FMSIB Freight Policy and Project Advisory Committee (FPPAC)

Meeting #10
Sept. 7, 2021

Mayor Ben Wick, FPPAC Chair
Brian J. Ziegler, FMSIB Director
Agenda

• Review Discussion at the last meeting (August 26)
• Eligibility and Prioritization Criteria (Plan A and Plan B)
• Discuss expectations of stakeholders
• Review “Draft Report”
• FPPAC Workplan (Present to FMSIB Workshop Sept. 16)
• Next Steps
• Reviewed the criteria Washington State has used in the recent past (WSDOT and FMSIB) to determine:
  – Project Eligibility
  – Project Priority
• Goal was to identify previously used Eligibility and Prioritization criteria that FPPAC would like to consider using to develop the 2022 list.
• Four examples of Eligibility and Prioritization criteria approaches were presented:
  – FMSIB Call for Projects
  – FMSIB/WSDOT 2016
  – WSDOT Validation Stage 1
  – WSDOT Validation Stage 2
• Discussed “Level of Effort” for each of the four examples.
Review Last Meeting (con’t.)

- “One criteria could be too broad unless we add a “project readiness” constraint.”
- “Examples could include “On the FGTS system,” but also freight impact, speed to market, dollar amount.”
- “Set a threshold screen.”
- “We don’t want “pie in the sky” applications.”
- “The Plan A matrix looks nice, but what’s our Plan B?”
- “I like the Plan A/B approach, give them equal weight. High end: More expansive eligibility and detailed prioritization criteria. Low end: More restrictive eligibility requirements.”
- “The proviso language gives flexibility to meeting it (i.e., Ready to go, geographic balance, etc.).”
Eligibility and Prioritization Criteria (Plan A and Plan B)

• Eligibility Criteria
  – Expansive: High quantity of responses.
  – Restrictive: Low quantity of responses.

• Prioritization Criteria
  – Qualitative criteria: Lower cost to apply and score.
  – Quantitative criteria: Higher cost to apply and score.
  – Hybrid is most common approach.

• Could FMSIB’s existing Threshold and Ranking criteria be modified to develop both Plans?

• Before selecting a Plan, we should find out what the affected stakeholders think.
Discuss Expectations of Stakeholders

• “Friends of Freight” (FMSIB, TIB, CRAB + AWC, WSAC, WPPA)
  – Provide opportunity for low volume connections
  – Commit to making future revisions to whatever criteria because it won’t be perfect the first time.

• Kelly McGourty (PSRC Transportation Director and Current Chair of the MPO/RTPO Coordinating Committee)
  – Strongly supports creation of a freight project list. If done well, it will help guide state and regional plans for years.
  – Likes the idea of expansive eligibility criteria but also project categories (see next slide).
  – Supports use of “hybrid” approach to project prioritization, using both quantitative and qualitative criteria, since that’s how most of PSRC’s processes work.
Quantitative and Qualitative Criteria

- FMSIB **Threshold** criteria based on RW 47.06A.020(4):
  - On a Strategic Freight Corridor (FGTS T1/2)
  - Removes a bottleneck for freight
  - Increases capacity for freight
  - Mitigates impacts of freight
  - B/C greater than 1.0
Quantitative and Qualitative Criteria

- **FMSIB Prioritization** criteria (based on “ranking” requirement in RCW 47.06A.020(5). FMSIB created 198-point scale, 17-page application):

### Summary of Evaluation Criteria: Weight

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Freight Mobility for the Project Area</td>
<td>35 Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Freight Mobility for the Region, State, &amp; Nation</td>
<td>35 Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>General Mobility</td>
<td>25 Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>20 Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Freight &amp; Economic Value</td>
<td>15 Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>20 Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>25 Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Consistency with Regional &amp; State Plans</td>
<td>5 Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>10 Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Special Issues</td>
<td>8 Maximum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>198 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Categories (Examples)

**Project Readiness Categories**
1. Construction start within 4 years
2. Constructions start within 2 years
3. Construction start immediately

**Project Cost Categories**
1. Under $1 million
2. $1 million to $10 million
3. $10 million to $100 million
4. $100 million to $1 billion
5. Over $1 billion

**Modal Categories**
1. Roadway
2. Rail
3. Waterway
4. Multimodal (At least 25% in each of two modes)

**Project Type Categories (At least 75% of cost in a particular category)**
1. Pavement Preservation
2. Bridge Preservation
3. Safety
4. Mobility
5. New Route

**Freight Usage Categories**
1. On the FGTS
2. On FGTS T1/T2
3. Connector to T1/T2
4. Other (High value freight or freight data not available)
Review of “Draft Report”

Switch to Word document
Review items highlighted in yellow.
FPPAC Work Plan - 2021


• Incorporate Board input and prepare Final Report for presentation to the Board’s Nov. 19 meeting in Tacoma (Fabulich Center).

• May be an FPPAC meeting between Sept. 17 and Nov. 19.
Next Steps

• Staff revisions to preliminary Criteria and Categories
  – FMSIB Threshold and Ranking criteria
  – Project Categories
• Staff revisions to the “Draft Report.”
• Present above work products to Sept. 16 FMSIB Workshop (Packet to be mailed Sept. 8).