESS

1. Goal: Implement design elements that will help to reduce automobile speeds along boulevard segments, with a goal of reducing speeds to 25 miles per hour, or less. (10 points)

1.	Current lane widths are narrowed?	Yes ☐	No ☐
2.	Curb extensions/"squeeze points" are constructed?	Yes ☐	No ☐
3.	On-street parking is permitted?	Yes ☐	No ☐
4.	Corner turn radii are engineered for slower turn movements?	Yes ☐	No ☐
5.	Pedestrian crossings are increased	Yes ☐	No ☐
6.	Pedestrian crossings are demarcated with distinct texture/color/platform treatment?	Yes ☐	No ☐
7.	Signals re-timed to progress at slower than current speeds?	Yes ☐	No ☐
8.	Travel or turn lanes are eliminated?	Yes ☐	No ☐
9.	Other element? (relate to street design guidelines).	Yes ☐	No ☐

Scoring:

4+ design elements	*10 points*
3 design elements	*7 points*
2 design element	*3 points*
1 design element	*0 points*

2. Goal: Implement appropriate design elements to enhance alternative modes of travel along Boulevard segments.

a. Sidewalks will be widened. (5 points) Yes ☐ No ☐

Ranking Objective: Achieve optimum sidewalk width of at least 10 feet on all boulevards. Points are reallocated to other criteria where existing sidewalk width is greater than or equal to ten feet.

Proposed Methodology: candidate projects that are constrained by narrow right of way may obtain full 5 points upon demonstration that all practical means are employed to maximize sidewalk widths including:

narrowing travel lanes and center median, elimination of on-street parking on one or both sides of the street and transfer of bike facilities to parallel facility.

b. Additional Enhancements. (10 points)

1.	Are transit amenities provided?	Yes ☐ No ☐
2.	Is a landscape buffer provided?	Yes ☐ No ☐
3.	Are pedestrian refuges(curb extensions)installed at crossings?	Yes ☐ No ☐
4.	Is a raised pedestrian refuge in a median installed?	Yes ☐ No ☐
5.	Are bike lanes added (on or parallel to facility)?	Yes ☐ No ☐
6.	Are obstructions (e.g., utilities) removed from the primary pedestrian-way?	Yes ☐ No ☐
7.	Are street amenities provided? (e.g., benches, pedestrian scale decorative lights, railings, statuary, brick pavers, etc.)	Yes ☐ No ☐
8.	Other Factors? (relate to street design guidelines)	Yes ☐ No ☐

Scoring:

4+ elements	*10 points*
3 elements	*7 points*
2 elements	*3 points*
1 element	*0 points*

III. COST EFFECTIVENESS

Goal: **Implement maximum feasible, highest priority boulevard design elements at lowest cost. (15 points)**

Ranking Objective: Determine project cost per mile and divide result by sum of effectiveness points.

Example:

1. ¼ mile of improvement @ $100,000 = $400,000/mile of improvement.
2. Effectiveness points = $20,000 per "cost/effectiveness" point.
3. Allocate 15/7/0 points to low/medium/high-cost thirds.

IV. SAFETY

Goal: **Enhance safety of alternative modes within Boulevard design classifications that are most hazardous, especially to pedestrian travel, through design elements that reduce speed of motor vehicles, increase driver awareness of non-motorized traffic, and promote higher density, mixed use development.**

a) Ranking Objective: assess existing characteristics of motor vehicle right of way. Identify existence of features listed below which pose greatest hazard to alternative travel modes. Project proposal should specify corrections which should benefit alternative travel modes rather than restrict them. (10 points)

Project includes actions to correct the following safety problems:

1. 5 lanes	Yes ☐	No ☐
2. 12 ft lane width, or greater	Yes ☐	No ☐
3. speed > 40 mph (noon/off-peak)	Yes ☐	No ☐
4. no pedestrian refuge	Yes ☐	No ☐
5. more than 330 feet between marked pedestrian crossings	Yes ☐	No ☐
6. poor vertical delineation of pedestrian-way (e.g., no curb, intermittent curb, numerous driveways, substandard width, occluded by utility infrastructure, etc.).	Yes ☐	No ☐
7. Other considerations (e.g., SPIS data; high incidence of pedestrian/bicycle injuries, etc.)	Yes ☐	No ☐

Scoring:

5+ elements	*10 points*
4 elements	*7 points*
3 elements	*3 points*
2 elements	*0 points*

b) Ranking Objective: Identify land use factors (other than expected increased of mixed use density) which promote/compel pedestrian/bike travel within the corridor. (10 points)

1. **Transit corridor (4 points)**
2. **Regional bike system (3 points)**
3. **Within ¼ mile of a school, civic complex or cultural facilities (3 points)**

ATTACHMENT B-1

FY 2000 MTIP 2040 POINT ALLOCATION

		Points		
1. Access To:	**Is a high proportion of travel on the project link seeking access to:**	**HI**	**Med**	**Lo**
	• Central City, Regional Centers, Industrial Sanctuaries, Intermodal Terminals	20	15	10
	• Station Areas, Town Centers, Main Streets, Corridors	15	10	5
	• Employment Areas, Inner and Outer Neighborhoods	5	0	0
	OR			
2. Circulation Within:	**Does a project improve mode appropriate circulation within:**			
	• Central City, Regional Centers, Industrial Sanctuaries, Intermodal Terminals	20	15	10
	• Station Areas, Town Centers, Main Streets, Inner Neighborhoods	15	10	5
	• Employment Areas, Inner and Outer Neighborhoods	5	0	0
	AND			
3. 2040 Target Density:	**Does the project serve an area projected in the 2040 Growth Concept to have a large increase of mixed use development between 1994 and 2020?**			
	Change in Mixed Use Density 1994 to 2020: High	20		
	Med	10		
	Low	0		

6/30/98

hlqdocs\00tip\ranking.wb1

FY 2000 MTIP 2040 POINT ALLOCATION FOR FREIGHT

		Points		
1. Access To:	**Is the project located within Industrial Areas, Intermodal Facilities, Employment Areas:**	**H**	**M**	**L**
	• Intermodal rail yard, marine terminal, air cargo facility, truck terminal or distribution facility	20	15	10
	• Industrial Area	15	10	5
	• Employment Areas with other industrial activity	10	5	0
	• outside industrial area but providing access to	10	5	0
	OR			
2. Circulation Within:	**Does a project improve mode appropriate circulation within:**	**H**	**M**	**L**
	• Intermodal rail yard, marine terminal, air cargo facility, truck terminal or distribution facility	20	15	10
	• Industrial Area	15	10	5
	• Employment Areas with other industrial activity	10	5	0
	AND			
3. Employment Growth or Traded Sector Focus	Does the project serve an area projected in the 2040 Growth Concept to have high growth of industrial employment between 1994 and 2020, or exhibit a high current focus on "traded sector" businesses?	High	10	
		Med	5	
		Low	0	

7/22/98 – Revised by JPACT 7/22/98

h\qdocs\00tip\ranking.wb1

ATTACHMENT 2

FY 2000 MTIP PROJECT RANKING TECHNICAL CRITERIA

8/28/98

ROAD MODERNIZATION	ROAD RECONSTRUCTION	BLVD. DESIGN	FREIGHT	PEDESTRIAN	BICYCLE	TOD	TRANSIT	TDM
GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)	**GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)**	**GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)**	**GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)**	**GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)**	**GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)**	**GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)**	**GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)**	**GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)**
GOAL: Provide Mobility at Reasonable Cost (15 points) Cost/VHD eliminated in 2020 with truck delay factored to auto equivalent value.	**GOAL: Provide Mobility at Reasonable Cost (15 points)** Cost/VMT in 2020 (or VT at interchanges and intersections.	**GOAL: Implement Blvd Design Elements for Least Cost. (15 points)** Cost/mile/benefit points	**GOAL: Provide Mobility at Reasonable Cost (15 points)** Cost/Truck hours of delay eliminated in 2020.	**GOAL: Provide Mobility at Reasonable Cost (15 points)** Cost/VMT reduced in 2020.	**GOAL: Provide Mobility at Reasonable Cost (15 points)** Cost/(VMT - ratio of '94 to 2020 mode splits in priority land uses needed to achieve 10% VMT reduction)/by miles.	**GOAL: Reduce VMT at Reasonable Cost (15 points)** Cost/VMT reduced in 2020.	**GOAL: Increase Ridership at Reasonable Cost (25 points)** Determine cost per new transit patron.	**GOAL: Reduce VMT at Reasonable Cost (25 points)** Cost/VMT reduced.
GOAL: Reduce Congestion (25 points) Project derives from CMS, consistent with 10% per capita VMT reduction. Compare base year V/C ratio (pm peak hr & direction) against ratios with and without project.	**GOAL: Bring Facility To Current Urban Standard Or Provide Long-term Maintenance (25 points)** Reward pavement condition that is currently "fair" and will be "poor" 10 years into future.	**GOAL: Slow vehicle speeds/enhance alt. mode access. (25 points)** Encourage projects that incorporate maximum feasible Blvd street design elements so alternative travel modes are appealing & safer.	**GOAL: Reduce Delay of Freight & Goods Movement In and Through the Region (25 points)** Truck hours of delay eliminated in 2020.	**GOAL: Increase Walk Mode Share/Reduce Auto Trips (25 points)** Compute new trips made by walking (or walking to transit) instead of by auto. Use 2020 mode split after reducing VMT 10%.	**GOAL: Ridership (25 points)** Determine potential ridership increase based on travel shed, socio-economic data and travel behavior survey data. Current methods assume 2020 mode splits adjusted to reflect 10% VMT reduction.	**GOAL: Increase Non-Auto Mode Share (25 points)** Determine increase of transit, walk and bike trips that result from TOD program subsidy of market development.	**GOAL: Increase Modal Share (35 points)** Compute benefits in relation to 2020 ridership targets in areas proposed for service additions.	**GOAL: Increase Modal Share (35 points)** Compute non-SOV mode share increase and VMT reduction.
GOAL: Safety (20 points) Accident rate per Vehicle (use current ODOT Accident Rate Book) and qualitative assessment of bike/ped conflicts.	**GOAL: Safety (20 points)** Accident Rate per Vehicle (use current ODOT Accident Rate Book) and qualitative assessment of bike/ped conflicts.	**GOAL: Safety (20 points)** Target least safe/highest non-auto demand boulevard segments for improvement.	**GOAL: Safety (20 points)** Addresses high accident locations with special emphasis on hazardous road/rail situations and conflict with bike/pedestrian modes.	**GOAL: Safety (20 points)** Project corrects an existing safety problem. Factors such as traffic volume, speed, road width, citizen complaints, and especially proximity to schools will be considered in determining critical safety problems.	**GOAL: Safety (20 points)** Factors include blind curves, high truck & auto volume, soft shoulders, high reported accident rate, high speeds and especially proximity to schools.	**GOAL: Increase Density (20 points)** Does the TOD project increase density within a one-quarter mile radius of transit above the level that would result without public subsidy from the TOD program?		

h:\..\terry\00tip\00multi mode criteria Revised by JPACT 7/16/98
7/22/98

ATTACHMENT 1

FY 2000 MTIP/STIP PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

Available Revenue →

STEP 1: PROJECT APPLICATION BY STATE, REGIONAL AND LOCAL JURISDICTIONS

↓

STEP 2: THRESHOLD CRITERIA

- Meet Street Design Guidelines
- Consistent With RTP Functional Classification Maps
- To Be Included in RTP "Strategic" Component
- Cost of Candidate Projects Constrained to Target of 3 Times Expected Revenue

↓

STEP 3: TECHNICAL SCORE IS CALCULATED

FREIGHT	ROAD MOD	RECONSTRUCTION	BLVD. DESIGN	PEDESTRIAN	BICYCLE	TOD	TRANSIT	TDM
GOAL: Support 2040 1. Increase Access to/ Circulation Within Industrial Areas -- 20 Points 2. Increase of Industrial Jobs, or High focus on "Traded Sector" businesses. -- 20 Points	*SUPPORT 2040:* 1. INCREASE ACCESS TO OR CIRCULATION WITHIN DESIGNATED 2040 PRIORITY LAND USES -- 20 POINTS 2. SERVES AREAS WHERE 2040 GROWTH CONCEPT CALLS FOR INCREASED MIXED USE DENSITY -- 20 POINTS							
GOAL: Mobility at Reasonable Cost (15 points) Cost/Truck hours of delay reduced.	GOAL: Mobility at Reasonable Cost (15 points) Cost/VHD reduced.	GOAL: Mobility at Reasonable Cost (15 points) Cost/VMT.	GOAL: Implement Blvd Design Elements for Least Cost. (15 points) Cost/mile/benefit points	GOAL: Mobility at Reasonable Cost (15 points) Cost/VMT reduced.	GOAL: Mobility at Reasonable Cost (15 points) Cost/VMT reduced.	GOAL: Reduce VMT at Reasonable Cost (15 points) Cost/VMT reduced.	GOAL: Increase Ridership at Reasonable Cost (25 points) Cost per new patron.	GOAL: Reduce VMT at Reasonable Cost (25 points) Cost/VMT reduced.
GOAL: Reduce Delay of Freight & Goods Movement Delay (25 points) Truck hours of delay eliminated.	GOAL: Reduce Congestion (25 points) Reduce V/C ratio/improve LOS.	GOAL: Upgrade To Urban Standard; Provide Long-term Maintenance (25 points) Maintain "Fair" pavement condition.	GOAL: Slow vehicle speeds/enhance alt. mode access. (25 points) Encourage Blvd street design elements.	GOAL: Increase Walk Trips/Re-duce Auto Trips (25 points) Generate new walk trips.	GOAL: Ridership (25 points) Generate new ridership.	GOAL: Increase Non-Auto Mode Share (25 points) Increase Non-SOV trips.	GOAL: Increase Modal Share (35 points) Increase Transit Trips. Compare "Core" vs "Emerging" systems separately.	GOAL: Increase Modal Share (35 points) Decrease SOV mode share.
GOAL: Safety (20 points) Reduce road/rail conflict and truck conflict with bike/pedestrian modes.	GOAL: Safety (20 points) Improve high accident locations.	GOAL: Safety (20 points) Improve high accident rate locations.	GOAL: Safety (20 points) Slow vehicles & enhance street scape to promote alt. mode safety.	GOAL: Safety (20 points) Reduce pedestrian hazards.	GOAL: Safety (20 points) Reduce bike hazards, especially near schools.	GOAL: Increase Density (20 points) Increase mixed use density.		
100 Points	100 Points	100 Points	100 Points	100 Points	100 Points	100 Points	100 Points	100 Points

↓

RESULTS OF STEP 3: PROJECT LIST IS RANKED BY TECHNICAL SCORE

FREIGHT	ROAD MOD	RECONSTRUCTION	BLVD. DESIGN	PEDESTRIAN	BICYCLE	TOD	TRANSIT	TDM
Proj. 1 - 100 Proj. 2 - 97 Proj. 3 - 88 Proj. 4 - 73	Proj. 1 - 100 Proj. 2 - 97 Proj. 3 - 88 Proj. 4 - 73	Proj. 1 - 100 Proj. 2 - 97 Proj. 3 - 88 Proj. 4 - 73	Proj. 1 - 100 Proj. 2 - 97 Proj. 3 - 88 Proj. 4 - 73	Proj. 1 - 100 Proj. 2 - 97 Proj. 3 - 88 Proj. 4 - 73	Proj. 1 - 100 Proj. 2 - 97 Proj. 3 - 88 Proj. 4 - 73	Proj. 1 - 100 Proj. 2 - 97 Proj. 3 - 88 Proj. 4 - 73	Proj. 1 - 100 Proj. 2 - 97 Proj. 3 - 88 Proj. 4 - 73	Proj. 1 - 100 Proj. 2 - 97 Proj. 3 - 88 Proj. 4 - 73

↓

STEP 4: ADDTIONAL INFORMATION ADDED THROUGH ADMINISTRATIVE CRITERIA

- Is the candidate project the minimum logical phase?
- Is the project linked to another high priority project?
- Is there local or private over-match?
- Is there a past regional commitment?
- Does the project include significant multi-modal benefits?
- Is there an affordable housing connection?
- What other factors are not reflected by the technical criteria?

FUNDING AMOUNT AVAILABLE
BY STATE MOD, STP, CMAQ, TE, NHS, etc. →

← ALLOCATION CRITERIA

- Multi-Modal Program
- Geographic Equity
- Support 2040 Objectives
- Meets Air Quality Test

↓

STEP 5: DRAFT FUNDING RECOMMENDATION FOR PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION BY JPACT AND THE METRO COUNCIL

PROJECT EVALUATION (Steps 2 through 4)

PROJECT SELECTION (Step 5)

ATTACHMENT 4

Local Public Involvement Checklist

Local jurisdictions/project sponsors must complete this checklist for local transportation plans and programs from which projects are drawn that are submitted to Metro for regional funding or other action. Section 3.D of Metro's local public involvement policy for transportation describes the certification process, including completion of this checklist. See Section 3.D for information about the other certification steps.

If projects are from the same local transportation plan and/or program, only one checklist need be submitted for those projects. For projects not in the local plan and/or program, the local jurisdiction should complete a checklist fc each project.

The procedures for local public involvement (Section 3) and this checklist are intended to ensure that the local planning and programming process has provided adequate opportunity for public involvement prior to action by Metrc To aid in its review of local plans, programs and projects, Metro is requesting information on applicable local public involvement activities. Project sponsors should keep information (such as that identified in italics) on their public involvement program on file in case of a dispute.

A. Checklist

☐ 1. At the beginning of the transportation plan or program, a public involvement program was developed and applied that met the breadth and scope of the plan/program. Public participation was broad-based, with early and continuing opportunities throughout the plan/program's lifetime.

Keep copy of applicable public involvement plan and/or procedures.

☐ 2. Appropriate interested and affected groups were identified and the list was updated as needed.

Maintain list of interested and affected parties.

☐ 3. Announced the initiation of the plan/program and solicited initial input. If the plan/program schedule allowed, neighborhood associations, citizen planning organizations and other interest groups were notified 45 calendar days prior to (1) the public meeting or other activity used to kick off public involvement for the plan/program; and (2) the initial decision on the scope and alternatives to be studied.

Keep descriptions of initial opportunities to involve the public and to announce the project's initiation. Keep descriptions of the tools or strategies used to attract interest and obtain initial input.

☐ 4. Provided reasonable notification of key decision points and opportunities for public involvement in the planning and programming process. Neighborhood associations, citizen planning organizations and other interest groups were notified as early as possible.

Keep examples of how the public was notified of key decision points and public involvement opportunities, including notices and dated examples. For announcements sent by mail, document number of persons/groups on mailing list.

☐ 5. Provided a forum for timely, accessible input throughout the lifetime of the plan/program.

Keep descriptions of opportunities for ongoing public involvement in the plan/program, including citizen advisory committees. For key public meetings, this includes the date, location and attendance.

☐ 6. Provided opportunity for input in reviewing screening and prioritizing criteria.

Keep descriptions of opportunities for public involvement in reviewing screening and prioritizing criteria. For key public meetings, this includes the date, location and attendance. For surveys, this includes the number received.

☐ 7. Provided opportunity for review/comment on staff recommendations.

Keep descriptions of opportunities for public review of staff recommendations. For key public meetings, this includes the date, location and attendance. For surveys, this includes the number received.

☐ 8. Considered and responded to public comments and questions. As appropriate, the draft documents and/or recommendations were revised based on public input.

Keep record of comments received and response provided.

☐ 9. Provided adequate notification of final adoption of the plan or program. If the plan or program's schedule allows, the local jurisdiction should notify neighborhood associations, citizen participation organizations and other interest groups 45 calendar days prior to the adoption date. A follow-up notice should be distributed prior to the event to provide more detailed information.

Keep descriptions of the notifications, including dated examples. For announcements sent by mail, keep descriptions and include number of persons/groups on mailing list.

B. Certification Statement

_____

Project sponsor

Certifies adherence to the local public involvement procedures developed to enhance public participation.

_____

Signed

_____

Date

C. Summary of Local Public Involvement Process

Please attach a summary (maximum two pages) of the key elements of the public involvement process for this plan, program or group of projects.

☐ Attachment 3: Detailed Technical Project Selection Criteria

Transportation Measures

- Pedestrian
- Transit Oriented Development
- Bicycle
- Road Modernization
- Road Reconstruction
- Transit
- Freight
- Transportation Demand Management (TDM)
- Boulevard Projects

Land Use Support Measures

- 2040 Funding Priority Matrix (Attachment B-1: Applicable to all modes except freight)
- 2040 Freight Funding Priority Matrix

Pedestrian System

GOAL: Increase Modal Share/Reduce Auto VMT (25 points)

VMT reduction potential for pedestrian projects will be inferred on the basis of zone walk-to-transit values generated by the Metro regional model. The following factors will be used to rank pedestrian project effectiveness.

> *Note: For CMAQ eligibility purposes, total person trips within a 1/8th mile radius of the project will be calculated and zonal mode shift factors will be used to estimate walk reduction potential of projects and corresponding reduction of VMT and emissions.*

Project is located in a zone with a high increase in the number of walk-to-transit mode share between 1994 and 2020. (15 Points)

Points	
15	High
8	Medium
0	Low

Project is located in zone with a high increase in the percent of walk-to-transit trips between 1994 and 2020. (10 Points)

Points	
10	Large increase
5	Moderate increase
0	Low increase

GOAL: Safety (20 points)

Project corrects an existing safety problem. Very wide roads with fast moving traffic make crossing difficult and dangerous. Factors such as traffic volume, speed, road width, proximity to schools, and citizen complaints will be considered in determining critical safety problems.

Points	
20	Project will correct an extremely hazardous situation which needs immediate attention.
13	Project will correct an unsafe situation.
0	Project will provide little or no safety improvement.

GOAL: Addresses 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)

See Funding Priority Matrix. **(Attachment B-1)**

GOAL: Provide Mobility at Reasonable Cost (15 points)

Add effectiveness and 2040 mixed use density points (maximum of 45 points). Divide sum of points by total project cost.

Points	
15	Low Cost/point
8	Moderate Cost/point
0	High Cost/point

TOD

GOAL: Increase Mode Share (25 points)

Is the TOD project proposed in a zone with a high increase in the percent of walk-to-transit, bike, and walk trips between 1994 and 2020.

Note: For CMAQ eligibility purposes, total person trips generated by the TOD project will be calculated using standard ITE trip factors. Zonal mode shift percent change 1994/2020 will be used to estimate walk reduction potential of projects and corresponding reduction of VMT and emissions.

Points	
25	High
13	Medium
0	Low

GOAL: Density Criteria (20 points)

Does the TOD project increase the density of land uses within a one-fourth mile radius of transit above the level that would result without these public funds into the TOD project?

Points	
20	High - 50 percent or greater increase in persons per acre within a one-fourth mile radius.
10	Medium - 25 percent or greater increase in persons per acre within a one-fourth mile radius.
0	Low - less than 25 percent increase in persons per acre with a one-fourth mile radius.

GOAL: 2040 Criteria(40 points)

See Funding Priority Matrix. **(Attachment B-1)**

GOAL: Cost-Effectiveness Criteria (15 points)

Cost per effectiveness points.

Points	
15	Low cost/point
8	Medium cost/points
0	High cost/point

Bike

GOAL: Ridership (Usage) (25 points)

Ridership (Usage) (25 points)
Calculate the project's potential ridership based on a travel shed of ½ mile radius from the proposed project. The 2020 model generated distribution of bike trips occurring within the travel shed will be concentrated onto newly proposed bike facilities. Resultant "ridership" values will be compared for all bike projects.

Note: For CMAQ eligibility purposes, total person trips within a 1/8th mile radius of the project will be calculated and zonal mode shift factors will be used to estimate walk reduction potential of projects and corresponding reduction of VMT and emissions.

Points	
25	High ridership
13	Medium ridership
0	Low ridership

GOAL: Safety (20 points)
Does the project address an existing deterrent to bicycling?

Target roadway a deterrent to bicycling.

Points	
15	High auto ADT and narrow
8	High auto ADT and wide
0	Low auto ADT; narrow & curves

Other safety factors (blind curves, high truck volume, soft shoulders, high reported accident rate).

Points	
5	Yes
0	No

GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)

See regional and local bikeway rows on *2040 Transportation Prioritization Criteria* Matrix. **(Attachment B-1)**

Points	
40	High
20	Medium
0	Low

GOAL: Cost Effectiveness (15 points)

Determine cost per rider. (use concentrated 2020 ridership value)

Points	
15	Low cost/rider
8	Medium cost/rider
0	High cost/rider

Roadway Expansion

GOAL: Reduce Congestion (25 points)
(Project derives from CMS, consistent with 2020 per capita VMT targets)

1994 two-hour "blended" V/C Ratio (pm, peak direction) **2020 V/C Ratio** (pm peak hr & direction)
(Central City, Regional Centers, Town Centers, Main Streets, Station Areas)

Points		Points	
15	>1.1	10	>1.1
8	>1.0	5	>1.0
0	<1.0	0	<1.0

1994 two-hour "blended" V/C Ratio (pm, peak direction) **2020 V/C Ratio** (pm peak hr & direction)
(Corridors, Industrial Areas, and Inner and Outer Neighborhoods)

Points		Points	
15	>1.0	10	>1.0
8	>0.95	5	>0.95
0	<0.95	0	<0.95

Note: Regional Highways to be determined on case by case basis.

GOAL: Enhance Safety (20 points)
Accident Rate per Vehicle Mile (Use 1990 ODOT Accident Rate Book); per vehicle for intersections.

Points	
20	>124% Statewide Median
10	100% Statewide Median
0	<100% Statewide Median

GOAL: Addresses 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)

See Funding Priority Matrix. **(Attachment B-1)**

GOAL: Provide Mobility at a Reasonable Cost (15 points)

Cost per Vehicle hours of delay (VHD) eliminated in 2020: VHD = 2020 No-Build VHD - Build VHD

Points	
15	Top 1/3
8	Mid 1/3
0	Low 1/3

Roadway Reconstruction

GOAL: Project brings facility to current urban design standard or provides long-term maintenance (25 points)

1994 Condition: pavement base, etc. from ODOT

Points	
15	Fair
8	Poor
0	Very Poor

2004 Condition: pavement, base, etc. (without earlier improvement)

Points	
0	Fair
5	Poor
10	Very Poor

GOAL: Enhance Safety (20 points)

Accident Rate Per Vehicle Mile (Use 1990 ODOT Accident Rate Book)

Points	
20	>124% Statewide Median
10	100% Statewide Median
0	<100% Statewide Median

GOAL: Addresses 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)

See Funding Priority Matrix. **(Attachment B-1)**

GOAL: Provide Mobility at Reasonable Cost (15 points)

Cost per year 2020 VMT (or Vehicles Traveled at interchanges & intersections)

Cost/Year 2020 Vehicles or VMT

Intersections/Interchanges Points		Interstate Projects Points		Link Improvement Points	
15	<$.51 per vehicle	15	<$.51 per vehicle	15	<$.33/VMT
8	$.51-.99 per vehicle	8	$.51-.99 per vehicle	8	$.24-$.99 VMT
0	>$1.00 per vehicle	0	>$1.00 per vehicle	0	>$.99/VMT

- Note: To be updated to current costs or will assign points for low, medium and high cost.

Transit

GOAL: Increase Modal Share (35 points)

Formula:
Subtract
2020 transit target
- 1994 ridership
Multiply Remainder
x Percent attributed to project
x Average regional trip length
= VMT Reduction

Points	
35	High VMT Reduction
17	Medium VMT Reduction
0	Low VMT Reduction

Note: Service increase proposals will be split as urban core or suburban new start and ranked separately.

GOAL: Address 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)

See Funding Priority Matrix. **(Attachment B-1)**

GOAL: Provide Cost Effective Improvements (25 points)

Cost/New Ridership
(Factored 2020 ridership increase)

Points	
25	Low Cost
12	Medium cost
0	High cost

Freight Intermodal

GOAL: Reduce Truck Hours of Delay (25 points)
Determine Truck hours of Delay on target facility in 2020 with and without the project.

Hours of Delay Eliminated

Points	
25	High
13	Medium
0	Low

GOAL: Enhance Safety (20 points)

Points	
8	Reduces conflicts for freight modes (especially with bicycles and pedestrians)
8	Addresses hazardous road/rail geometric problem for truck/train
4	Addresses location with high accident rate

GOAL: Addresses 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)

See 2040 Freight Table. **(Attachment B-1)**

GOAL: Provide Freight Mobility at Reasonable Cost (15 points)

Cost per VHD eliminated in 2015: Cost/Year 2020 (No-Build VHD - Build VHD)

Points	
15	Low cost/VHD
8	Mid cost/VHD
0	High cost/VHD

TDM

GOAL: Increase Modal Share (35 points)

Mode share increase for (transit, bike, walk, shared-ride) or elimination of trip. Use Regional TDM program survey data to estimate SOV mode shift potential of proposed projects.

Points	
35	High
17	Medium
0	Low

GOAL: Addresses 2040 Land Use Objectives (40 points)

(See Funding Priority Matrix for specific land uses.) **(Attachment B-1)**

Points	
40	Project is a regional strategy

GOAL: Cost Effectiveness (25 points)

Cost/VMT reduced

Points	
25	Low cost
13	Medium cost
0	High cost