

ATTACHMENT A

Draft Project Acceleration/Deceleration Factors and Evaluation Process

Accelerators

| | Accelerator |
|--------------|--|
| Funding | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has new funding become available at an amount greater than 25% of the total project construction cost? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is this funding discretionary? ○ Is this funding somehow conditional to the project or time-sensitive? ○ Are unspent subregional funds available to be re-allocated to the project, with approval of the subregion? ○ Is funding available from a decelerated project? ○ Are confirmed surplus funds available from another project in the same subregion, based on a final Life of Project budget? |
| Process | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is this project currently undergoing or can commit to a streamlined planning and environmental review process, not exceeding three years in duration? |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has this project concluded the planning and environmental review process, needing no more than a refresh of the environmental document(s), not exceeding one year in duration to complete (Operation Shovel Ready)? |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can this project be designed to phase improvements to achieve early action, incremental benefits? |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has at least 75% of the required right-of-way and site acquisitions been completed or is anticipated to be completed within one year? |
| Partnerships | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the existing local land use regulatory framework accommodate Transit-oriented Communities (TOC) for at least 75% of the land area within two miles of every station? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Are the adopted land use plans, development standards, design standards, including identification of needed public improvements and public facilities/amenities conforming to Metro's adopted TOC policy <i>[proposed for future Board action]</i> and are cleared by a certified Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to streamline subsequent implementation? ○ Does the local jurisdiction have a current, State Housing and Community Development Department (HCD)-approved Housing Element; has properly planned and zoned for adequate sites to accommodate its Regional Housing Needs Assessment allocation; updated its development regulations to accommodate the density corresponding to the lower income category of housing units pursuant to State Housing Law; and has a minimum 10% inclusionary housing program, supported by a current density bonus ordinance that is consistent with State Density Bonus Law? |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the local jurisdiction and/or other local partner contributing at least 25% more than the required 3% contribution? |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is a local improvement or financing district existing or will be established within three years of the groundbreaking date for the purpose of either funding a portion of the greater than 3% contribution referenced above and/or implementing public infrastructure and amenities improvements pursuant to an adopted TOC program? |

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a program to collect a fee in-lieu of providing required parking and local traffic mitigation fees/improvements, with revenues allocated to transit passes and other transportation demand management (TDM) strategies? |
| Innovations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there an equal or superior, less costly improvement to accomplish the capacity and performance intended by the transportation project? |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there technological innovations that will reduce the planned capital and/or operating cost of the project? |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there an opportunity to combine two or more projects/segments to achieve economy of scale and minimize impacts of multiple back-to-back construction over a long period of time such that the combined project construction cost is reduced by at least 25%? |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is this project the subject of a public-private partnership proposal or other unsolicited proposal that can reduce the estimated construction cost by a minimum of 10% and accelerate the delivery date by at least 10 years? |

Decelerators

| | Decelerator |
|---------------------|--|
| Funding | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have there been new priorities, which are not part of the adopted Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), that reduce forecasted available revenue, resulting in a shortfall of 25% or more of the project construction cost? |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there an unrealized funding source for the project that was assumed in the financial plan, which reduces available project funding from that source by at least 25%? |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the cost of the project so high that it cannot be constructed within the three-year window in the Expenditure Plan for the "Opening Date?" |
| Process | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a determination, upon identifying the Locally Preferred Alternative or completion of the planning and environmental review process, that proceeding with the project as originally conceived is incompatible with the community and cannot be compatibly constructed because funding is insufficient to design it as desired? |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the project a subject of litigation that delays the project for more than six months and/or delays the project schedule such that the three-year window in the Expenditure Plan for "Opening Date" cannot be met? |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there significant environmental clearance complications that are lengthy or costly to address such the project is likely to be delayed for more than six months and/or the project schedule would be delayed such that the three-year window in the Expenditure Plan for "Opening Date" cannot be met? |
| Partnerships | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is less than 75% of the land area within two miles of project stations not included within updated local land use plans and regulations, and not cleared by a certified Program EIR, contrary to Metro's TOC Policy <i>[proposed for future Board action]</i>? |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have excessive permit requirements been imposed by the responsible agency or denials by an agency such that the project is delayed for more than 30 days and/or the project schedule is delayed such that the three-year window in the Expenditure Plan for "Opening Date" cannot be met? |

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have disproportionate or unwarranted project design requests by a local jurisdiction occurred such that six months or more is added to the planning and design review process, and the project schedule would be delayed such that the three-year window in the Expenditure Plan for "Groundbreaking Start Date" cannot be met? |
| Innovations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there requests to defer a project for speculative or long-term technological improvements that are not available during the three-year window in the Expenditure Plan for the "Opening Date"? |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are available state-of-the art, proven technologies that can increase capacity, reduce travel times and improve safety, while staying within the budgeted construction cost, which Metro is being prevented from utilizing by law or regulator? |

Process

1. Identify if one or more factors have occurred that suggest a potential for acceleration and/or deceleration. A tool would be utilized to assist in identifying the factors that potentially have occurred and would provide an initial screening of the propensity for acceleration and/or deceleration.
2. If so, then staff would conduct an analysis to confirm the acceleration and/or deceleration, determine the extent to which a project could be accelerated and/or decelerated, and what would be the impacts of that action.
3. The Board of Directors reviews the staff analysis and gives direction to subsequently provide notice and take action pursuant to law; declines to find for acceleration and/or deceleration; or directs staff to undertake further analysis.