

# Modifications to Major New Project Scoring based on Public Comment

December 4, 2008

## Benefit/Cost Analysis (pp 3 – 4)

- Will write a discussion of the highway and transit B/C analysis models so that customers know how the factors are measured.
- Currently the statewide travel demand forecasting model does not monetize the air quality benefits or economic development benefits of the projects being analyzed. These benefits will be added to the analysis.

## Peak Hour Transit and Intercity Rail Ridership (p 6)

- Reduced the top end of the scale from 3,300 to 2,500

| Previous            |        | Revised             |        |
|---------------------|--------|---------------------|--------|
| Peak Hour Ridership |        | Peak Hour Ridership |        |
| Ridership           | Points | Ridership           | Points |
| 240 – 579           | 2      | < 475               | 0      |
| 580 – 919           | 4      | 476 - 700           | 2      |
| 920 – 1259          | 6      | 701 - 925           | 4      |
| 1260 - 1599         | 8      | 926 - 1150          | 6      |
| 1600 – 1939         | 10     | 1151 - 1375         | 8      |
| 1940 – 2279         | 12     | 1376 - 1600         | 10     |
| 2280 – 2619         | 14     | 1601 - 1825         | 12     |
| 2620 – 2959         | 16     | 1826 - 2050         | 14     |
| 2960 – 3299         | 18     | 2051 – 2275         | 16     |
| 3300 +              | 20     | 2276 – 2500         | 18     |
|                     |        | 2501 +              | 20     |

## Adopting Appropriate Land Use Measures (p 9 - 10)

- Increased weight from 5 to 8 points
- Added points for the project being included in the MPO long range transportation plan
- Created a scale of scoring factors worth two points each

**Positioning Land for Redevelopment (p 10)**

- Increased weight from 5 to 7 points
- Slightly revised scale to reflect recent land use analysis of TRAC projects

**Previous**

| <b>Positioning Land for Redevelopment</b>                                |               |
|--|---------------|
| <b>Percentage of “Developed” Land Served by the Project <sup>1</sup></b> | <b>Points</b> |
| Less than 50%  | 0             |
| 51 – 60%   | 1             |
| 61 – 70%   | 2             |
| 71 – 80%   | 3             |
| 81 – 90%   | 4             |
| 91%+   | 5             |
| <sup>1</sup> Geographic area as defined by project applicant             |               |

**Revised**

| <b>Positioning Land for Redevelopment</b>  |               |
|--|---------------|
| <b>Percentage of “Developed” Land Served by the Project <sup>1</sup></b>                                     | <b>Points</b> |
| Less than 54%  | 0             |
| 55 – 60  | 1             |
| 61 – 65  | 2             |
| 66 – 70  | 3             |
| 71 – 75  | 4             |
| 76 – 80  | 5             |
| 81 – 85  | 6             |
| 86% +  | 7             |
| <sup>1</sup> Geographic area as defined by project applicant, or as default, within one mile of the project. |               |

**Considering Factors of Economic Distress (p 12)**

- County-level unit of analysis is the default for scoring these factors. Revision allows project sponsors to propose a more-local level of analysis, at the TRAC’s discretion.

**Local and Private Project Investment Factors (pp 13 – 14)**

- Changed title to “Project Sponsor Investment Factors.”
- Reduced points from 20 to 15
- Reduced the maximum percentage of local investment from 40% to 20%
- Provided 5 points for project sponsors that create a TIF or other value capture mechanism to contribute to the project construction cost.
- Clarified that congressional earmarks which do not represent a decrease in funding available to ODOT, will be scored as local investment in the project.

**Previous**

| <b>Maximizing Public Investment</b>               |        |
|---|--------|
| Local investment as percent of total project cost | Points |
| 1 - 10%   | 4      |
| 11% - 20%   | 8      |
| 21% - 30%   | 12     |
| 31% - 40%   | 16     |
| 41% and greater                                   | 20     |

**Revised**

| <b>Maximizing Public Investment</b>   |               |
|---|---------------|
| <b>Factor</b>   | <b>Points</b> |
| Creation of TIF district or other value capture tool with revenue dedicated to the project’s finance. | 5             |
| Local investment as percent of total project cost   |               |
| 5 – 9.9%  | 5             |
| 10 – 19.9%  | 10            |
| 20% and greater   | 15            |
| Points are cumulative but cannot exceed 15 points total.  |               |