



# **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

# Review Last Meeting



- 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):

<b><u>Summary of Evaluation Criteria:</u></b>	<b><u>Weight</u></b>
1. Freight Mobility for the Project Area	35 Maximum
2. Freight Mobility for the Region, State, & Nation	35 Maximum
3. General Mobility	25 Maximum
4. Safety	20 Maximum
5. Freight & Economic Value	15 Maximum
6. Environment	20 Maximum
7. Partnership	25 Maximum
8. Consistency with Regional & State Plans	5 Maximum
9. Cost	10 Maximum
10. Special Issues	<u>8 Maximum</u>
	198 points



# Project Categories (Examples)



## Project Readiness Categories

1. Construction start within 4 years
2. Constructions tart 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



- Present FPPAC process, analysis, preliminary criteria and Draft Report at the Sept. 16 FMSIB workshop (Walla Walla). Potential Board action on Sept. 17.
- 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).