



Albany Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

City of Albany • City of Jefferson • City of Millersburg • City of Tangent • Linn County • Benton County • Oregon Department of Transportation

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda

Date: Thursday, June 17, 2021
Time: 9:00am to 11:00am
Location: Join Zoom Meeting: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87651575084>
 Phone: 1-669-900-6833
 Meeting ID: 876 5157 5084, Passcode: 2020
Contact: Catherine Rohan, Transportation Planner

- | | | | |
|----|-------|--|-----------------------|
| 1) | 9:00 | Call to Order, Agenda Review, and Roll Call | Chair, Gary Stockhoff |
| 2) | 9:05 | Public Comments | Chair |
| 3) | 9:10 | Approval of Meeting Minutes (Attachment A)
May 20, 2021 TAC Meeting | Chair |
| | | <i>ACTION: Approve minutes</i> | |
| 4) | 9:15 | COVID Relief Funding (Handout)
Follow up from last meeting, and update on projects submitted for overall funding. Staff will have a finalized list of projects for review. | Meltzer |
| | | <i>ACTION: Finalize projects for stimulus funding</i> | |
| 5) | 9:45 | Draft MTIP Revision Policy (Attachment B)
Staff have drafted a new Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) revision policy that will include TAC expertise in decision making and further align AAMPO and CAMPO's MTIP revision policies. | Rohan |
| | | <i>ACTION: Discussion of draft MTIP revision policy, approval to forward to Policy Board</i> | |
| 6) | 10:00 | Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Project Prioritization Criteria (Attachment C)
Staff will present revised project prioritization criteria that incorporate feedback received at the May 20 th TAC meeting. | Rohan |
| | | <i>ACTION: Discussion on project prioritization criteria, approval to forward to Policy Board</i> | |
| 7) | 10:40 | Jurisdictional Updates/Other Business | All |
| 8) | 11:00 | Adjournment
Next meeting: July 15 th , 2021 at 9:00am | All |

The meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. Sign language, interpreter services or other accommodations can also be provided by contacting Emma Chavez at least 48 hours prior to the meeting. Emma can be reached at 541-967-8551 (TTY/TTD 711) or echavez@ocwcog.org.

**ALBANY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TAC REMOTE MEETING
Thursday, May 20, 2021
9:00 – 11:00 am**

DRAFT MINUTES

Members:

Chris Bailey
 Chuck Knoll
 Gary Stockhoff
 Georgia Edwards & Joe Samaniego
 James Feldmann
 Janelle Booth
 Walt Perry

Ex-Officio:

Jasmine Harris

Guests:

Greg Jones
 Barry Hoffman
 Daineal Malone

Representing:

Albany
 Linn County
 Benton County
 Tangent
 ODOT
 Millersburg
 Jefferson

FHWA

City of Tangent
 City of Albany
 Linn County

Staff: Catherine Rohan, Nick Meltzer, Steph Nappa, and Emma Chavez

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	DECISION / CONCLUSION
1. Call to Order, Agenda Review, and Roll Call	<p>Joe Samaniego introduced himself as the new City Manager of the City of Tangent. Samaniego is from Alaska where he worked as a local government's specialist.</p> <p>Daineal Malone introduced herself as Civil Engineer for Linn County. Chuck Knoll stated that she will be working on the design of Gold Fish Farm Road.</p>	<p>Meeting called to order at 9:06 am by Chair Gary Stockhoff.</p> <p>There were no changes to the agenda.</p>
2. Public Comment		There were no public comments.

3. Board Approval of April 15, 2021 TAC Meeting Minutes		Consensus to approve the April 15, 2021 TAC meeting minutes as presented.
4. COVID Relief Funding	<p>Staff Nick Meltzer reported that members submitted projects which are over the total amount; meaning that AAMPO could only fund one of the projects. Taking this into consideration; Staff reviewed the projects and have a recommendation on how to fund those. Meltzer moved on to review the memo on AAMPO Stimulus Funding Suggested Projects.</p> <p>Staff is proposing that each project receive half of the funding requested with a requirement of 50% match in order for each jurisdiction to receive funding for at least one project. Meltzer also noted that there have been conversations of splitting funding based on population. With that methodology, small communities would not receive enough funding to do anything substantial and Linn County and Albany would receive more funds.</p> <p>Member Feedback/Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James Feldmann asked which of the projects listed are in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Millersburg; Morningstar Road Sidewalks ○ Albany; US 20/1st Signal ○ Benton County; Gibson Hill Modernization • Chuck Knoll advised that the Linn County ADA Transitions project is a federal requirement. Linn County put together an ADA Transition Plan for all of Linn County, though it mostly pertains to the city limits of Lebanon, Albany, Millersburg, Sweet Home, and Tangent. Linn County identified where ADA improvements were needed. The ADA Transitions project is an opportunity for the County and Albany to work together and take a holistic approach. • Janelle Booth asked if there a timing associated with the funds and when they need to be spent, noting that a timeline may help Millersburg in deciding what projects to submit. Booth also noted that the Linn County ADA Transitions project would also benefit 	Discussion to continue at next meeting.

	<p>the city of Millersburg.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Meltzer advised that based on what was submitted; staff looked for lower-cost and simpler projects that could be achieved with the available funds. He went on to state that if members are welcome to switch projects out based on today's discussion. Additionally, while funds are not restricted; Staff will want to get the funds distributed as soon as possible and no later than the end of June 2022. ● Walt Perry reported that the reason Jefferson is hesitant to submit a request is that the two roads of concern are not city owned; one is a county owned (Marion) and the other is owned by ODOT. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Meltzer advised that Staff recognizes that Jefferson is currently working on updating their TSP and decided to place funds aside for the city for this reason. ● Feldmann stated that some of the project prices may not be accurate and may come out higher. If that is the case, he questioned who would bear the cost of the increase. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Meltzer answered that 10% has been taken off the top of the available funds for reserve and to ensure funding of the STBG projects due to the reduction of state fund exchange. By doing that, AAMPO would be spending all its funds and any overage would need to be covered by the local jurisdictions. ● Knoll asked if there are any regionally projects that members may want to see completed since there is not much funding to go around. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To this, Feldmann stated that he is concerned that the money will be spread too thin and that there will not be enough funds to cover the actual project costs. ○ Joe Samaniego asked if there is a deadline on making a decision on the project selection. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meltzer stated that there is not a hard deadline and the hope is that through TAC discussion and agreement there be a recommendation to 	
--	--	--

	<p>the Policy Board in the next couple of months.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chuck Knoll stated that a possible regional project would be the Albany to Corvallis path at Thurston Lake Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Gary Stockhoff reported that the county submitted for a good portion for the path and were just awarded funds for the southern section of the path. The county is also working with Representative Rayfield for the middle section of the path. Stockhoff then reminded members that since transit projects had received a lot of other monies, they would not be considered under this funding bucket. <p><i>(Chris Bailey joined the meeting and Meltzer provided a quick brief of what had been discussed so far)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chris Bailey noted that the city is going through ARPA funding for the city analysis and she asked if there is a similar deadline for these funds to be expended. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Meltzer responded that there is not a hard deadline. However, COG staff would not want to keep the funds for too long but something can be worked out if a funds need to be placed on hold under certain circumstances. • Feldmann stated that there needs to be a decision on whether the funds will be distributed to all member jurisdictions or if one to two regional projects should be funded. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chair Stockhoff stated that this will depend on whether jurisdictions are able to afford a match for their project/s. • Joe Samaniego questioned if all AAMPO member jurisdictions would benefit from the ADA Transitions project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Knoll stated that combining improvements and coming up with a reasonable project might be ideal. <p>Meltzer stated that this discussion could be a starting place. AAMPO could put funds aside for Jefferson, Linn County could work with Millersburg and Tangent on joint projects, and Albany can look at projects that may be ready to complete. If this approach does not work, AAMPO could discuss a more regional project.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Perry stated that AAMPO could chose to work on an intra-city project. He noted that Jefferson could propose a project that would benefit Millersburg and Jefferson but would be a Linn County road. After discussing, it was noted that the road belongs to ODOT and without it having been on ODOTs radar that may not be a project ready to go.</p> <p>Chair Stockhoff provided an overview of what was discussed and asked members to provide feedback on their follow-up discussions at the next meeting.</p>	
5. MTIP Revision Policy Update	<p>Staff Catherine Rohan reported that a couple of months ago, there were revisions needed for the MTIP and in that process; it came to light that AAMPO and CAMPOs policies are very different. CAMPO utilizes their TAC expertise a lot more when it comes to revisions. Staff believes that the AAMPO MTIP revision process could benefit from including the AAMPO TAC expertise in revision decisions. In additions to that, staff would like to further align the language between the MPOs MTIP/STIP revision policies.</p> <p>Member Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knoll stated that AAMPO and CAMPO have different structures, different people, administrations, and political structure. Additionally, the road departments have a different structure and relationships with their Board of Commissioners and AAMPO's decisions are related to those relationships. Knoll went on to note that this is the first time this topic has come up however, it will be good to take a look at past processes and potential new processes. • Bailey stated that there're the people who are more involved on a day to day technical type of work and there is the Policy Board and Council whom make the final decision. As TAC members it would be helpful to know when there are revisions that need to be made and for the TAC to be able to make recommendations to the Policy Board based on their technical expertise. • Feldmann stated that he supports aligning AAMPOs process 	Discussion to continue at next meeting

	<p>with CAMPOs and he is in favor of the TAC doing more.</p> <p>Rohan advised that members may take more time to read and digest the information provided to them and staff can draft some language for review at the next TAC meeting.</p>	
6. ATS Implementation Strategy	<p>Meltzer reported that the COG has been working on an Albany Transit System (ATS) medium implementation strategy. With the STIF funding; ATS is looking to implement the medium term scenario this Fall. ATS needs more details on where the routes should go and where the stops should be placed.</p> <p>Staff Steph Nappa shared the three route ideas with members. The noted that ATS and COG staff have been developing these ideas with consultant Nelson Nygaard and recently launched the project webpage. A live presentation and a survey are posted.</p> <p>ATS staff Barry Hoffmann thanked Nappa for all her hard work on the project. He encouraged members to watch the live presentation and provide feedback via the survey. He advised that the feedback will help inform the decision making process of the routes.</p> <p>James Feldmann stated that he is excited to for the improvements to come and Chris Bailey stated that it's been a lot of work and she appreciates COG staff for their assistance.</p> <p>Steph asked members to reach out to her with any questions or feedback.</p>	
7. Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Project Prioritization Criteria	<p>Rohan reported that she and Meltzer took a step back from the proposed criteria presented at the last meeting and focused instead on what would be most useful to the member jurisdictions. This resulted in a narrowing of the criteria (removed three and braking out two). An updated list was provided to members in their agenda packets.</p> <p>Rohan walked through a couple of projects' scoring with the new criteria and members provided feedback.</p>	<p>Updated criteria to be shared at the next meeting.</p>

	<p>Member Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excluding employment • Important not to speculatively give points • Enhance the connectedness category (e.g. connected to high category project) • Note on the criteria that schools and transit receive 2 points Define how far out from a transit stop you count as access to transit being improved <p>Chair Stockhoff stated that the criteria is a tool to evaluate projects and a way to advise officials of what process was used to make a recommendations.</p> <p>When asked how equity is defined on the map; Rohan replied that there are three criteria: low income (200% and below), age (over 65 and under 18), and percent minority population.</p>	
<p>8. Jurisdictional Updates/Other Business</p>	<p>OCWCOG – Meltzer asked members if there is interest in an in-person meeting based on the Governor’s announcement last week. Members discussed and shared feedback and agreed that there is a need to wait for more guidance and to see if COVID rates continue to go down while vaccinate rates increase. Members also shared that remote options are helpful and would like them to continue to be an option.</p> <p>City of Albany – Bailey reported that the city has a couple of big street projects that will be built over the summer (e.g. road by library will be rebuilt). Also, the Transit Development Plan (TDP) is currently underway. Albany applied for congressional funding for the Transit Operations Facility, formerly known as the Bus Barn and a sewer project.</p> <p>ATS – Hoffmann reiterated for members to participate on the ATS survey. ATS is excited to get the new service started. They are in need of more drivers so he asked for members to spread the word.</p> <p>City of Jefferson – Perry reported that a bid has been accepted for a project on 5th and it will start moving forward soon. The water plant</p>	

	<p>project took a two month delay.</p> <p>ODOT – No update.</p> <p>City of Tangent – Samaniego reported that the city is working with the county on Tangent Drive and is also looking at sidewalk gaps on Hwy 99.</p> <p>Linn County – Knoll reported that the county is working with COG staff on Gold Fish Farm Road and design should start soon, along with Gold Fish Farm bridge. Letters have been sent out to property owners along the bridge to do the survey work. There is a TIGER Grant project that will be wrapped up by October 1st. Wrapping things up on the recent fires through FEMA funding.</p> <p>City of Millersburg – Booth reported that the Fire Station project is under way and includes a new road. There has been a lot of interest on industrial property in Millersburg.</p>	
9. Adjournment		Meeting adjourned at 10:54 am.

MEMORANDUM

Albany Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

City of Albany • City of Jefferson • City of Millersburg • City of Tangent • Linn County •
Benton County • Oregon Department of Transportation



Date: June 8, 2021
To: AAMPO TAC
From: Catherine Rohan, AAMPO Assistant Transportation Planner
Re: **Update to AAMPO MTIP Revision Policy**

Background

The topic of updating AAMPO's Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) revision policy was discussed at the TAC's May 20th meeting. Inclusion of the topic was prompted by Staff's review of CAMPO's MTIP revision policy, which balances Technical Advisory Committee expertise with efficient and effective decision making.

During the May meeting, the AAMPO TAC was generally in agreement that an updated MTIP revision policy, which incorporates the TAC more in decisions would be beneficial. Most notably, a new revision policy would align the level of decision making with appropriate AAMPO body, with more technical items brought to the TAC and more policy oriented decisions brought to the Policy Board. Following the meeting, Staff agreed to draft an updated MTIP revision policy for review by the TAC at their June meeting. The draft revision policy is below.

Draft AAMPO MTIP Revision Policy

Note that this revision policy, below, pulls heavily from CAMPO's MTIP revision policy, though there are areas which have been edited for clarity and a few new "Type of Change" scenarios have been added. It is also important to note that MTIP revisions will largely necessitate the same level of scrutiny under the draft policy as they do under the current policy, with the major change being added clarification of different scenarios and a sharing in overall decision making between the TAC and Policy Board.

Purpose and Background

The purpose of this document is to describe the process by which revisions to projects programmed in the Albany Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (AAMPO) Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) and the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) take place.

While the text in the AAMPO MTIP changes very little during the life of the document, the projects programmed within the MTIP are regularly amended, revised, split, canceled, etc. These projects include infrastructure construction projects, capital purchases, plan development, engineering activities, outreach programs, and others. Incorporating revisions into the MTIP and the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is essential to project delivery and must be completed before revising intergovernmental agreements (IGAs) and executing fund transfers.

Project revisions must be approved by the MPO before they can be incorporated into the MTIP and the STIP. The MTIP is maintained by AAMPO and cross-referenced to match the STIP, which is maintained by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT). ODOT, FTA, and FHWA have a separate policy agreement on how STIP revisions take place.

Types of Revisions

There are three types of MTIP revisions processed by the MPO: **full amendments, administrative amendments and adjustments**. Full amendments require the greatest level of scrutiny including communicating basic project information to the Policy Board and the provision of a public comment period. Administrative amendments are largely handled by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). Adjustments are small changes that AAMPO staff has the authority to approve, the TAC is informed of adjustments as appropriate. A full description of the procedures associated with the three types of MTIP revisions is included later in this document.

The table below lists a number of potential MTIP actions and illustrates whether they require a full amendment, administrative amendment, or an adjustment.

Type of Change	Full Amendment	Administrative Amendment	Adjustment
If a project is NOT in the MTIP			
1. Planning Grant or Project (i.e. non-construction) less than \$100,000			X
2. Planning Grant or Project (i.e. non-construction) more than \$100,000		X	
3. Adding a project with previously identified funding		X	
4. Adding a federally funded project to the MTIP	X		
If a project is ALREADY in the MTIP			
5. Cancelling a federally funded and regionally significant project	X		
6. Advancing or delaying a project by one year, or a cost changes of less than 10% involving MTIP dollars			X
7. Advancing or delaying a project by two years or more, or cost changes between 10% and 20% involving MTIP dollars		X	
8. Cost changes of more than 20% involving MTIP dollars	X		
9. Scope changes including physical extension or shortening of a project	X		
10. Combining of two projects into one, or separating of one project into two		X	
11. Moving more than \$100,000 between phases of the same project (e.g. moving funds from UR to RW) where there is no change to total project funding amount		X	
12. Moving less than \$100,000 between phases of the same project (e.g. moving funds from UR to RW) where there is no change to total project funding amount			X
13. Advancing or slipping an approved project/phase outside its current MTIP			X

14. Minor corrections such as making the MTIP consistent with naming conventions and project descriptions, planning project dollar adjustments, updating of placeholder fund amounts, fixing typographical errors or missing data, etc.			X
15. Other scenarios	X	X	

Full Amendment

Full amendments involve a major change to a project and require the greatest level of scrutiny. Full amendments are first reviewed by the TAC. Typically, review takes place during a public meeting, however TAC review can also take place via email, telephone, or other virtual meeting platform if the project is on a critical schedule. The TAC makes a recommendation to the Policy Board regarding approval of the amendment and also determines what level public outreach is necessary beyond placing the amendment on the next Policy Board agenda.

All AAMPO Policy Board meetings are advertised via AAMPO's website and an interested parties email list a week in advance of the meeting, with the invitation for members of the public to attend and provide comment. Additional outreach beyond inclusion in the agenda may include a public comment period (typically two weeks), the holding of a public meeting for the specific amendment, and any other actions deemed advisable by the TAC. After the TAC has made their recommendation and the outreach has been completed, the amendment is brought to the Policy Board for approval.

Administrative Amendment

Administrative amendments are less significant changes than full amendments, but still require a level of scrutiny. Project changes have a smaller impact to the region or AAMPO member communities and are usually familiar to local staff members. Administrative amendments are brought to the TAC for discussion and approval. Following a decision, the Policy Board will be notified at their next regularly scheduled meeting. All AAMPO TAC meetings are advertised via AAMPO's website and an interested parties email list a week in advance of the meeting, with the invitation for members of the public to attend and provide comment. If the project is on a critical schedule, TAC approval can be given via email, telephone, or other virtual meeting platform.

Adjustment

Adjustments are the most minor of the revision types. Staff approves minor adjustments on behalf of the MPO, and informs the TAC as appropriate. It is expected that with a planning project, both the TAC and Policy Board have been made aware of the grant proposal prior to submission and have had an opportunity to comment; therefore the project has preliminarily been approved.

The primary goal of incorporating staff level adjustments into the MTIP process is to minimize delays and improve approval turn-around times. Adjustments help ensure minor project changes move forward more quickly than otherwise possible.

Other Scenarios

When a project change can reasonably be classified under two revision types, the revision type with a higher level of scrutiny will take precedent. When a project change can reasonably be classified under two "Type of Change" categories, the category that most directly addresses the project change will take precedent.

Summary

Currently, the AAMPO TAC is not involved in MTIP revisions of any kind. The draft MTIP revision policy incorporates the TAC into the MTIP revision process for both full amendments (TAC recommendation to the Policy Board regarding approval and TAC decision on level of outreach) and administrative amendments (requires TAC approval). An abbreviated list of additional changes associated with the draft policy is listed below.

- Additional TAC discretion and input
- Added flexibility regarding public outreach
- Added flexibility regarding projects on critical schedules
- More scenario specific guidance
- Alignment with CAMPO's MTIP revision policy
- Removal of language related to road capacity: *"Adding or deleting any project that significantly affects roadway capacity, vehicle volumes or travel speeds, such as construction of a new regionally significant roadway or new interchange or the widening of a regionally significant roadway that will significantly affect roadway capacity, vehicle volumes, or travel speeds."* and *"Actions related to adding, deleting, or modifying projects that do not significantly affect existing roadway capacity, vehicle volumes, or travel speeds, including but not limited to...."*

Next Steps

Staff are requesting TAC approval to forward the draft MTIP revision policy to the Policy Board.

AAMPO's Current MTIP Revision Policy

As found on pages three through four of AAMPO's 2021-2024 MTIP found [HERE](#)

A TIP revision is a change that is made between full updates of the TIP. There are several types of TIP revisions, some of which require a 30-day public comment period and some of which are technical corrections completed by staff. All TIP revisions should be submitted to MPO staff to determine the appropriate revision procedure.

TIP Amendments: *An amendment involves a major change to a project in the TIP and requires a 30-day public comment period and approval by the MPO Policy Board at a public meeting. The following changes qualify as Amendments:*

- *Changes in the total project cost exceeding either \$100,000 or 20% of the total project cost (whichever is greater)*
- *Adding or cancelling a project funded with AAMPO STP/ STBGP funds*
- *Adding or deleting any project that significantly affects roadway capacity, vehicle volumes or travel speeds, such as construction of a new regionally significant roadway or new interchange or the widening of a regionally significant roadway that will significantly affect roadway capacity, vehicle volumes, or travel speeds*
- *Major changes in project schedule or scope, including addition of a construction phase*

TIP Adjustments: *A TIP Adjustment is a less significant change to the TIP. Adjustments still require approval by the MPO Policy Board at a public meeting but do not require a 30-day public comment period. The following changes qualify as Amendments:*

- *Changes in the total project cost exceeding either \$50,000 or 10% of the total project cost (whichever is greater)*
- *Adjustments to previously approved MPO STP/STBGP funded projects that transfers more than \$100,000 of STP/STBGP funds between different phases of a project*
- *Actions related to adding, deleting, or modifying projects that do not significantly affect existing roadway capacity, vehicle volumes, or travel speeds, including but not limited to:*
 - *safety improvements*
 - *same site bridge replacements not requiring significant additional right-of-way*
 - *signal interconnection, installation or removal*
 - *resurfacing or rehabilitation projects not requiring significant additional right-of-way*
 - *bike lanes*
 - *bus purchases, bus shelters, or bus stop improvements*
 - *projects implementing ADA or ADA paratransit requirements*
 - *MPO planning support*

Administrative Modifications: *Administrative modifications involve minor changes to the TIP and do not require a 30-day public comment period nor approval by the Policy Board at a public meeting. Administrative modifications are processed by MPO staff in cooperation with project sponsor and ODOT and are brought to the Policy Board as informational items. The following are examples of items that may be processed as administrative modifications:*

- *Changes in the total project cost that are less than either \$50,000 or 10% of the total project cost (whichever is greater)*
- *Moving less than \$100,000 in MPO STP/STBGP funds from one project phase to another previously approved phase within the same project where there is no change to total project STP/STBGP funding amount*
- *Minor changes in project or phase initiation dates*
- *Adding or deleting a phase other than construction*
- *Minor changes in funding sources for previously included projects*
- *Splitting or combining individually listed projects, provided that these changes do not create major changes to overall cost, schedule, or scope*

Attachment B

- *Minor corrections to make the TIP consistent with naming conventions and project descriptions*
- *Minor corrections to fix typographical errors or missing data*
- *Adding an emergency repair and relief project that does not involve substantial change in function and location*

MEMORANDUM

Albany Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

City of Albany • City of Jefferson • City of Millersburg • City of Tangent • Linn County •
Benton County • Oregon Department of Transportation



Date: June 2, 2021
To: AAMPO TAC
From: Catherine Rohan, AAMPO Assistant Transportation Planner
Re: **Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Project Prioritization Criteria**

Background

Staff presented a revised draft of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan project prioritization criteria to the TAC at their May 20th meeting. The revised draft scaled back the original project prioritization criteria and expanded the key destinations criterion, breaking out schools and transit stops. Staff then walked through two project examples, one in Jefferson and one in Albany, demonstrating how the prioritization criteria would be applied. The demonstration helped highlight how the project prioritization criteria can assist jurisdictions when they are deciding which projects to implement.

During the meeting, staff received feedback on the Connectedness criterion. Feedback included the need to recognize off-street path projects and projects that are part of an important travel route. Both items have been incorporated into the project prioritization criteria, shown below.

Proposed Criteria

The original and revised Connectedness criterion are listed below. In the revised criterion, an “important route” is a route that connects large portions of a city or cities to one another. These routes are typically along collector or arterial streets and form the “backbone” of the pedestrian and bicycle network.

Original: Connectedness – Does the project fill an identified gap in the existing pedestrian or bicycle network?

Revised: Connectedness – Does the project fill an identified gap in the existing pedestrian or bicycle network? Can be accomplished by infilling the existing route or by providing a comparable, alternative route. If the project is part of an important route an additional point is awarded.

#	Criteria	Response	Goal Alignment
1	Safety – Is the project located along a segment or intersection at which a crash was reported in the last five years? OR Does the project provide a comparable, alternative route that avoids a crash location?	Yes/No	1
2	Connectedness – Does the project fill an identified gap in the existing pedestrian or bicycle network? Can be accomplished by infilling the existing route or by providing a comparable, alternative route. If the project is part of an important route an additional point is awarded.	Yes/No	2, 3, 5
3	Key destinations (community destinations) – Does the project provide access to a community destination?*	Yes/No	2, 3
4	Key destinations (schools) – Does the project provide access to a school?***	Yes/No	2, 3

5	Key destinations (transit) – Does the project provide access to a transit stop?*	Yes/No	2, 3
6	Equity – Is the project located within or directly adjacent to an underserved census block group as identified by the composite equity index map (4 th quartile)?	Yes/No	4
7	Adoption & Implementation – Is the project identified in a local Transportation System Plan?	Yes/No	7
8	Public priority – Has the project received significant comments from the public?	Yes/No	N/A

* Community destinations include but are not limited to libraries, hospitals, grocery stores, parks and recreation centers, government and community services, and points of interest.

**Projects that provide access to transit stops and schools receive two points under this criterion.

Request

Staff is looking for TAC agreement on the project prioritization criteria so that criteria can be taken to the Policy Board.

AAMPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Goals (reference)

- Goal 1: *Create a network that is safe, comfortable, and intuitive for all users*
- Goal 2: *Create a network that connects Jefferson, Millersburg, Albany, and Tangent*
- Goal 3: *Create a network that is locally connected and provides access to key destinations*
- Goal 4: *Create a network that prioritizes equity*
- Goal 5: *Create a network that builds on existing infrastructure and is expandable in the future*
- Goal 6: *Support economic development by including recommendations that encourage walking and biking to businesses*
- Goal 7: *Support plan adoption and local implementation through feasible infrastructure, policy, and programing recommendations*