

City staff propose to add two additional economic benefit criteria to the TSP project evaluation criteria, for a total of four economic benefit criteria. The two new criteria, Freight Access and Freight Mobility, are consolidations of the project evaluation criteria in the Portland Freight Master Plan. Only freight projects are likely to receive points for these criteria. Freight projects can receive points for all of the other criteria, depending on what is included in the project. We are seeking feedback on these two new criteria:

- Will these criteria lead to prioritizing freight projects that provide higher economic outcomes?
- Is it fair to have criteria that only freight projects can get points on?
- Is it fair to have four economic benefit criteria?

**TSP Project Evaluation Criteria**

December 2, 2014

Page 1

	Safety	Neighborhood Access	Economic Benefit: Opportunity Access	Economic Benefit: Freight Access	Economic Benefit: Freight Mobility	Economic Benefit: Revitalization
<b>Objective</b>	Reduce the number of pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicle occupants killed or seriously injured on the region's roadways each by 50% by 2035 compared to 2005. This is an important step toward achieving the ultimate vision of zero deaths. (Regional Transportation Plan)	By 2035, create complete 20-minute neighborhoods where 80 percent of Portlanders can safely and easily walk or bike to local services and amenities to meet their household needs. (Portland Plan Goals and Objectives)	Increase multimodal access to high concentrations of jobs and/or higher education, especially family wage jobs and areas with high concentrations of net new jobs.  Portland Plan Goal – Expand upward mobility pathways so that 90 percent of households are economically self-sufficient.	Increase family wage jobs by improving freight access to traded sector facilities and/or vacant/underutilized industrial lands.	Increase family wage jobs by improving freight mobility (reliability, travel time and/or freight-specific capacity) along freight routes and within freight districts.	Measurably increase economic value in designated commercial and mixed use centers and corridors.
<b>Scoring Question</b>	Relative to other projects, how much will this project <b>reduce fatalities and serious injuries</b> ?	Relative to other projects, <b>how many people will benefit</b> from improved walk/bike/transit access to essential neighborhood destinations due to this project?	Relative to other projects, how much will this <b>project improve household access to employment and higher education opportunities</b> ?	Relative to other projects, how much will this project <b>improve freight access to traded sector facilities and/or vacant/underutilized industrial lands</b> ?	Relative to other projects, how much will this project <b>improve freight mobility (reliability, travel time, and/or freight-specific capacity) along freight routes and within freight districts</b> ?	Relative to other projects, how much will this project <b>increase economic value</b> beyond current market trajectory?
<b>Scoring</b>  Benefit is relative to other projects, not to the magnitude of the problem.  Ideal distribution of points is approximately:  3 = ~ 30% 2 = ~ 30% 1 = ~ 30% 0 or -1 = ~ 10%	3 = Project with safety component along or crossing a designated High Crash Corridor. 2 = Project with safety component along or crossing a <b>30+ mph, 3+ lane arterial</b> . 1 = Project with safety component along or crossing a <b>2-lane arterial</b> , or a project providing grade separation between vehicles and rail lines. 0 = Project does not have a safety component or is confined to local streets. -1 = Project has a negative impact on safety.  +1 point for safety projects that address high concentrations of fatal and serious injury crashes. Max 3 points.	3 = Project has ped/bike/transit component and is within top quarter of projects in terms of average 2035 household density. 2 = Project has ped/bike/transit component and is within upper middle quarter of projects in terms of average 2035 household density. 1 = Project has ped/bike/transit component and is within lower middle quarter of projects in terms of average 2035 household density. 0 = Project has ped/bike/transit component and is within bottom quarter of projects in terms of average 2035 household density, or project does not have ped/bike/transit component. -1 = Project has negative impact on ped/bike/transit access.	3 = Project is in top quarter of projects in terms of average 2035 job density. 2 = Project is in upper middle quarter of projects in terms of average 2035 job density. 1 = Project is in lower middle quarter of projects in terms of average 2035 job density. 0 = Project is in bottom quarter of projects in terms of average 2035 job density. -1 = Project has negative impact on opportunity access.  +1 point if project is expected to significantly lower average person travel time by improving route directness or addressing transportation bottlenecks. Maximum of 3 points.	3 = Project provides <b>new or substantially improved</b> freight access to traded sector facilities and vacant/underutilized industrial areas. 2 = Project provides <b>new or substantially improved</b> freight access to traded sector facilities or vacant/underutilized industrial areas. 1 = Project provides <b>minor</b> freight access improvements to traded sector facilities and/or vacant/underutilized industrial areas. 0 = Project does not provide improved freight access. -1 = Project has negative impact on freight access.	3 = Project substantially improves freight mobility on a Priority Truck Street or higher freight classification. 2 = Project substantially improves freight mobility on a Major Truck Street or within a Freight District. 1 = Project makes minor improvements for freight mobility on freight routes or within a Freight District. 0 = Project has little or no impact on freight mobility. -1 = Project worsens freight mobility.	3 = Streetscape and/or Frequent Transit project along a corridor where the investment is likely to substantially increase economic value. 2 = Streetscape and/or Frequent Transit project along a Civic Corridor or in a Regional or Town Center 1 = Streetscape and/or Frequent Transit project along a Neighborhood Corridor or in a Neighborhood Center. 0 = Little or no impact on revitalization. -1 = Negative Impact on revitalization.
<b>Supporting Data</b>	High crash corridors, busy streets, crossings maps.	2035 Household density.	2035 Household and Job density. Transportation Network.	Vacant/Underutilized industrial lands map.	Freight Classifications.	Centers and Corridors.

**TSP Project Evaluation Criteria**

December 2, 2014

Page 2

	Health	Equity	Climate	Cost Effectiveness	Community Support or Opposition
<b>Objective</b>	Increase physical activity by making walking and bicycling the most convenient, safe and enjoyable choices for trips less than three miles. (Regional Active Transportation Plan)	Ensure underrepresented and/or underserved populations benefit as much or more and are burdened no more (or are burdened less) than population as a whole.	Decrease per capita VMT 28% from 2008 to 2030. (2009 Climate Action Plan)	Increase benefits relative to capital and operating costs.	Incorporate public support and/or opposition into project evaluation.
<b>Scoring Question</b>	Relative to other projects, how much will this project increase the attractiveness of walking/bicycling by <b>addressing gaps and deficiencies</b> in the pedestrian and bicycle networks and/or improving access to transit?	Relative to other projects, how much will this project <b>improve safety, access (opportunity and neighborhood), and/or health for underserved populations</b> (low-income, people of color, seniors and youth)?	Relative to other projects, how much will this project reduce greenhouse gas emissions by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT)</b>, and/or</li> <li>• <b>Improving vehicle flow</b>?</li> </ul>	What is the <b>ratio of benefit scores to cost scores</b> ?	What is the <b>extent of support or opposition to the project</b> ?
<b>Scoring Guidance</b> Benefit is relative to other projects, not to the magnitude of the problem.  3 = ~ 30% 2 = ~ 30% 1 = ~ 30% 0 or -1 = ~ 10%	3 = Project has ped/bike component and is within top third of projects in terms of transportation gaps and deficiencies surrounding the project. 2 = Project has ped/bike component and is within middle third of projects in terms of transportation gaps and deficiencies surrounding the project. 1 = Project has ped/bike component and is within bottom third of projects in terms of transportation gaps and deficiencies surrounding the project. 0 = Project does not have ped/bike/ component. -1 = Project has negative impact on ped/bike/transit gaps and deficiencies.	3 = Project improves areas with average concentrations of 3 to 4 underserved populations 2 = Project improves areas with average concentrations of 2 to 3 underserved populations 1 = Project improves areas with average concentrations of 1 to 2 underserved populations 0 = Project improves areas with average concentrations of less than 1 underserved population, or project area has little residential population. -1 = Project has a negative local impacts in terms of safety, access, and/or health.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 point if arterial project improves vehicle flow without inducing additional automobile trips.</li> <li>• 1 point for ped/bike/transit projects and programs.</li> <li>• 1 point for substantial frequent service transit access and operational improvements</li> <li>• 1 point for projects that add or substantially improve bicycle facilities along major arterials.</li> <li>• Maximum of 3 points.</li> </ul>	Sum the scores of each of the previous benefit categories.  Create ten cost categories based on natural breaks, resulting in a 10-point range of cost scores.  Divide the benefit scores by the cost scores and divide the results into nine equal bands, with the top band scoring 9, the second band scoring 8, etc.	3 = Broad support from diverse individuals and organizations. 2 = Substantial support and minimum opposition. 1 = More support than opposition, or no comments received 0 = Balance of support and opposition. -1 = More opposition than support.
<b>Supporting Data</b>	Existing gaps and deficiencies.	Equity populations map.	Frequent service transit and major city bikeway network maps.	Benefit score and cost estimates.	Comments received via map app and other means.