



AGENDA

Phone: 541-682-5481
www.eugene-or.gov/pc

Meeting Location:
Sloat Room—Atrium Building
99 W. 10th Avenue
Eugene, OR 97401

The Eugene Planning Commission welcomes your interest in these agenda items. Feel free to come and go as you please at any of the meetings. This meeting location is wheelchair-accessible. For the hearing impaired, FM assistive-listening devices are available or an interpreter can be provided with 48 hours notice prior to the meeting. Spanish-language interpretation will also be provided with 48 hours notice. To arrange for these services, contact the Planning Division at 541-682-5675.

MONDAY, JANUARY 28, 2013 – REGULAR MEETING (11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.)

11:30 a.m. I. PUBLIC COMMENT

The Planning Commission reserves 10 minutes at the beginning of this meeting for public comment. The public may comment on any matter, **except for items scheduled for public hearing or public hearing items for which the record has already closed.** Generally, the time limit for public comment is three minutes; however, the Planning Commission reserves the option to reduce the time allowed each speaker based on the number of people requesting to speak.

11:40 a.m. II. ENVISION EUGENE UPDATES: INVESTMENT STRATEGIES

Staff: Robin Hostick, 541-682-5507

12:30 p.m. III. TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN UPDATE

Staff: Kurt Yeiter, 541-682-8379

1:15 p.m. IV. ITEMS FROM COMMISSION AND STAFF

- A. Other Items from Staff
- B. Other Items from Commission:
- C. Learning: How are we doing?

Commissioners: Steven Baker; Jonathan Belcher; Rick Duncan; Randy Hledik, Chair; John Jaworski; Jeffery Mills; William Randall, Vice Chair

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Meeting Date: January 28, 2013

To: Eugene Planning Commission

From: Kurt Yeiter, Senior Transportation Planner, Public Works Engineering

Subject: Eugene Transportation System Plan Update

ACTION REQUESTED: This memorandum provides a status report on the Eugene Transportation System Plan update. The last Planning Commission update on this project was on May 7, 2012. No action is requested at this meeting.

BACKGROUND: The Eugene Transportation System Plan (“TSP”) is being updated to replace *TransPlan* as Eugene’s local comprehensive transportation strategy. The Transportation System Plan will support the Envision Eugene vision for future growth and mobility over the next 20 years or more. The plan will provide goals and policies to direct future changes to our transportation system and a list of projects and programs needed to implement these changes. The Transportation System Plan addresses all modes of travel, so it must weave together direction from the Airport Master Plan, Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan, Lane Transit District’s long range transit plan (not yet completed), and other plans. Principal funding for the city’s Transportation System Plan update is provided by the Oregon Department of Transportation.

Work on the Transportation System Plan has been informed by a community dialogue through the Transportation Community Resource Group (TCRG), which invites participation from all original members of the Envision Eugene Community Resource Group (CRG), the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan project advisory committee (PAC), the city’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), a multi-agency Technical Advisory Committee, and others.

At the suggestion of the TCRG, “triple-bottom line” metrics were integrated into the decision-making process using the Sustainable Transportation Analysis and Rating System (STARS), developed in Portland, as a template. With this approach, the resultant transportation system can optimize its effects on environmental, societal, and economic conditions.

All research, reports, meeting materials, feedback, and a new project video are available on the project website: www.EugeneTSP.org.

In addition to the Eugene Transportation System Plan there will continue to be two additional *regional* transportation plans required by state and federal regulations: the Regional Transportation System Plan (RTSP) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), respectively. Preparation of the regional plans occurs through separate, but coordinated, processes managed and funded by other parties.

WHERE ARE WE NOW?

The work program (and funding) is divided into two distinct stages. The following key tasks and products were completed during **Phase 1**, which is now coming to an end:

- Creation of a community involvement process, including an interactive, multi-agency transportation planning website.
- Establishment and meetings of the Transportation Community Resource Group. This group discussed land use regulations, Envision Eugene, bicycle and pedestrian planning, transit planning, transportation options and demand management techniques, street design, the Sustainable Transportation Analysis and Rating System, LCOG's regional traffic model and areas of projected congestion, statewide efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, reduced state and federal funding, and the products listed below.
- An Existing Conditions Report and updated traffic measurements at 50 intersections.
- A regional traffic model updated to better reflect the development potential recommended by Envision Eugene's technical resource group.
- Draft goals and objectives.
- A list of potential transportation projects and programs worthy of further consideration.
- Evaluation criteria and research to establish the best methods of measuring the criteria parameters.
- Outreach to the Sustainability Commission, Housing Policy Board, and Human Services Network.
- Coordination with the Lane Livability Consortium and other regional planning efforts.

WHERE ARE WE GOING?

Phase 2, which should be funded by March 2013, will entail an evaluation of all the potential projects, winnowing projects that do not meet community objectives, and project prioritization. Through an iterative process, the goals, objectives, and policies will be refined to better reflect community needs as indicated by the prioritized projects. The regional traffic model will be updated in April to incorporate Envision Eugene's preferred growth scenario. The Transportation System Plan will be packaged for adoption and integrated with Envision Eugene and other plans – in the end, the Transportation System Plan will function as the transportation element of the Envision Eugene comprehensive plan. The second phase of the transportation plan, including the adoption process, may take 18 months.

The public involvement strategy emerging for Phase 2 includes continued, but strategic use of the large TCRG advisory forum, increased use of smaller focus groups and contacts with individual community organizations and neighborhood groups, and increased use of the website's interactive capabilities. Staff will work with the Planning Commission throughout the process, but especially on procedural matters as the adoption process draws near.

The following issues will likely be fundamental to successful completion of the Transportation System Plan:

- Adjusting expectations to the predictions that there will be much less funding available for transportation projects in the future.
- Making sure that the final list of transportation projects and programs truly reflect community needs.
- Integrating the Transportation System Plan with other local and regional plans so that together they tell a clear and cohesive narrative.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: None, for discussion purposes only.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Staff Contact: Kurt Yeiter, Senior Transportation Planner
Telephone: (541) 682-8379
Staff E-Mail: Kurt.M.Yeiter@ci.eugene.or.us
Project Web Site: www.EugeneTSP.org

ATTACHMENTS:

- A. What We Are Hearing
- B. Draft Frequent Transit Network Policy
- C. Draft goals, objectives, and evaluation criteria (including TCRG comments)

REFERENCES:

- 1. Project lists (figures):
http://www.centallanertsp.org/sites/default/files/EugeneTSP_ScreeningResults_Figures_0.pdf
- 2. Memorandum re Evaluation Framework:
http://www.centallanertsp.org/sites/default/files/EugeneTSP_EvaluationFramework_0.pdf
- 3. Memorandum re Long List of Potential Project and Program Ideas:
http://www.centallanertsp.org/sites/default/files/EugeneTSP_PotentialProjectIdeas_0.pdf

What We Are Hearing. For more than a year, the Transportation Community Resource Group studied Envision Eugene, the Climate and Energy Action Plan, the Oregon Sustainable Transportation Initiative (OSTI) and greenhouse gas reduction strategies, transit planning, the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan, projected state and federal funding, and street design. One workshop used the Sustainable Transportation Analysis and Rating System (STARS) to help shape the Transportation System Plan in a “triple bottom line” framework. While we cannot say that every member of the TCRG agrees on every point, the following themes seem to be emerging to guide the Transportation System Plan:

- The Metro Plan, *TransPlan*, and Eugene’s Growth Management Policies provide a good foundation for the future, but the Transportation System Plan should be updated to explicitly address climate change, energy uncertainty, and sustainability.
- True sustainability is very difficult to achieve, but sensible steps towards this goal should be taken soon. The Transportation System Plan should do its best to meet the goals set forth in the local Climate and Energy Action Plan and Oregon Sustainable Transportation Initiative.
- Increases in fuel prices create increased demand for alternatives to travel in single-occupant automobiles, such as for public transit, safe and convenient bike facilities, and housing located nearer stores and employment. Demand for these services will increase in the future.
- Money not spent on transportation is money spent locally and is good for the local economy.
- There will be significantly less state and federal money available in the future for transportation projects. ODOT will focus its spending on maintaining and preserving the highway system.
- Transit funding fluctuates: When revenues go down, demand for transit goes up. Local transit service needs a more stable funding source.
- Envision Eugene’s “Key Transit Corridors” are among our most vibrant and congested commercial areas.
- Successful transit depends on the character of the built environment (e.g., density, connectivity, mix of uses, design, and amenities).
- Our streets are not wide enough to accommodate all travel modes all the time, for everyone. We must find the right balance on how to use the space within limited rights-of-way.
- Freight movement is important.
- Equity and access matter.
- Congestion is probably unavoidable, and we should reconsider our tolerance for more congestion.
- Our transportation future may be very different and harder to predict because of new

technologies and trends.

- Resiliency to rapid changes and the effects of climate change is very important.

Public Transit is a regional service that is critical to local transportation needs. In a parallel process to the development of Eugene and Springfield's Transportation System Plans, a Regional Transportation System Plan and a Long Range Transit Plan are also being developed by the Lane Council of Governments (acting as the Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization) and Lane Transit District, respectively. Through these coordinated efforts a new policy describing the need for a "Frequent Transit Network" is evolving. A draft policy, presented below, is being considered as a refinement of *TransPlan's* Bus Rapid Transit policy. This proposed policy more clearly defines the desired services to be provided, is less reliant on the design of the infrastructure, and allows more flexibility in implementation over time. The intention is that this or a similar policy can be adopted for all the appropriate local plans.

Public Transportation System

Development of a Frequent Transit Network (FTN) for the Central Lane Metropolitan Area is an important strategy towards meeting regional transportation goals. Policies relating to the FTN and a map depicting locations of the FTN are provided below. Implementation of the FTN is discussed in the Lane Transit District Strategic Plan.

Policy 1: Implement a network of higher capacity frequent transit corridors serving existing and proposed high-density land uses throughout the Eugene/Springfield metropolitan region that provide viable alternatives to vehicle trips .

Definition and intent:

The frequent transit corridors shall be referred to as the "Frequent Transit Network (FTN)." The FTN network represents the highest orders of transit service within the region. The FTN represents corridors where transit service would be provided, but does not presume specific street alignments. Street alignments will be determined in future studies. FTN stops will be located closest to the highest density development within the corridor.

FTN Corridors will have the following characteristics:

- *Enables a well-connected network that provides regional circulation*
- *Compatible with and supportive of adjacent urban design goals*
- *Operates seven days a week in select corridors*
- *Service hours are appropriate for the economic and social context of the area served*
- *Coverage consists of at least 16 hours a day and area riders trip origins or destinations are within ¼ of a mile-straight line distance*
- *Frequency is at least every 10-15 minutes in peak travel times*
- *Speed is no less than 40 percent of the roadway speed limit*
- *Coverage throughout the region is geographically equitable and serves Title VI protected populations*
- *Transit service is reliable and runs on schedule*
- *Transit vehicles are branded*

- *Transit stations are of high quality with amenities, including bicycle and pedestrian connections to stations and end-of-trip facilities, such as bike parking. Park and rides are provided at key termini.*

Policy 2: Enable transit-supportive land uses to develop along designated FTN corridors by removing institutional barriers.

Definition and intent:

The cities of Eugene and Springfield will encourage transit-supportive land uses within one-quarter mile of FTN corridors. Institutional barriers refer to zoning or other development regulations that currently prevent construction of high density residential, commercial, or other development that would be likely to produce high levels of transit ridership.

Policy 3: Encourage transit-supportive development along FTN corridors through public private partnerships or other approaches.

Definition and intent:

Funding for transit-supportive development can be obtained in several ways. Agencies throughout the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan region commit to exploring traditional and alternative financing structures for transit-supportive development.

[Source: Working draft “Regional Transportation System Plan” prepared for the Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization by CH2M Hill, January 2013]

**TRANSPORTATION COMMUNITY RESOURCE GROUP (TCRG)
MEETING #8**

FUTURE NO-BUILD, SCREENING AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

Monday, October 8, 2012 / 11:00 a.m. - 1:30 p.m.

Meeting Participants

Alisa Hansen	Paul Moore
Ann Vaughn	Paul Thompson
Barb Bellamy	Philip Farrington
Bill Randall	Randy Parker
Carlos Barrera	Rob Zako
Chris Henry	Ron Kilcoyne
Christian Watchie	Sasha Lufig
Colin McArthur	Savannah Crawford
Debbie Jeffries	Scott Gillespie
Ed McMahan	Shane McRhodes
Ed Necker	Susan Payne
Faye Forhan	Sue Wolling
Jack Roberts	Susan Ban
Jennifer John	Terry Cole
Jessica Bloomfield	Tom Larsen
Jon Belcher	Will Mueller
Judi Horstmann	
Kurt Yeiter	<u>Consultant Team</u>
Laura Potter	Theresa Carr
Lydia McKinney	Kristin Hull
Mark Rust	Julia Kuhn
Nancy Ellen Locke	
Natalie Stiffler	
Paul Conte	

The meeting purpose:

The purpose of this meeting was to review the screened list of projects, learn about future transportation conditions and review the proposed evaluation criteria.

The summary is organized by agenda topic, and focuses on the conversation aspect of this meeting and **does not provide a summary of meeting presentations**. All materials from this meeting as well as other resource documents for the TSP and presentations delivered for this meeting are located on the website at www.eugenetsp.org.

Welcome, introductions, and review of agenda (Hull)

Kristin Hull welcomed the group and led them in a round of introductions. She then reviewed the agenda.

Project Update (Yeiter)

Kurt Yeiter reviewed work that had been done since the last TCRG meeting and asked Alissa Hansen to review the progress on Envision Eugene.

Future no-build (Kuhn)

Julia reviewed the future no build model results at a corridor level. The TCRG asked the following questions and made the following comments:

- Are variables for technology changes that affect demand (e.g. skype) included?
 - Some factors are included in the no build in the way that they shape behavior.
- Does the no build include improvements to Beltline?
 - The no build does not include the recommendations in the facility plan. It only includes projects that are funded for construction.
- The model allows interplay between supply and demand; it does not only look at demand on the roadways without evaluating the supply.
- The model seems to do as well as it can, but it cannot completely predict behavior as people are not robots.
- More pedestrians and bikes are using the trail which pushes cyclists onto River Road.
- How does the model differentiate between different types of intersection control?
 - The no build assumes existing intersection control. The build will look at changes.
- Does the intersection level of service look at pedestrians and bicycles or just at vehicles?
 - The intersection levels of service on the maps are for vehicles.
- Does the no-build include the West Eugene EmX?
 - No. The no-build only includes projects that are funded for construction.
- Model shows people revising choices, but still shows where people prefer a congested route to detouring.

Project screening (Carr)

Theresa reviewed the screening process and walked through the TAC's recommendations for screening in each sub area. The TCRG raised the following questions and issues:

- Where is the idea for a cycle track on the Northwest Expressway?
 - Recommendations from other processes will move forward, but not all ideas are shown on the TSP maps.
- The accessway standard in the ped-bike master plan is really important to making the system work. Why are those connections not shown on these maps?
 - The accessway projects will be bundled into TSP alternatives.

-
- Is the pedestrian and bike crossing of Delta Highway at Goodpasture Island Road included?
 - Developer is building improvement, so it is not included in the TSP.
 - Are the ped-bike master plan projects that are not on the maps at a disadvantage for funding?
 - No - all project are included in TSP.
 - Neighborhood-scale transit should be added to the maps, particularly in the Amazon and Friendly neighborhoods.

Evaluation criteria breakout (All)

Theresa and Kurt introduced the evaluation criteria breakout group activity. For the activity, four breakout groups reviewed the evaluation criteria under two goals each. For each goal area, the group considered:

- Are these the right set of criteria?
- Is anything missing?
- Do these help us differentiate?
- Does data exist?

Because the TCRG did not have time for a report out, the results from each breakout group will be posted to the web site (www.eugenetsp.org) for further discussion. The notes from each breakout group are attached to this summary.

TCRG evaluation framework discussion notes

Safety and Health

Project Objectives	Evaluation Criteria	Are These The Right Set Of Criteria?	Is Anything Missing?	Do These Criteria Help Us Differentiate Among Alternatives/Options?	What Data Exist To Help Us Use These Criteria To Evaluate Options?
1. Double the percentage of pedestrian, bicycle, and transit trips by the year 2035.	How does the project or program affect city-wide mode split, as reported as percentage of commute trips taken by pedestrians, cyclists, and transit?	Does it double it? Not now does it? Need a scale. Objective is right – criteria should be more specific.	Target for each mode. Numerical or scale. Criteria should reference reduction in VMT specifically	Yes, if more specific 	
2. Improve community health by increasing physical activity as part of the transportation system.	How does the project or program support active modes? How many of the three active modes are available? What is the quality of available modes?	Yes, needs to be qualitative, but consider a 1-5 scale of the level of impact. Is this impossible to measure?	Can the evaluation criteria reflect different intended geographies?		
3. Support the reduction in quantities of harmful airborne pollutants associated with transportation.	What is the project or program's ability to reduce airborne pollutants, based on available LRAPA data on criteria pollutants?	VMT may be a good measure.			
4. Improve safety and security for all users, especially for the most vulnerable; strive for zero fatalities.	What is the project's ability to address known safety concern areas, provide safe and attractive pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities, and address areas that are otherwise considered unsafe? (Combined assessment)	Probably the right criteria. Objective of zero fatalities should be more definitive (e.g. remove strive). Achieving zero fatalities may not be possible.			

7

Social Equity

Project Objective	Evaluation Criteria	Are These The Right Set Of Criteria?	Is Anything Missing?	Do These Criteria Help Us Differentiate Among Alternatives/Options?	What Data Exist To Help Us Use These Criteria To Evaluate Options?
<p>1. Use future transportation investments to reduce or eliminate disparities between neighborhoods in access, economic benefits, safety, and health.</p>	<p>What impacts does the project or program have on areas with greater proportions of low income, minority, and/or elderly population than the city as a whole?</p>		<p>Add disability as group in criteria.</p> <p>Add young people (8-16 ages) – some disagreement.</p> <p>Look at economic burdens (payment).</p> <p>Add ability to pay for transportation costs.</p> <p>Choice in mode; is auto greater “power” mode – human rights (Paul).</p> <p>Revise objective to “eliminate disparities between neighborhoods and populations”</p>	<p>Good for discussion – not sure.</p> <p>Need to measure a variety of benefits.</p> <p>Balancing act between planning for future social engineering.</p>	

∞

Access and Mobility for All Modes

Project Objective	Evaluation Criteria	Are These The Right Set Of Criteria?	Is Anything Missing?	Do These Criteria Help Us Differentiate Among Alternatives/Options?	What Data Exist To Help Us Use These Criteria To Evaluate Options?
1. Foster neighborhoods where 90 percent of Eugene residents can meet most daily needs without relying heavily on an automobile.	Does the project or program help improve ability to access typical daily destinations within a 20-minute walk, bicycle trip, or bus ride?	Not all neighborhoods can be 20 minute neighborhoods. This is really a complete streets and land use issue.	Instead of measuring whether or not it helps, measure how much it helps. Can we identify hot spots?		
2. Improve the comfort and convenience of travel, especially for walking, bicycling, carpooling, and riding transit.	Does the project or program improve the comfort, safety, or convenience for walking, cycling, carpooling, or riding transit? This could include filling a gap in a sidewalk or bicycle facility, providing a connection that didn't exist before, carpool program to reach new customers, or improving safety or comfort while waiting for the bus.	How can we use technology to help maximize effectiveness (ex: transport system)?	Need to measure access to all amenities within metro area not just in 20 minute neighborhoods. Need to address mobility for autos.		
3. Maintain a network of Emergency Response Streets to facilitate prompt emergency response ³ .	Does the project improve roadway network connectivity for Emergency Response Streets? Projects that reduce emergency access or response times, especially on these routes will not score as well		Adequate geometry for emergency response vehicles –street treatments, cross-sections, hard edge to pavement.		
4. Complete safe, comfortable, and direct sidewalk and bikeway networks between key destinations, transit stops, and residential areas.	Does the project idea add bicycle and pedestrian facilities near key destinations, transit stops, and in residential areas?				
5. Support Lane Transit District's efforts to provide high-capacity, frequent transit service, on the Frequent Transit Network.	Does the project add or enhance frequent transit to primary transit network, connect to primary transit network, or facilitate the ability to implement or add transit on identified future and existing transit routes? Does the project reduce or remove delays on existing transit service? Does the project increase reliability of existing or future transit service?				

Community Context

Project Objective	Evaluation Criteria	Are These The Right Set Of Criteria?	Is Anything Missing?	Do These Criteria Help Us Differentiate Among Alternatives/Options?	What Data Exist To Help Us Use These Criteria To Evaluate Options?
<p>1. Ensure consistency between transportation investments and all relevant adopted and accepted local plans, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Envision Eugene, - A Community Climate and Energy Action Plan for Eugene, - Airport Master Plan, - Long Range Transit Plan, - Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan, etc. 	<p>Yes/No – Is project consistent with current planning efforts?</p>		<p>Degree of community support.</p> <p>Does it advance community's vision?</p> <p>Objective seems too "plannerish", instead relate to how people think about this.</p>		

Economic Benefit

Project Objective	Evaluation Criteria	Are These The Right Set Of Criteria?	Is Anything Missing?	Do These Criteria Help Us Differentiate Among Alternatives/Options?	What Data Exist To Help Us Use These Criteria To Evaluate Options?
1. Support redevelopment priorities by promoting compatible transportation investments along key transit corridors and in core commercial areas, including downtown.	Does the project or program reduce the duration or level of congestion, or increase the number of modes or travel options available along key transit corridors and in core commercial areas?				Mode shift
2. Reduce congestion and improve speed consistency (thereby optimizing fuel consumption) between key origins and destinations for transit and regional freight movement.	Does the project or program reduce the level of congestion or delay along key transit and freight corridors (as applicable)?				Freight mobility
3. Increase access to employment centers via foot, bike, and transit, while improving the quality of the traveling experience.	Does the project or program improve the likelihood of employees walking, bicycling, or riding transit to major employment centers? Does the project idea add bicycle, pedestrian, or transit facilities in or to employment centers?				
4. Encourage infrastructure and programs that allow residents to reinvest in the local economy by reducing expenditures on fuel and vehicle use.	Does the project or program affect mode split, as reported as percentage of trips taken by pedestrians, cyclists, and transit and/or VMT?				
5. Support access and visibility of businesses that rely on drive-by traffic by balancing congestion with economic development goals.	Does the project or program remove a large percentage of drive-by traffic for a major commercial center? Does the project or program make it prohibitively difficult to access commercial areas?		Replace term "drive by" with pass by instead to include other modes. Make bike/ped access clearer as a priority.		

PDX/EUG/NETSP_TCRG-MEETING #8 SUMMARY TO CITY.DOCX

8

Cost Effectiveness

Project Objective	Evaluation Criteria	Are These The Right Set Of Criteria?	Is Anything Missing?	Do These Criteria Help Us Differentiate Among Alternatives/Options?	What Data Exist To Help Us Use These Criteria To Evaluate Options?
1. Optimize benefits relative to public, private, and social costs over the plan's time horizon.	What are the benefits compared to the costs of the project or program?		Add "social, public & private" before "benefits" in criteria. Consider long-term maintenance costs.		
2. Maximize the life of the current transportation system.	To what extent does the project or program use and take advantage of existing network, preserve or maintain existing facilities, or modernize existing facilities to function more optimally?		Doesn't consider if the system is sufficient for all modes. That if the system is "currently" only auto oriented, then a more holistic system should be considered. Replace "maximize" with "extend" in objective. Include criteria that recognize multimodal facilities.		
3. Favor transportation investments that have potential funding for both implementation and ongoing maintenance.	How competitive is the project or program to receive funding from existing funding sources and potential future funding sources?				

Other ideas:

- Use triple bottom line
- Consistency with Envision Eugene

Climate and Energy

Project Objective	Evaluation Criteria	Are These The Right Set Of Criteria?	Is Anything Missing?	Do These Criteria Help Us Differentiate Among Alternatives/Options?	What Data Exist To Help Us Use These Criteria To Evaluate Options?
<p>1. Focus on transportation programs and projects that help to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. reduce total community-wide fossil fuel use by 50% by 2030 b. reduce vehicle miles traveled per capita by 10% by the year 2020 c. reduce community-wide greenhouse gas emissions 10% below 1990 levels by 2020 	<p>How does the project or program affect mode split and/or VMT?</p>		<p>What about embedded energy costs? (Would capture construction costs).</p> <p>CO2 emissions from vehicles in congested traffic. Does that conflict with VMT reduction?</p> <p>Loss of vehicle capacity for benefit of transit or biking.</p> <p>May be a solution in long run, but what about in next few years?</p> <p>We need to capture magnitude of multimodal impact.</p>		<p>How does this favor different types (e.g. bike lane is always narrower than a car lane)?</p>

Ecological Function

Project Objective	Evaluation Criteria	Are these the right set of criteria?	Is anything missing?	Do these criteria help us differentiate among alternatives/options?	What data exist to help us use these criteria to evaluate options?
1. Improve water quality and lower the rate of stormwater runoff as it relates to new transportation infrastructure.	What is the amount of net increase in impervious surface area (e.g., curb-to-curb width of street) associated with the project? (Projects with less impervious surface increases will score better. Does project incorporate mitigation, such as runoff detention and filtration opportunities?)	Agree with goal, but method of treating storm water is handled in design phase so we won't have that data. Concerned about the details of this criteria.	Does it provide an opportunity for new mitigation? Can the TSP support green mitigation? New development is required to mitigate, so it won't help us differentiate but currently doesn't incent green (on-site) vs. piping?		
2. Reduce the urban heat island caused by paving that absorbs and re-radiates heat.	What is the amount of net additional paved surface? What is the ROW availability and potential impacts to landscaping strips? Is the increase able to be mitigated?		Add: Does the project incorporate mitigation, such as additional tree canopy?		
3. Foster transportation investments that avoid damaging and improve habitat areas, where possible.	What are the habitat area impacts compared to the other projects? Are there opportunities for improvement? Consider both positive and negative impacts to habitat areas.		Can we look at both on-site and downstream impacts Be clear that habitat is defined as Goal 5 resources. Scoring needs to allow for potential enhancement and detrimental opportunities; mid-point is neutral		