



Puget Sound Regional Council

Equity Advisory Committee | Remote Only

Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 from 5:30-7:30 pm

Optional: Post-Meeting Q&A from 7:30-8:00 pm

1. Welcome (5:30) – *Shannon Turner & Julius Moss, Co-Chairs*

2. Reports

- a. Meeting Summary for October 5, 2023*
- b. EAC Member Announcements*
- c. Staff Announcements

2. Discussion Item (6:00)

- a. Equity Pilot Program: Review Process and Recommendations* – *Kelly McGourty, Doug Cox, & Charles Patton, PSRC*

3. Break (6:45)

4. Discussion Item (6:55)

- a. Equity Pilot Program: Review Process and Recommendations* – *Kelly McGourty, Doug Cox, & Charles Patton, PSRC*

5. Zoom Poll (7:25)

6. Next meeting: December 7, 2023

7. Adjourn (7:30)

Optional Post-Meeting Q&A (7:30) – *Charles Patton, PSRC*

*Supporting materials attached.

Members can access the attendance sheet [here](#) to complete and submit to finance@psrc.org for compensation.

Zoom Remote Connection Details

- To join the webinar, please click the following link: https://psrc-org.zoom.us/j/87329222982?pwd=ZwO9mcdO9GBqL7aLnE1cy3_B-pnFjA.66Dy5_tcRSmvBrku and enter Passcode: 350867.

- To join by phone, call 877 853 5257 US Toll Free or 888 475 4499 US Toll Free and enter Webinar ID: 873 2922 2982 and Passcode: 350867.
- For TTY-based telecommunications relay service dial 711.
- العربية | Arabic, 中文 | Chinese, Deutsch | German, Français | French, 한국어 | Korean, Русский | Russian, Español | Spanish, Tagalog, Tiếng Việt | Vietnamese, visit <https://www.psrc.org/contact/language-assistance>.



Puget Sound Regional Council

Equity Advisory Committee Meeting Summary

Date: October 5, 2023

Location: Remote Only

Presentations from the meeting are available on the [Equity Advisory Committee webpage](#). Audio recording of the meeting is available by request.

Welcome

Julius Moss, from Pierce County, and Shannon Turner, from Kitsap County, called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm. The co-chair welcomed everyone and asked Mikayla to begin the roll call for attendance.

2023-2024 EAC Board Representation

Charles recapped the PSRC Board Participation presentation, and facilitated a committee vote to determine EAC representation on the PSRC Transportation Policy Board and Growth Management Policy Board. The EAC determined the following members will serve as non-voting members representing the committee:

- Annie Tran (EAC representative): TPB
- Shannon Turner (EAC representative): GMPB
- Julius Moss (alternate): TPB
- Lisa Espinosa (alternate): GMPB

You can view the presentation [here](#).

State Legislative Agenda: Draft Policy Areas and EAC Feedback

PSRC staff have begun work to support the adoption of recommendations to the Washington State Legislature in advance of the 2024 legislative session. PSRC staff updated the Equity Advisory Committee on the process to adopt legislative priorities and sought feedback on potential legislative policy items.

You can view the presentation [here](#).

Questions? Contact Robin Koskey, Director of Government Relations and Communications, at rkoskey@psrc.org.

Regional Safety Plan Draft Scope of Work Outline

PSRC staff has developed a draft scope of work for a Regional Safety Plan, which is being developed through funding awarded by the USDOT Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Grant Program. The Equity Advisory Committee was briefed on the draft scope of work and provided feedback.

You can view the presentation [here](#).

Questions? Contact Gary Simonson, Senior Planner, gsimonson@psrc.org.

Adjourn

At the close of the meeting, members participated in a poll to evaluate the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 7:30 pm.

Members Represented at the Table

See attached attendance roster.

PSRC Staff and Other Guests Present

Mikayla Svob, PSRC
Charles Patton, PSRC
Grant Gibson, PSRC
Katie Enders, PSRC
Robin Koskey, PSRC
Gary Simonson, PSRC
Gwen McCullough



Puget Sound Regional Council

DISCUSSION ITEM

November 2, 2023

TO: Equity Advisory Committee

FROM: Kelly McGourty, Director of Transportation Planning

SUBJECT: Equity Pilot Program: Review Process and Recommendations

IN BRIEF

From January and September 2023, the Equity Advisory Committee (EAC) worked with PSRC staff to review PSRC's current project selection process as it relates to equity, and ultimately develop an equity pilot program to distribute approximately \$6 million of PSRC's 2025-2026 Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) funds. Additionally, from July to August, a subgroup of EAC members attended staff meetings to help design the Pilot. Moving forward the EAC will also develop recommendations for potential further equity improvements in future PSRC project selection processes.

During the upcoming meeting of the Equity Advisory Committee, members will hear an overview of the Equity Pilot and the transportation projects that have been submitted to date. Following this overview, members will begin the discussion to evaluate the results of the pilot.

DISCUSSION

PSRC conducts a project selection process to distribute federal transportation funds every two years. The process and the criteria used to evaluate every project is based on policies and outcomes detailed in [VISION 2050](#) and the [Regional Transportation Plan](#). These include elements such as accessibility, multimodal mobility, safety, equity and climate, as well as financial and project readiness considerations.

In addition to substantial improvements to how equity was incorporated into the existing project selection process, as part of the 2022 *Policy Framework* approximately \$6 million of PSRC's FHWA funds were set aside for an Equity Pilot Program. The EAC was asked to co-create this program, developing the parameters by which projects would be selected for funding, with an overarching focus on improving equity with transportation investments.

During the April meeting, members of the EAC encouraged staff to increase the points allocated for equity, evaluate the quality of displacement policies, encourage agencies

to partner with community-based organizations (CBOs) on their transportation projects, etc.

During three meetings in July and August, an EAC subgroup worked with staff to develop questions that reflected these recommendations. They also offered additional recommendations such as encouraging agencies to improve the resilience of the transportation system, aligning relevant questions with the Regional Economic Strategy, requiring all project sponsors describe how displacement is being addressed, etc. **Please see Attachment A and B to view the Equity Pilot the EAC co-created.**

During the November meeting of the EAC, PSRC staff will provide an overview of the Equity Pilot and the transportation projects that have been submitted to date. The deadline is being extended to November 15th to encourage additional project submittals for a more robust pilot evaluation. **Information on the currently submitted projects and the staff assessment will be shared with the EAC on Tuesday, October 31, 2023.** Following this overview, members will share their thoughts on the draft results from the pilot, discussion of which will continue at the December meeting.

Members will be asked questions such as:

- Were these the types of responses and projects you were expecting?
- Which pathway do you prefer, pathway 1 or pathway 2?
- Thinking ahead to the final recommendations, what elements of the Pilot do you feel should be included in the full project selection process?
- Keeping in mind that there are two pathways, how should we distribute the funds for the Pilot?

Next Steps

The next meeting of the Equity Advisory Committee will be held on December 7, 2023. During this meeting, staff and the EAC will continue the conversation about the Equity Pilot, exploring how the lessons learned from the Equity Pilot should inform PSRC's project selection process moving forward. Additionally, members will have a follow-up conversation about the state legislative agenda.

Lead Staff

For more information, please contact Kelly McGourty, Director of Transportation Planning, at kmcgourty@psrc.org or Charles Patton, Program Manager – Equity Policy and Initiatives, at cpatton@psrc.org.

Attachments:

Attachment A: Equity Pilot Pathway 1 – Updating Existing Process

Attachment B: Equity Pilot Pathway 2 – Updating Existing Process and Elevating Equity Throughout

REGIONAL PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA

EQUITY PILOT PATHWAY 1 – UPDATING EXISTING PROCESS

CRITERIA	Point Values – Existing Process	Point Values – Equity Pilot Pathway 1
Development of Centers	30	24
Circulation, Mobility and Accessibility	27	21
Equity	10	20
Safety	8	10
Air Quality / Climate Change	20	20
Project Readiness / Financial Plan	5	5
TOTAL	100	100

Development of Center = 24 Points (6 points/bullet)

- Describe how this project will support the housing and/or employment development in a regional, countywide or locally adopted center. Does it support multiple centers?
- Describe how the project will support the development/redevelopment plans and activities (objectives and aims) of the center.
- Describe how the project will benefit a variety of user groups, including commuters, residents, and/or commercial users.
- 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 and users 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 and users 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 and users in the center and is consistent with the development goals for the center.

Guidance:

Applicants should look to their jurisdiction’s comprehensive plan or applicable subarea plan to develop an understanding of how their jurisdiction envisions the future of the regional, countywide or local center and use this guidance to address the criteria above. In particular, applicants should demonstrate the magnitude of the benefits provided by the project and describe how it might support increased or sustained activity for a variety of user groups 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.

Applicants should describe the benefits provided by the project to the specific industry clusters identified in the regional economic strategy. For example, a project proposing increased connectivity through a new pedestrian route could provide a new customer base for businesses within a center by providing a new mode of connection. Another example may be improving the ability of a business to draw its workforce and customer base from a wider area, or improved travel time for goods delivery benefiting 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 in the jurisdiction’s comprehensive plan or subarea plan and provide documentation of the relevant policies. For example, a jurisdiction may have a comprehensive plan policy that states that roadways within the center 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, traffic calming, 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 with multimodal facilities for more direct access to center services, where none previously existed, may meet this goal.

Circulation, Mobility and Accessibility = 21 Points (7 points/bullet)

- Describe how the project provides access to major destinations within the center, such as completing a physical gap, providing an essential link in the transportation network for people and/or goods, or providing a range of travel modes or a missing

mode.

- Describe how the project will improve circulation to or within the center and enhance opportunities for active transportation, for example through improvements in: walkability, public transit access, public transit speed and reliability, bicycle mobility, streetscape improvements, traffic calming, etc.
- Describe how the project remedies a current or anticipated problem (e.g. congestion, incomplete sidewalk system, inadequate transit service/facilities, modal conflicts, preservation of essential freight movement, addressing redundancies in the system, and/or improving individual resilience and adaptability to changes or issues with the transportation system).

High: A project will receive a high rating if it significantly improves safe and convenient access and circulation to or within the center, provides a variety of travel modes and opportunities for increased public health benefits through active transportation improvements, employs innovative design (e.g, in traffic calming or parking management), and remedies a clearly demonstrated existing or anticipated problem.

Medium: A project will receive a medium rating if it moderately improves access and circulation to or within the center, provides moderate travel and safety benefits for more than one mode, provides moderate opportunities for active transportation, and remedies an existing or anticipated problem.

Low: A project will receive a low rating if it improves access and circulation to a limited degree to or within the center, provides benefits for a single mode with limited opportunities for active transportation, and resolution of an existing or anticipated problem has not been clearly demonstrated.

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 significant congestion or other identified issues such as needed redundancies in the system?

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, schools, 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. Transit-related improvements should address all types and durations of service, not just commuter routes.

The applicant should describe how the project will enhance circulation within the center, for example by providing a missing link or mode, transportation demand management (TDM) program 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.

Equity = 20 Points

Section 1. Addressing population groups, benefits and disparities (8 points)

- Identify the equity populations to be served by the project with supportive data. PSRC's defined equity populations are: people of color, people with low incomes, older adults, youth, people with disabilities, and people with limited English proficiency.
 - Further identify the most impacted or marginalized populations within the project area. For example, areas with a higher percentage of both people of color and people with low incomes, and/or other areas of intersectionality across equity populations such as areas with low access to opportunity, areas disproportionately impacted by pollution, etc.
- Identify the existing disparities or gaps in the transportation system or services for these identified equity populations that need to be addressed.
- Describe how the project is addressing those disparities or gaps and will provide benefits or positive impacts to these equity populations by improving their mobility.

High: A project will receive a high rating if it identifies equity populations in the project area with supportive data, clearly demonstrates the identified populations' unique transportation needs the project will address, and provides a clearly demonstrated benefit to increase access to opportunities for the equity populations identified above. Projects that provide access to, from, or within the areas with a higher proportion of both people of color who are also low-income will receive a higher rating. The benefit and disparity are also clearly tied to travel to, from, or within the center.

Medium: A project will receive a medium rating if it identifies equity populations in the project area with supportive data but their needs and benefit have only been partially demonstrated for travel to, from, or within the center for any of the equity populations identified above.

Low: A project will receive a low rating if it does not identify equity populations the project will serve or the disparity and benefit has not been clearly demonstrated for travel to, from, or within the center for any of the equity populations identified above.

Guidance: The project should have the potential to improve access and mobility of the disproportionately impacted equity populations in the project areas. Additional resources are provided in the Call for Projects to assist sponsors in determining the location of these equity populations within their project area. Sponsors should also clearly describe how the project reduces disparities or gaps currently experienced by the most marginalized communities, rather than simply providing data on the location of any given group. Disparities are considered imbalances in access, condition, experience, etc., while needs or gaps are considered missing links in the transportation system. Additional resources, including an [interactive web map](#) and the [Transportation System Visualization Tool](#), are also provided in the Call for Projects to assist sponsors in determining disparities and gaps experienced by equity populations within their project area. Further, sponsors should be specific to equity population groups within the project area and the relationship to the center, rather than at the jurisdiction level. Sponsors are also encouraged to include data highlighting disparities experienced by these unique populations.

Example of a High Scoring Project:

“PSRC’s Equity Focus Area maps illustrate that the size of the low-income population and communities of color in the proposed project’s area are above the regional average. Although residents in these communities disproportionately attend school and work later in the evening, these communities currently do not have access to high-capacity transit to access educational or employment opportunities during off peak hours.

This proposed bus line will provide service to key educational institutions and employment centers, it will have frequency and span to serve off peak hours, it will be located in areas of low income and affordable housing where an individual will be able to walk or bike within 5 minutes to access high-capacity transit service.”

Section 2. Addressing outreach (6 points)

- Describe the public outreach process that led to the development of the project. This could be at a broader planning level (comprehensive plan, corridor plan, etc.) or for the specific project. Include specific outreach or communication with the equity

populations identified in the previous section, including activities reflective of best practices from PSRC's [Equitable Engagement Guidance](#). These include, for example:

- Compensating community members for their input
- Effectively addressing language barriers
- Partnering and co-creating with community-based organizations
- Describe how this outreach influenced the development of the project, e.g., the location, scope, design, timing, etc.

High: A project will receive a high rating if it's shaped by feedback gathered using outreach strategies included in the Equitable Engagement Guidance and clearly addresses a demonstrated problem or need specifically identified by community members from the Equity Focus Area (EFA) identified in the previous section, either from general or project specific outreach.

Medium: A project will receive a medium rating if it's shaped by feedback gathered using outreach strategies **NOT** included in the Equitable Engagement Guidance and addresses a demonstrated problem or need identified through feedback provided by the wider community, either from general or project specific outreach.

Low: A project will receive a low rating if there is no clear connection demonstrated between the development of the project and outreach heard from members of the community.

Guidance: Sponsors should clearly describe the feedback received from members of EFAs within the project area during the general or project specific outreach process and highlight how it influenced the project, illustrating that this is a project these population groups want in their community. Pathways for outreach are different for different projects, so whether the outreach was at the planning or project level will not influence the score. For example, a sponsor for complete streets may reference a comment from members of an EFA for a plan that may state, "Please address the different needs of people using modes including but not limited to walking, wheelchairs, running, biking, e-scooters, strollers, etc." Or the sponsor may reference a comment from members of an EFA specific to the project that may state, "Please add sidewalks and bike lanes to Dakota St. so people with different needs can get from the bus stop on 42nd St. to Gramercy Park." Responses will be scored based on how well feedback from members of relevant EFAs were taken into consideration and how well best practices from PSRCs [Equitable Engagement Guidance](#) were implemented in this outreach.

Example of a High Scoring Project:

“The outreach process included creating an ad hoc committee comprised of people with disabilities (i.e., the EFA for this project) that met several times to identify project needs and goals, review improvement options, and select recommended improvements. The agency engaged in meaningful conversations with the committee to better understand their needs and center the project on issues they shared with staff. Committee members were compensated for their time and expertise.

Committee members cited a need for sidewalks, traffic calming, and a street design that would keep residents safe from vehicle traffic. They were particularly interested in sidewalks and street designs that would address access and safety issues for people with disabilities who currently wait for the bus along the edge of the road.”

Section 3. Addressing displacement (6 points)

- Using PSRC’s [Housing Opportunities by Place \(HOP\)](#) tool, identify the typology associated with the location of the project and identify the strategies the jurisdiction uses to reduce the risk of displacement that are aligned with those listed for the typology.

High: A project will receive a high rating if the sponsor demonstrates that it is located in a jurisdiction with policies that clearly display a commitment to addressing displacement and are aligned with their assigned typology in the Housing Opportunities by Place (HOP) tool.

Medium: A project will receive a medium rating if the sponsor demonstrates that it is located in a jurisdiction with policies that simply mention displacement, or the policies are **NOT** aligned with their assigned typology in the Housing Opportunities by Place (HOP) tool.

Low: A project will receive a low rating if the sponsor **DOES NOT** demonstrate that it is located in a jurisdiction with policies that address or mention displacement.

Guidance: The focus of this criterion is to evaluate the likelihood that populations vulnerable to displacement currently living in the surrounding community will enjoy the benefits of the project in the future. PSRC’s Housing Opportunities by Place (HOP) tool provides information on locations where residents are most at risk for displacement and tailored strategies to reduce that risk. Sponsors should determine where their project is located on the HOP map and identify the typology and anti-displacement strategies associated with that location. They should then contact their Community Development or Planning Departments to learn more about their local comprehensive plans and the

broader jurisdiction wide mitigation strategies that are currently in place to deter displacement that are aligned with their assigned typology. For example, a jurisdiction that falls under the “Strengthen Access and Affordability” typology could highlight that their comprehensive plan includes policies that eliminate unnecessary large minimum lot size requirements for development, mandate inclusionary zoning, encourage affordable housing near high-capacity transit stations, etc. Sponsors that accurately identify the HOP typology associated with their project’s location and clearly note the broader mitigation strategies in place that are aligned with this typology will score higher than those that do not.

Example of a High Scoring Project:

“The project serves areas of high displacement risk / lower opportunity, which falls under the “Improve Access and Affordability” typology. The Comprehensive Plan includes strategies that align with this typology and reflect the jurisdiction’s commitment to reduce the risk of displacement. Examples of these strategies include: no minimum parking requirements, incentive / inclusionary zoning, and relocation assistance. Attachment A includes language from the comprehensive plan that provides additional details on these strategies.”

Safety and Security = 10 Points

- Describe how the project addresses safety and security. (4 points)
- Describe how the project helps protect vulnerable users of the transportation system, by improving pedestrian safety and addressing existing risks or conditions for pedestrian injuries and fatalities and/or adding or improving facilities for pedestrian and bicycle safety and comfort. (3 points)
- Does your agency have an adopted safety policy (e.g., Vision Zero, Target Zero, etc.)? How did these policies inform the development of the project? (2 points)
- Describe how the project reduces reliance on enforcement and/or designs for decreased speeds. (1 point)

High: A project will receive a high rating if it identifies and addresses a clearly demonstrated existing or future safety or security issue, includes features that directly address vulnerable users of the system, implements the agency’s adopted safety policies, and includes element(s) that may decrease speeds and/or reduce reliance on enforcement.

Medium: A project will receive a medium rating if it addresses an existing or future safety and security issue, includes features that support vulnerable users of the system, is

consistent with the agency's adopted safety policies, and does not include elements that may reduce speeds and/or reduce reliance on enforcement.

Low: A project will receive a low rating if it does not clearly demonstrate how it addresses an existing or potential future safety and security issue, does not include features that support vulnerable users of the system, has no clear connection to adopted safety policies and does not include elements that may reduce speeds and/or reduce reliance on enforcement.

Guidance: Applicants should clearly describe the safety or security related issue being addressed by the project, and how the project will improve safety conditions. Applicants should describe how the project improves safety and comfort for pedestrians and bicyclists as well as wheelchair users and other vulnerable users. For example, projects may address unsafe conditions for these modes, provide a separation of vulnerable users from other modes, improve lighting and other security conditions, improve steep grade conditions, etc.

Applicants should also highlight features of the project that may result in decreased vehicle speeds. Examples of these features include decreasing the number of vehicle travel lanes and/or travel lane widths, adding a pedestrian crossing median, implementing a more restrictive intersection geometry, etc. Features that may support a reduced reliance on enforcement could include improved signage and technologies such as radar speed signs, variable message signs, red light cameras, etc.

In terms of policy, there is a spectrum of safety policies adopted by jurisdictions across the region, from broad safety-supportive statements to more precise calls for improvements in specific locations. Policies are found in a range of documents from comprehensive plans to sub-area plans to standalone safety plans. Applicants should identify what their agency's policies on safety are and discuss how the project implements or was informed by these policies. Specific factors to consider include the project location, the scope of the project and the specific safety issue being addressed.

Air Quality / Climate Change = 20 Points

- Describe how the project will reduce emissions, particularly of diesel particulates, through one or more of the following: (15 points)
 - 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.
- Is the project located in an area identified as a 7 of 10 for diesel pollution and disproportionate impacts in the Washington Environmental Health Disparities map? (5 points)

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 2035.

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 2035.

Low: A project will rate low if it results in a limited amount of emission reductions, and the air quality benefits will occur after 2035.

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.

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.

Projects will receive additional points if they are located in an area noted above for exposure to diesel pollution, as long as some estimated emission reduction is estimated to occur. The Air Quality Guidance document in the Call for Projects provides additional resources regarding the estimation of emissions reductions from a variety of types and

scales of transportation projects, information on the technical tool PSRC uses to estimate emissions reductions, and a link to the Washington Environmental Health Disparities map. This guidance document is provided in the Call for Projects on PSRC's website.

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 secured for the project, anticipated and reasonably expected to be secured, or unsecured at the time of the application.

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 work on the prerequisites for obligation of the requested phase has begun and/or remaining work is scheduled and feasible to be completed by the obligation deadline. All funds needed to complete the phase(s) have been secured at the time of application 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 and feasible to be completed by the obligation deadline. No funds needed to complete the phase(s) have been secured at the time of application, but funds are reasonably expected by the obligation deadline for the phase(s) requested.

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 needed to complete the phase(s) are secured, and there is risk that the sponsor's plan to secure all necessary funding will not be achieved 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.

REGIONAL PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA

EQUITY PILOT PATHWAY 2 – UPDATING EXISTING PROCESS AND ELEVATING EQUITY THROUGHOUT

CRITERIA	Point Values – Current	Point Values – Equity Pilot Pathway 1	Point Values – Equity Pilot Pathway 2
Development of Centers	30	24	25
Circulation, Mobility and Accessibility	27	21	28
Equity (Outreach and Displacement)	10	20	12
Safety	8	10	10
Air Quality / Climate Change	20	20	20
Project Readiness / Financial Plan	5	5	5
TOTAL	100	100	100

EQUITY INFORMATION

Identification of population groups

Using the resources provided in the Call for Projects, identify the equity populations (i.e., Equity Focus Areas (EFAs)) to be served by the project with supportive data. PSRC’s defined EFAs are: people of color, people with low incomes, older adults, youth, people with disabilities, and people with limited English proficiency.

Further, identify the most impacted or marginalized populations within the project area. For example, areas with a higher percentage of both people of color and people with low incomes, and/or other areas of intersectionality across equity populations such as areas with low access to opportunity, areas disproportionately impacted by pollution, etc.

Development of Center = 25 Points (5 points/bullet)

- Describe how this project will support the housing and/or employment development in a regional, countywide or locally adopted center. Does it support multiple centers?
- Describe how the project will support the development/redevelopment plans and activities (objectives and aims) of the center.
- Describe how the project will benefit a variety of user groups, including commuters, residents, and/or commercial users.
- 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 the support for a diversity of business types and sizes within the community.

- Describe how the project will expand access to high, middle and/or living wage jobs for the EFAs identified above.

High: A project will receive a high rating if it clearly supports a significant amount of existing and/or planned population/employment activity and users in the center, expands access to high, middle and/or living wage jobs within the industry clusters identified in the adopted regional economic strategy for the EFAs, 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 and users in the center, expands access to high, middle and/or living wage jobs within the industry clusters identified in the adopted regional economic strategy for the EFAs, 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 and users in the center, does not expand access to high, middle and/or living wage jobs within the industry clusters identified in the adopted regional economic strategy for the EFAs, and is inconsistent with the development goals for the center.

Guidance:

Applicants should look to their jurisdiction’s comprehensive plan or applicable subarea plan to develop an understanding of how their jurisdiction envisions the future of the regional, countywide or local center and use this guidance to address the criteria above. In particular, applicants should demonstrate the magnitude of the benefits provided by the project and describe how it might support increased or sustained activity for a variety of user groups 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.

Applicants should describe the benefits provided by the project to the specific industry clusters identified in the regional economic strategy and how the project expands access to high, middle and/or living wage jobs within the industry clusters for the identified EFAs. For example, a project proposing increased connectivity through a new pedestrian route could provide a new customer base for businesses within a center by providing a new mode of connection. Another example may be improving the ability of a business to draw

its workforce and customer base from an EFA, or improved travel time for goods delivery benefiting 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 in the jurisdiction's comprehensive plan or subarea plan and provide documentation of the relevant policies. For example, a jurisdiction may have a comprehensive plan policy that states that roadways within the center 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, traffic calming, 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 with multimodal facilities for more direct access to center services, where none previously existed, may meet this goal.

Circulation, Mobility and Accessibility = 28 Points (7 points/bullet)

- Describe how the project provides access to major destinations within the center, such as completing a physical gap, providing an essential link in the transportation network for people and/or goods, or providing a range of travel modes or a missing mode.
- Describe how the project will improve circulation to or within the center and enhance opportunities for active transportation, for example through improvements in: walkability, public transit access, public transit speed and reliability, bicycle mobility, streetscape improvements, traffic calming, etc.
- Describe how the project remedies a current or anticipated problem (e.g. congestion, incomplete sidewalk system, inadequate transit service/facilities, modal conflicts, the preservation of essential freight movement, addressing redundancies in the system, and/or improving individual resilience and adaptability to changes or issues with the transportation system).
- Identify the existing disparities or gaps in the transportation system or services for the equity populations identified above that need to be addressed. Describe how the project is addressing those disparities or gaps and will provide benefits or positive impacts to these equity populations by improving their mobility.

High: A project will receive a high rating if it significantly improves safe and convenient access and circulation to or within the center, provides a variety of travel modes and opportunities for increased public health benefits through active transportation improvements, employs innovative design (e.g, in traffic calming or parking

management), and remedies a clearly demonstrated existing or anticipated problem for the general population as well as specifically for the identified EFA.

Medium: A project will receive a medium rating if it moderately improves access and circulation to or within the center, provides moderate travel and safety benefits for more than one mode, provides moderate opportunities for active transportation, and remedies an existing or anticipated problem for the general population as well as specifically for the identified EFA.

Low: A project will receive a low rating if it improves access and circulation to a limited degree to or within the center, provides benefits for a single mode with limited opportunities for active transportation, and resolution of an existing or anticipated problem for the general population and the EFA has not been clearly demonstrated.

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 significant congestion or other identified issues such as needed redundancies in the system?

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, schools, 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. Transit-related improvements should address all types and durations of service not just commuter routes.

The applicant should describe how the project will enhance circulation within the center, for example by providing a missing link or mode, transportation demand management (TDM) program 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.

The project should also have the potential to improve access and mobility of the disproportionately impacted equity populations in the project area. Additional resources

are provided in the Call for Projects to assist sponsors in determining the location of these equity populations within their project area. Sponsors should also clearly describe how the project reduces disparities or gaps currently experienced by the most marginalized communities, rather than simply providing data on the location of any given group. Disparities are considered imbalances in access, condition, experience, etc., while needs or gaps are considered missing links in the transportation system. Additional resources, including an [interactive web map](#) and the [Transportation System Visualization Tool](#), are also provided in the Call for Projects to assist sponsors in determining disparities and gaps experienced by equity populations within their project area. Further, sponsors should be specific to equity population groups within the project area and the relationship to the center, rather than at the jurisdiction level. Sponsors are also encouraged to include data highlighting disparities experienced by these unique populations.

Outreach and Displacement = 12 Points

Section 1. Addressing outreach (6 points)

- Describe the public outreach process that led to the development of the project. This could be at a broader planning level (comprehensive plan, corridor plan, etc.) or for the specific project. Include specific outreach or communication with the equity populations identified in the previous section, including activities reflective of best practices from PSRC's [Equitable Engagement Guidance](#). These include, for example:
 - Compensating community members for their input
 - Effectively addressing language barriers
 - Partnering and co-creating with community-based organizations
- Describe how this outreach influenced the development of the project, e.g., the location, scope, design, timing, etc.

High: A project will receive a high rating if it's shaped by feedback gathered using outreach strategies included in the Equitable Engagement Guidance and clearly addresses a demonstrated problem or need specifically identified by community members from the EFA identified in the previous section, either from general or project specific outreach.

Medium: A project will receive a medium rating if it's shaped by feedback gathered using outreach strategies **NOT** included in the Equitable Engagement Guidance and addresses a demonstrated problem or need identified through feedback provided by the wider community, either from general or project specific outreach.

Low: A project will receive a low rating if there is no clear connection demonstrated between the development of the project and outreach heard from members of the community.

Guidance: Sponsors should clearly describe the feedback received from members of the EFAs within the project area during the general or project specific outreach process and highlight how it influenced the project, illustrating that this is a project these population groups want in their community. Pathways for outreach are different for different projects, so whether the outreach was at the planning or project level will not influence the score. For example, a sponsor for complete streets may reference a comment from members of an EFA for a plan that may state, "Please address the different needs of people using modes including but not limited to walking, wheelchairs, running, biking, e-scooters, strollers, etc." Or the sponsor may reference a comment from members of an EFA specific to the project that may state, "Please add sidewalks and bike lanes to Dakota St. so people with different needs can get from the bus stop on 42nd St. to Gramercy Park." Responses will be scored based on how well feedback from members of relevant EFAs were taken into consideration and how well best practices from PSRCs [Equitable Engagement Guidance](#) were implemented in this outreach.

Example of a High Scoring Project:

"The outreach process included creating an ad hoc committee comprised of people with disabilities (i.e., the EFA for this project) that met several times to identify project needs and goals, review improvement options, and select recommended improvements. The agency engaged in meaningful conversations with the committee to better understand their needs and center the project on issues they shared with staff. Committee members were compensated for their time and expertise.

Committee members cited a need for sidewalks, traffic calming, and a street design that would keep residents safe from vehicle traffic. They were particularly interested in sidewalks and street designs that would address access and safety issues for people with disabilities who currently wait for the bus along the edge of the road."

Section 2. Addressing displacement (6 points)

- Using PSRC's [Housing Opportunities by Place \(HOP\)](#) tool, identify the typology associated with the location of the project and identify the strategies the jurisdiction uses to reduce the risk of displacement that are aligned with those listed for the typology.

High: A project will receive a high rating if the sponsor demonstrates that it is located in a jurisdiction with policies that clearly display a commitment to addressing displacement and are aligned with their assigned typology in the Housing Opportunities by Place (HOP) tool.

Medium: A project will receive a medium rating if the sponsor demonstrates that it is located in a jurisdiction with policies that simply mention displacement, or the policies are **NOT** aligned with their assigned typology in the Housing Opportunities by Place (HOP) tool.

Low: A project will receive a low rating if the sponsor **DOES NOT** demonstrate that it is located in a jurisdiction with policies that address or mention displacement.

Guidance: The focus of this criterion is to evaluate the likelihood that populations vulnerable to displacement currently living in the surrounding community will enjoy the benefits of the project in the future. PSRC’s Housing Opportunities by Place (HOP) tool provides information on locations where residents are most at risk for displacement and tailored strategies to reduce that risk. Sponsors should determine where their project is located on the HOP map and identify the typology and anti-displacement strategies associated with that location. They should then contact their Community Development or Planning Departments to learn more about their local comprehensive plans and the broader jurisdiction wide mitigation strategies that are currently in place to deter displacement that are aligned with their assigned typology. For example, a jurisdiction that falls under the “Strengthen Access and Affordability” typology could highlight that their comprehensive plan includes policies that eliminate unnecessary large minimum lot size requirements for development, mandate inclusionary zoning, encourage affordable housing near high-capacity transit stations, etc. Sponsors that accurately identify the HOP typology associated with their project’s location and clearly note the broader mitigation strategies in place that are aligned with this typology will score higher than those that do not.

Example of a High Scoring Project:

“The project serves areas of high displacement risk / lower opportunity, which falls under the “Improve Access and Affordability” typology. The Comprehensive Plan includes strategies that align with this typology and reflect the jurisdiction’s commitment to reduce the risk of displacement. Examples of these strategies include: no minimum parking requirements, incentive / inclusionary zoning, and relocation assistance. Attachment A includes language from the comprehensive plan that provides additional details on these strategies.”

Safety and Security = 10 Points

- Describe how the project addresses safety and security. (2 points)
- Specific to the equity populations identified above, describe how the project will improve safety and/or address safety issues currently being experienced by these communities. (2 points)
- Describe how the project helps protect vulnerable users of the transportation system, by improving pedestrian safety and addressing existing risks or conditions for pedestrian injuries and fatalities and/or adding or improving facilities for pedestrian and bicycle safety and comfort. (3 points)
- Does your agency have an adopted safety policy (e.g., Vision Zero, Target Zero, etc.)? How did these policies inform the development of the project? (2 points)
- Describe how the project reduces reliance on enforcement and/or designs for decreased speeds. (1 point)

High: A project will receive a high rating if it identifies and addresses a clearly demonstrated existing or future safety or security issue, describes how the project will improve safety for the EFAs within the project area, includes features that directly address vulnerable users of the system, implements the agency's adopted safety policies, and includes element(s) that may decrease speeds and/or reduce reliance on enforcement.

Medium: A project will receive a medium rating if it addresses an existing or future safety and security issue, describes how the project will improve safety for the EFAs within the project area, includes features that support vulnerable users of the system, is consistent with the agency's adopted safety policies, and does not include elements that may reduce speeds and/or reduce reliance on enforcement.

Low: A project will receive a low rating if it does not clearly demonstrate how it addresses an existing or potential future safety and security issue, does not describe how the project will improve safety for an EFA, does not include features that support vulnerable users of the system, has no clear connection to adopted safety policies and does not include elements that may reduce speeds and/or reduce reliance on enforcement.

Guidance: Applicants should clearly describe the safety or security related issue being addressed by the project, including those issues experienced by the EFAs within the project area, and how the project will improve safety conditions. Applicants should describe how the project improves safety and comfort for pedestrians and bicyclists as well as wheelchair users and other vulnerable users. For example, projects may address unsafe conditions for these modes, provide a separation of vulnerable users from other

modes, improve lighting and other security conditions, improve steep grade conditions, etc.

Applicants should also highlight features of the project that may result in decreased vehicle speeds. Examples of these features include decreasing the number of vehicle travel lanes and/or travel lane widths, adding a pedestrian crossing median, implementing a more restrictive intersection geometry, etc. Features that may support a reduced reliance on enforcement could include improved signage and technologies such as radar speed signs, variable message signs, red light cameras, etc.

In terms of policy, there is a spectrum of safety policies adopted by jurisdictions across the region, from broad safety-supportive statements to more precise calls for improvements in specific locations. Policies are found in a range of documents from comprehensive plans to sub-area plans to standalone safety plans. Applicants should identify what their agency's policies on safety are and discuss how the project implements or was informed by these policies. Specific factors to consider include the project location, the scope of the project and the specific safety issue being addressed.

Air Quality / Climate Change = 20 Points

- Describe how the project will reduce emissions, particularly of diesel particulates, through one or more of the following: (15 points)
 - 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.
- Is the project located in an area identified as a 7 of 10 for diesel pollution and disproportionate impacts in the Washington Environmental Health Disparities map? (5 points)

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 2035.

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 2035.

Low: A project will rate low if it results in a limited amount of emission reductions, and the air quality benefits will occur after 2035.

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.

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.

Projects will receive additional points if they are located in an area noted above for exposure to diesel pollution, as long as some estimated emission reduction is estimated to occur. The Air Quality Guidance document in the Call for Projects provides additional resources regarding the estimation of emissions reductions from a variety of types and scales of transportation projects, information on the technical tool PSRC uses to estimate emissions reductions, and a link to the Washington Environmental Health Disparities map. This guidance document is provided in the Call for Projects on PSRC's website.

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 secured for the project, anticipated and reasonably expected to be secured, or unsecured at the time of the application.

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 work on the prerequisites for obligation of the requested phase has begun and/or remaining work is scheduled and feasible to be completed by the obligation deadline. All funds needed to complete the phase(s) have been secured at the time of application 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 and feasible to be completed by the obligation deadline. No funds needed to complete the phase(s) have been secured at the time of application, but funds are reasonably expected by the obligation deadline for the phase(s) requested.

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 needed to complete the phase(s) are secured, and there is risk that the sponsor's plan to secure all necessary funding will not be achieved 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.