FEEDBACK ON 2016 REGIONAL SOLICITIATON

Based on survey responses, scoring committee feedback, and comments heard at the committee meetings, staff has compiled the following key questions to help guide potential changes for the 2018 Regional Solicitation.

Application Categories:

1. Should interchange projects have their own application category?
2. Should the use of two transit application categories (Transit Expansion and Transit Modernization) be continued?
3. If so, how can more clarity be provided to applicants about what types of projects should be applied for in Transit Expansion versus Transit System Modernization?

Qualifying Criteria and Rules:

4. Should different project elements on the same transit route be allowed to apply in both transit categories in consecutive Regional Solicitation cycles?
5. Should the $5.5M maximum federal award in the Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities category be reduced?
6. Should applicants be required/allowed to attach a one-page project overview pdf of their project?
7. Should TAB continue to fund at least one project from each of the five-eligible roadway functional classifications?

Scoring Criteria:

8. Should the point distribution, criteria, and measures for the Roadway System Management application category be revamped to better-reflect the types of projects applying to it and to allow bundling of projects?
9. Should any measures for the Travel Demand Management projects be revamped to better-reflect the types of projects applying in the category?
10. Should more points be given to the freight measures of roadway projects?
11. Should the “infrastructure age” criterion be removed from Roadway Expansion and Roadway System Management since many of these projects include new elements compared to the Roadway Reconstruction application category?
12. What improvements can be made to the way cost effectiveness is measured?

Scoring and Project Selection Practices:

13. Should the scoring committees have the flexibility to consider an alternative to prorating scores when high-scoring outlier projects diminish the separation given to most projects?
14. Do scoring measures that auto-calculate need to be scored by outside scorers or can it be done by Council staff?
15. Should the methodology to distribute funds within a mode be tied back to priorities in the Transportation Policy Plan?
16. What other ways should regional balance of awarded funds be measured?

Measures:

17. How should the results of recently completed and ongoing studies (e.g., Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study, Regional Truck Highway Corridor Study, and Bicycle Barriers Study) be incorporated into the scoring?
18. Should the “average distance to other arterials” measure be removed from Roadway Expansion, Roadway Reconstruction, and Roadway System Management due to the difficulty in accurately comparing projects?
19. Should the 70 points for “housing performance score” be reduced?
20. Should the “equity” measure be modified to better-incorporate the potential negative impacts of projects of various populations? If so, how?

1: INTERCHANGE PROJECTS

Should interchange projects have their own application category?

Interchange applications were successful during the 2016 Regional Solicitation. In the Roadway Expansion category, five of the seven projects funded were interchange projects (the other funded projects included one lane expansion and one new underpass).

The success that interchange projects had in the Roadway Expansion category prompted survey respondents to suggest a new application category be made just for interchanges. The below table summarizes the Roadway Expansion category by project type (i.e., interchange vs. non-interchange).

	Funded	**Not Funded**	**Average Score**	**Application Ranks**
Interchange	5 (71%)	2 (29%)	538	1-3, 5, 7, 9-10
Non-Interchange	2 (14%)	12 (86%)	379	4, 6, 8, 11-21
		Difference:	159	-

Any changes that come about should allow for incorporation of the Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study into the scoring.

Possible Actions:

- Create a new interchange category
- Guarantee funding for at least one non-interchange expansion project each funding cycle.
- Modify the scoring in Roadway Expansion.
- No action.

Feedback from the Funding & Programming Committee included:

The Funding & Programming Committee asked which measures most contributed to the difference in the total scores between interchange projects and non-interchange projects. While no measure is responsible for most the 159-point difference in average score, the following measures stand out as the most significant that favored interchange projects, on average:

- 2A-Current Daily Person Throughput: Measure worth 110 points
- 2B-Forecast 2040 Average Daily Traffic Volume: Measure worth 65 points
- 5A-Vehicle Delay Reduced: Measure worth 100 points
- 6-Safety: Measure worth 150 points

However, the advantage that interchange projects have is relatively spread out across measures and would not likely be corrected by adjusting one or two measures.

Measures where non-interchange projects scored better, on average, then interchange projects included:

- 1B-Connection to Jobs: Measure worth 30 points
- 3B-Housing Performance Score: Measure worth 70 points
- 9-Cost Effectiveness: Measure worth 100 points

Several members on TAC favored a separate category for interchanges. Further information will be brought back to TAC F&P at its June meeting on this possibility.

2: TRANSIT CATEGORIES

Should the use of two transit application categories (Transit Expansion and Transit Modernization) be continued?

Confusion regarding which proposals fit into which category lead to the question of whether the two transit application categories should still be used. If not, should they be merged or new transit categories be created?

Possible Actions:

- Combine transit categories into one application type.
- Create new transit application categories (e.g., transitway-related projects and non-transitway projects).
- No action.

Feedback from the Funding & Programming Committee included:

- Both application types (Transit Expansion and Transit Modernization) are important, as they accommodate different project types.
- Transitway and non-transitway projects could be separated or scored separately within the existing categories.
- Examples of each type of project should be included in the application.
- Requested that a working group of technical experts be formed.

Given that a working group has been formed, TAC provided no further comment.

3: TRANSIT EXPANSION VERSUS TRANSIT SYSTEM MODERNIZATION

How can more clarity be provided to applicants about what types of projects should be applied for in Transit Expansion versus Transit System Modernization?

Some applicants expressed uncertainty as to whether a transit application fit in the Transit Expansion or Transit System Modernization category. Each application states "If a project has both transit expansion and transit system modernization elements, then the project should apply in the application category that requires the majority of the project costs." This may provide uncertainty for some projects. Another source of uncertainty could be whether an improvement that indirectly enables expansion (such as bus storage space) is an expansion. The definition of these measures could be adjusted to clear up confusion.

Possible Actions:

- Establish Transit Expansion as any project that expands capacity in the form of more frequent service, expanded routes, more park-and-ride spaces, or new routes.
- The response may depend on the direction given on question #2.

Feedback from the Funding & Programming Committee included:

- Requested that a working group of technical experts be formed.

Given that this will be discussed in the transit working group, TAC provided no further comment.

4: FUNDING FROM TRANSIT EXPANSION AND SYSTEM MODERNIZATION

Should different project elements of the same transit route be allowed to apply in both transit categories in consecutive Regional Solicitation cycles?

Several 2016 applications requested funding in the Transit System Modernization category for upgraded transit stations along arterial bus rapid transit (ABRT) routes that were funded in the Transit Expansion category in 2014 for new bus purchases. Survey feedback questioned whether this should be allowed given other limitations to funding multiple projects in the same corridor and whether you can modernize a facility before the new buses are in use.

Conversely, the purpose of ABRT is to provide incremental improvements on an existing, high-use transit corridor. Both the bus purchases in 2014 and the station upgrades in 2016 had independent utility (i.e., they did not rely on other investments for them to have value).

Possible Actions:

- Write language assuring that a project is not broken into two pieces to be funded in two solicitations.
- Write language stating that modernization funds cannot be spent on yet-to-exist elements.
- Increase the maximum award size in the transit categories.
- No action.

Feedback from the Funding & Programming Committee included:

- It would be difficult to fund one of the highest regional transit priorities (bus rapid transit projects) if this was not allowed.
- Each project should show independent utility.

Given that this will be discussed in the transit working group, TAC provided no further comment.

5: MAXIMUM AWARD FOR MULTIUSE TRAILS AND BICYCLE FACILITIES

Should the $5.5M maximum federal award in the Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities category be reduced?

Prior to the 2016 Regional Solicitation, the maximum federal award for the Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities category was a topic of much discussion. TAC recommended that the maximum be $3.5M, but TAB approved keeping the maximum at $5.5M. The rationale for reducing the maximum was that more projects could be funded and that an award of $3.5M was high enough to fund most large trail bridge projects when added to the 20% local match. The rationale that led to the eventual retention of the $5.5M maximum was that past Regional Solicitation history had applicants that requested the full $5.5M, so that there is a demand for these larger projects.

The result of the 2016 Regional Solicitation was that three projects at $5M or more federal were funded, all to the same applicant. If the maximum would have been $3.5M, the extra funds could have been used to fund an additional four trail projects for this high-demand category (only 12 of 39 requests were funded).

Possible Actions:

- Reduce the maximum award for Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities.
- Increase the point value for cost effectiveness so that small projects can better compete with larger projects.
- No action.

While the Funding & Programming Committee members tended to favor a reduced maximum, one member is interested in more information, given the fact that TAB kept the $5.5M maximum, citing it as key to funding large projects.

TAC did not provide additional feedback.

6: APPLICANT SUMMARIES

Should applicants be required/allowed to attach a one-page project overview pdf of their project?

An applicant commented in the survey that applicants should be allowed to provide a one-page project overview to present key "attachment" information to scorers, who may not always read all the longer attachments. The short summaries could also be used by TAB to better understand the types of projects submitted.

Along with some survey respondents, staff is interested in reducing the length of applications and suggests consideration of this option with a limit to other attachments that can be included. Some application files end up being several-hundred pages, which becomes cumbersome for scorers. Consideration could also be given to limiting attachments to 8.5" X 11," as large attachments make the PDF applications difficult to navigate.

A one-pager could serve as an opportunity for an applicant to provide any "highlight" information it would like, including:

- Maps
- Links to plans and large maps.
- Photos or other illustrations.
- Expanded summary or list of attributes.

Possible Actions:

- Allow or require for one-pager.
- Include limits to size and number of attachments.
- No action.

Funding & Programming Committee members generally liked the idea of having applicants include a one-pager, though there was feedback that the format and content should be prescriptive and that applicants should be careful not to be too specific to the point that additional scope changes are needed.

TAC did not provide additional feedback.

7: FUNDING FOR ALL ROADWAY CLASSIFICATIONS

Should TAB continue to fund at least one project from each of the five-eligible roadway functional classifications?

In response to concerns that A-minor connectors (two-lane roadways that connect rural town centers) are not competitive in Roadway scoring, TAB established a rule that at least one project from each roadway classification (principal arterials and four A-minor classifications) must be funded. Four of the five functional classifications were funded due to their high scores. However, to fund at least one A-minor connector, 15 higher scoring projects had to be skipped over to get the #28 ranked project out of 33 projects in the Roadway Reconstruction/ Modernization application category.

Possible Actions:

- Eliminate requirement to fund all roadway classifications.
- No action.

Funding & Programming Committee members generally felt that the provision to fund at least one project from each functional classification should remain so that all parts of the A-minor arterials system receive funding. One member suggested that a similar practice could be used in the transit categories.

TAC did not provide additional feedback.

8: ROADWAY SYSTEM MANAGEMENT

Should the point distribution, criteria, and measures for the Roadway System Management application category be revamped to better-reflect the types of projects applying to it and to allow bundling of projects?

Roadway System Management (RSM) projects differ from other roadway projects in that they tend to be low-cost improvements implemented across several corridors or systemwide. Most of the measures in the RSM application category match those in the other roadway categories, for which they were designed. "Date of Construction" (as discussed in item #11) may not be appropriate. Survey respondents provided feedback that it may be impractical to score emissions and congestion with the Synchro model, as is done for Roadway Expansion and Reconstruction/Modernization. Further, safety may have too many points (200) assigned to it for this application category. Given the differences between RSM projects and traditional roadway projects, it may be worth exploring whether the point values are appropriately distributed, whether scoring methodologies should change, whether any additional criteria or measures should be added, and whether any measures should be deleted. RSM projects strongly align with regional highway investment policy and should continue moving forward.

Additionally, "bundling," while discouraged in construction categories may be worth encouraging in the RSM category. RSM projects tend to be about "networks" as opposed to "corridors" and the application category should be designed to avoid compromising the effectiveness of projects.

Possible Actions:

- Several actions could occur, including allowing bundling, removing scoring measures, or shifting point values.
- Remove signal retiming projects that can use Synchro to assess congestion reduction from other system management improvements.

The Funding & Programming Committee suggested a working group be formed to discuss this topic. One member suggested that a different model (MOVES) would better-capture the emissions impacts of some elements in this category, compared to the model (Synchro) currently in use.

Given that a working group has been formed, TAC provided no further comment.

9: TRAVEL DEMAND MANAGEMENT

Should any measures for the Travel Demand Management projects be revamped to better-reflect the types of projects applying in the category?

Travel Demand Management (TDM) projects tend to relate to carpooling, telework strategies, bike sharing, car sharing, and technology meant to limit single-occupancy vehicle travel during peak hours. Projecting the usage of these project types is difficult to do in a fair manner. Unreliable usage numbers in turn impact the reliability of the congestion reduction and air quality measures.

Possible Actions:

- Several actions could occur, including removing scoring measures, and shifting point values.

The Funding & Programming Committee had limited discussion on this topic.

TAC requested a working group be established for this topic.

10: FREIGHT

Should more points be given to the freight measures on roadway projects?

Freight is assessed in a few measures in the Regional Solicitation. Applicants are required to obtain a heavy commercial traffic count within the project area and this is worth 50 points (30 in Roadway System Management and 35 in Bridge). The specific freight benefits related to the project (e.g., adding wider shoulders or longer turn lanes) is worth 15 points (10 in Roadway System Management). Finally, existing manufacturing/distribution employment, combined with total jobs, within one mile of the project is worth 30 points. Given the importance of freight in the FAST Act, survey comments suggested that more points should be given to freight than 85 out of 1,100. The results of the Regional Truck Highway Corridor Study could be used as a replacement to some of the freight measures moving forward.

Possible Actions:

- Increase points allocated to freight.
- Incorporate the results of the Regional Truck Highway Corridor Study.
- No action.

Funding & Programming Committee feedback included:

- The freight measure only worth 15 points should either be increased or the measure should be eliminated.

TAC did not provide additional feedback.

11: INFRASTRUCTURE AGE

Should the "infrastructure age" criterion be removed from Roadway Expansion and Roadway System Management since many of these projects include new elements compared to the Roadway Reconstruction application category?

Scoring "Infrastructure Age" has been challenging in the Roadway Expansion category, given that some roadway expansion applications are for new roadways. There had been discussion of new roadway projects receiving a score of zero, but committee members found that to be unfair. Perhaps even more difficult is scoring the measure for Roadway System Management projects, which often have brand new infrastructure along with various types of existing infrastructure of various ages.

Staff feels that this measure is not only difficult to score, but not particularly vital to project selection. Staff does believe that "Infrastructure Age" is both practical and vital in the Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization category.

Possible Actions:

- Removal of infrastructure age from Roadway Expansion and/or Roadway System Management.
- Add a "hold harmless" exemption for new roadways in Roadway Expansion like is already part of the Housing Performance score for townships.
- No action.

Funding & Programming Committee feedback:

- Members generally agreed with leaving the age criterion in Roadway Modernization and eliminating it from Roadway Expansion and Roadway System Management.

TAC did not provide additional feedback.

12: COST EFFECTIVENESS

What improvements can be made to the way cost effectiveness is measured?

For 2016, Cost Effectiveness was set apart as its own measure, dividing total score by total project cost. At times, there has been sentiment to use the federal request to determine cost effectiveness.

Advantages of using federal requested amount:

- Encourages leveraging the federal dollars with local funds.
- Reduces variability in the total cost estimates.
- Reduces the incentive to "game" the score by estimating a low total project cost.
- Rewards projects that have significant local contributions.

Disadvantages of using federal requested amount:

- May provide an advantage to larger projects / sponsors who can provide a larger local match.

Further, for the purposes of this measure, noise walls are not counted as part of the cost, in recognition that it's difficult to predict the presence of noise walls that far in advance. One application included a $3.9M noise wall, while another's noise wall made up 40% of the cost.

The Cost Effectiveness measure was impacted in Transit Expansion by a LRT station that had no operating costs and a 70-year useful life. Is there benefit to simplifying transit Cost Effectiveness?

Finally, there could be an opportunity to reward private contributions in this category.

Possible Actions:

- Base cost effectiveness on federal request.
- Exempt privately-contributed funds from the cost for scoring this measure.
- No action.

There was limited Funding & Programming Committee or TAC feedback.

13: OUTLIERS

Should the scoring committees have the flexibility to consider an alternative to prorating scores when high-scoring outlier projects diminish the separation given to most projects?

Several survey respondents commented that one outlier project greatly impacted some scoring measures. The most notable example was the Ridership measure in Transit System Modernization. This measure was worth 300 points and none of the 12 projects that did not come out on top scored more than 96 points. There are several other examples in which the second-place project scored fewer than half the possible points.

Over the past two Solicitations, scoring committee members have suggested spacing scores at equal intervals or using the second- or third-ranked score as the basis for pro-rating the other scores. While this can spread lower scores out better, it is also an artificial diminishment of a high-performing application's attributes in a given measure.

Outliers were much less prevalent in the 2014 Regional Solicitation, though a few measures were adjusted through strategies discussed above.

Possible Actions:

1. Continue prorating scores regardless of the existence of outliers.
2. Continue prorating scores, but mute the impact of outliers by basing the proration of the other applications of an average of the top two scores instead of just the top score.
3. Stop prorating scores in certain measures. Staff urges caution before selecting this option because a) many prorated measures do not have significant outliers and b) it is not possible to know, in advance of the application deadline, which measures will have outliers.
4. Keep the prorated measures as written but provide the scoring committees the flexibility to determine whether a different approach is appropriate.

Funding & Programming Committee Members generally favored giving flexibility to scoring committees, perhaps with some guidance as to when or how it can be applied.

TAC did not provide additional feedback.

14: AUTO-CALCULATED MEASURES

Do scoring measures that auto-calculate need to be scored by outside scorers or can it be done by Council staff?

There was some survey feedback that many scoring measures are essentially auto-calculated and scoring them perhaps not the best use of a professional expert's time.

Staff agrees that several experts are scoring measures that are subject to little-to-no interpretation. Further, staff would be able to score these with minimal workload impact. Note, however, that newcomers to the scoring process are usually provided easier scoring measures to introduce them to the process.

Some survey commenters also felt that their expertise should have been better-utilized. The demand (i.e., the number of interested potential scorers), particularly in transit and bicycle/pedestrian measures, far exceeds the supply (i.e., the number of scoring measures). Staff tries to place scorers in appropriate/requested categories but it is not possible to please all scorers. A possible alternative would be to have Council staff score some of the auto-calculated measures and have two volunteers team up to score some of the more involved measures.

Funding & Programming Committee Members generally preferred to let staff score the auto-calculated projects. It was suggested that this could free up scorers to pair up on more difficult measures.

TAC did not provide additional feedback.

15: FUNDS DISTRIBUTION WITHIN THE MODES

Should the methodology to distribute funds within a mode be tied back to priorities in the Transportation Policy Plan?

Following the completion of scores, staff provides "starting points" for funding scenarios. The first priority in establishing these starting points is to fall within the TAB-established modal funding ranges. However, less direction exists regarding how to distribute funds within those ranges. In recent Regional Solicitations, staff has started by using the number of applications provided in each category within a mode as an approximation of demand. That is, if one-half of roadway applications are in the Reconstruction/Modernization category, then roughly one half of the roadway funding will be provided to that category in the scenario. This is subject to change based on TAB constraint (e.g., the mandated amount of funding to bridges) or scoring circumstances (e.g., a thin scoring margin in one category).

Feedback on this currently-used approach has been mixed, as some find it to be an arbitrary starting point and suggest that, in theory, Roadway Expansion could see more funding than Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization despite Transportation Policy Plan (TPP) guidance to prioritize reconstruction projects.

Staff does not feel that using number of applications as an approximation of demand is necessarily the ideal way to spread funds within a mode. However, the TPP may not necessarily provide clear guidance on how to distribute funds between modes and within modes. Further, conflicting interpretations of how to adhere to the TPP could be at play. It would be possible to make stronger ties to the TPP including the matching up the application category names to the ones used for these project types in the TPP.

There was limited Funding & Programming Committee and TAC feedback.

16: REGIONAL BALANCE

What other ways should regional balance of awarded funds be measured?

In theory, the Regional Solicitation funds projects that are of most benefit to the region. However, there has been some sentiment that project awards are not adequately spread throughout the region. While "regional balance" is a secondary lens used by TAB, it is not a part of scoring. However, there is one policy that addresses the issue; the funding of at least one roadway project in each of the five roadway classifications.

Thus far, distribution of regional funds has been discussed in simple terms of total federal dollars vs. county population. Determining the appropriate geographic spread of funds may need to take other elements into consideration.

Possible Actions:
Possible "regional balance" criteria include:

- Population.
- Vehicle-Miles Travelled (VMT).
- Commute patterns.

Possible geographies include:

- Thrive land use classifications.
- Council districts.
- Inside vs. outside of 494/694.
- NE/SE/NW/SW quadrants.

There was limited Funding & Programming Committee and TAC feedback. Council staff is preparing maps that display different ways to display regional balance.

17: ONGOING STUDIES

How should the results of recently completed and ongoing studies (e.g., Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study, Regional Truck Highway Corridor Study, and Bicycle Barriers Study) be incorporated into the scoring?

The following studies were recently completed or are in process:

- Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study. Completed.
- Regional Truck Highway Corridor Study. Completed.
- Congestion Management Safety Plan IV. Ongoing.
- Bicycle Barriers Study. Ongoing.
- Park-and-Ride Study. Ongoing.

These studies are meant to inform the Transportation Policy Plan (TPP), which informs the Regional Solicitation. Therefore, staff believes it makes sense to consider incorporating elements of these studies into the measures and scoring guidance. However, the timing of study completion could prove challenging.

There was limited Funding & Programming Committee and TAC feedback. Staff will bring back ideas on how to incorporate recently-completed studies.

18: SPACING

Should the "average distance to other arterials" measure be removed from Roadway Expansion, Roadway Reconstruction, and Roadway System Management due to the difficulty in accurately comparing projects?

The "average distance to other arterials" measure has proven difficult for both applicants and staff, as a great deal of post-application re-mapping has had to occur during the past two Solicitations. Further, four measures populate the "Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy" criterion, where points are spread very thinly.

Staff also questions the value of measuring the average distance to parallel roadways, particularly for Roadway Reconstruction projects, and given that measure is calculated through oddly-shaped polygons on maps.

Possible Actions:

- Remove this measure and reallocate the points to the new regional studies that have just been completed or to other measures.
- No action.

Funding & Programming Committee Members discussed removing this measure and using the points under Role in the Regional Transportation and Economy to go toward new measures that incorporated recently completed regional studies.

TAC did not provide additional feedback.

19: THE IMPACT OF THE HOUSING PERFORMANCE SCORE

Should the 70 points for "housing performance score" be reduced?

Concern has been expressed during recent Solicitation creation and survey feedback that housing performance score is not directly related to the project and provides scores that carry no nexus to a proposed project's value or effectiveness. The score is also inconsistent in its impact on more regional projects that benefit more than the city in which they are located, as discussed when the scoring process was made more complex for interchanges located near city boundaries. Housing, however, has been in the Regional Solicitation since the 1990s.

Possible Actions:

1. Reduce the points for this measure in one or more of the application categories and reallocate the points.
2. No action.

Funding & Programming Committee Members generally felt the point value should be reduced in favor of applying the points to measures that directly measure the merits of the project.

TAC did not provide additional feedback.

20: EQUITY MEASURE: CAPTURING THE TRUE IMPACT

Should the "equity" measure be modified to better-incorporate the potential negative impacts of projects of various populations? If so, how?

In the survey, concern was expressed that the negative impacts on traditionally disadvantaged communities are difficult for a scorer to capture.

Staff believes that the measure has been valuable in helping shape project applications with an eye toward serving the traditionally under-served populations. However, while applicants have done a good job at highlighting the positive attributes of their projects, a far more difficult task is assuring that negative externalities are captured and reflected in scoring.

Staff research shows that a few MPOs have tried to capture negative impacts of projects. Scoring rubrics also exist that provide additional guidance to scorers.

1. Explore changes to this measure to reflect any potential harm that the project could do on under-served populations.
2. No action.

There was limited Funding & Programming Committee feedback. TAC questioned how this issue would be addressed and had some discussion of forming a working group. A suggestion was made to approach non-transportation experts.

Roadway Expansion Projects

Prioritizing Criteria	Thrive Outcomes	TPP Goals	Measures
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	– Prosperity – Livability	– Access to Destinations – Competitive Economy – Align Transportation and Land Use	– Average distance to nearest parallel roadways – Connection to Total Jobs and Manufacturing/Distribution Jobs – Current daily heavy commercial traffic – Freight Project elements
Usage	– Livability – Prosperity	– Access to Destinations – Competitive Economy	– Current daily person throughput – Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume
Equity and Housing Performance	– Equity – Livability	– Access to Destinations – Align Transportation and Land Use	– Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation – Housing Performance Score
Infrastructure Age	– Stewardship – Livability – Sustainability	– Transportation System Stewardship	– Date of construction
Congestion Reduction/Air Quality	– Prosperity – Livability	– Access to Destinations – Healthy Environment – Competitive Economy	– Vehicle delay reduced – Kg of emissions reduced
Safety	– Livability – Sustainability	– Safety and Security – Stewardship	– Crashes reduced
Multimodal Facilities and Existing Connections	– Prosperity – Equity – Livability – Sustainability	– Access to Destinations – Transportation and Land Use – Healthy Environment – Competitive Economy	– Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections
Risk Assessment	– Stewardship	– Transportation System Stewardship	– Risk Assessment Form
Cost Effectiveness	– Stewardship	– Transportation System Stewardship	– Cost effectiveness (total project cost/total points awarded)

Reconstruction/Modernization Projects

Prioritizing Criteria	Thrive Outcomes	TPP Goals	Measures
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	– Prosperity – Livability	– Access to Destinations – Competitive Economy – Align Transportation and Land Use	– Average distance to nearest parallel roadways – Connection to Total Jobs and Manufacturing/Distribution Jobs – Current daily heavy commercial traffic – Freight project elements
Usage	– Livability – Prosperity	– Access to Destinations – Competitive Economy	– Current daily person throughput – Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume
Equity and Housing Performance	– Equity – Livability	– Access to Destinations	– Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits – Housing Performance Score
Infrastructure Age/Condition	– Stewardship – Livability – Sustainability	– Access to Destinations – Transportation System Stewardship	– Date of construction – Geometric, structural, or infrastructure deficiencies
Congestion Reduction/Air Quality	– Prosperity – Livability	– Access to Destinations – Healthy Environment – Competitive Economy	– Vehicle delay reduced – Kg of emissions reduced
Safety	– Livability – Sustainability	– Safety and Security – Stewardship – Healthy Environment	– Crashes reduced
Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections	– Prosperity – Equity – Livability – Sustainability	– Access to Destinations – Transportation and Land Use – Healthy Environment – Competitive Economy	– Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections
Risk Assessment	– Stewardship	– Transportation System Stewardship	– Risk Assessment form
Cost Effectiveness	– Stewardship	– Transportation System Stewardship	– Cost effectiveness (total project cost/total points awarded)

Roadway System Management

Prioritizing Criteria	Thrive Outcomes	TPP Goals	Measures
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	– Prosperity – Livability	– Access to Destinations – Competitive Economy – Align Transportation and Land Use	– Average distance to nearest parallel roadways – Connection to Total Jobs and Manufacturing/Distribution Jobs – Current daily heavy commercial traffic – Freight project elements
Usage	– Livability – Prosperity	– Access to Destinations – Competitive Economy	– Current daily person throughput – Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume
Equity and Housing Performance	– Equity – Livability	– Access to Destinations	– Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits – Housing Performance Score
Infrastructure Age	– Stewardship – Livability – Sustainability	– Access to Destinations – Transportation System Stewardship	– Date of construction
Congestion Reduction/Air Quality	– Prosperity – Livability	– Access to Destinations – Healthy Environment – Competitive Economy	– Vehicle delay reduced – Kg of emissions reduced
Safety	– Livability – Sustainability	– Safety and Security – Stewardship – Healthy Environment	– Crashes reduced
Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections	– Prosperity – Equity – Livability – Sustainability	– Access to Destinations – Transportation and Land Use – Healthy Environment – Competitive Economy	– Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections
Risk Assessment	– Stewardship	– Transportation System Stewardship	– Risk Assessment Form
Cost Effectiveness	– Stewardship	– Transportation System Stewardship	– Cost effectiveness (total project cost/total points awarded)

Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement

Prioritizing Criteria	Thrive Outcomes	TPP Goals	Measures
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	– Stewardship – Prosperity – Livability	– Access to Destinations – Competitive Economy – Aligns Transportation and Land Use	– Average distance to nearest parallel bridges – Connection to Total Jobs and Manufacturing/Distribution Jobs – Current daily heavy commercial traffic – Freight project elements
Usage	– Livability – Prosperity	– Access to Destinations – Competitive Economy	– Current daily person throughput – Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume
Equity and Housing Performance	– Equity – Livability	– Access to Destinations	– Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation – Housing Performance Score
Infrastructure Condition	– Stewardship – Livability – Sustainability	– Transportation System Stewardship – Safety and Security	– Bridge Sufficiency Rating – Load-Posting
Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections	– Prosperity – Equity – Livability – Sustainability	– Access to Destinations – Transportation and Land Use – Healthy Environment – Competitive Economy	– Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections
Risk Assessment	– Stewardship	– Transportation System Stewardship	– Risk Assessment Form
Cost Effectiveness	– Stewardship	– Transportation System Stewardship	– Cost effectiveness (total project cost/total points awarded)

Transit Expansion

Prioritizing Criteria	Thrive Outcomes	TPP Goals	Measures
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	– Stewardship – Prosperity – Equity – Livability	– Access to Destinations – Align Transportation and Land Use – Competitive Economy	– Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions – Average number of weekday transit trips connected to the project
Usage	– Livability – Prosperity	– Access to Destinations – Align Transportation and Land Use – Competitive Economy	– New annual riders
Equity and Housing Performance	– Equity – Livability	– Access to Destinations	– Connection to disadvantaged populations and project benefits – Housing Performance Score
Emissions Reduction	– Sustainability	– Healthy Environment	– Total emissions reduced
Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections	– Prosperity – Equity – Livability – Sustainability	– Access to Destinations – Transportation and Land Use – Healthy Environment – Competitive Economy	– Bicycle and pedestrian elements of the project and connections
Risk Assessment	– Stewardship	– Transportation System Stewardship	– Risk Assessment Form
Cost Effectiveness	– Stewardship	– Transportation System Stewardship	– Cost effectiveness (total annual project cost/total points awarded)

Transit System Modernization

Prioritizing Criteria	Thrive Outcomes	TPP Goals	Measures
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	– Livability – Stewardship – Equity – Prosperity	– Healthy Environment – Stewardship – Competitive Economy – Access to Destinations	– Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions – Average number of weekday transit trips connected to the project
Usage	– Livability – Prosperity	– Access to Destinations – Align Transportation and Land Use – Competitive Economy	– Total existing annual riders
Equity and Housing Performance	– Equity – Livability	– Access to Destinations	– Connection to disadvantaged populations and project benefits – Housing Performance Score
Emissions Reduction	– Sustainability	– Healthy Environment	– Description of emissions reduced
Service and Customer Improvements	– Prosperity – Stewardship	– Transportation System Stewardship	– Percent reduction in passenger travel time – Percent reduction in operating and maintenance costs – Project improvements for transit users
Multimodal Facilities and Connections	– Livability – Prosperity	– Access to Destinations – Transportation and Land Use – Healthy Environment – Competitive Economy	– Bicycle and pedestrian elements of the project and connections
Risk Assessment	– Stewardship	– Transportation System Stewardship	– Risk Assessment form
Cost Effectiveness	– Stewardship	– Transportation System Stewardship	– Cost effectiveness (total annual project cost/total points awarded)

Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities

Prioritizing Criteria	Thrive Outcomes	TPP Goals	Measures
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	– Stewardship – Livability – Prosperity	– Access to Destinations – Align Transportation and Land Use – Competitive Economy	– Identify location of project relative to Regional Bicycle Transportation Network
Potential Usage	– Livability – Prosperity	– Access to Destinations – Align Transportation and Land Use – Competitive Economy	– Existing population and employment within 1 mile
Equity and Housing Performance	– Equity – Livability	– Access to Destinations	– Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation – Housing Performance Score
Deficiencies and Safety	– Stewardship – Livability – Sustainability	– Access to Destinations – Transportation System Stewardship – Safety and Security	– Gaps closed/barriers removed and/or continuity between jurisdictions improved by the project – Deficiencies corrected or safety problems addressed
Multimodal Facilities and Existing Connections	– Livability – Prosperity – Sustainability	– Access to Destinations – Transportation and Land Use – Healthy Environment – Competitive Economy	– Transit or pedestrian elements of the project and connections
Risk Assessment/ Public Engagement	– Stewardship	– Transportation System Stewardship	– Risk Assessment Form
Cost Effectiveness	– Stewardship	– Transportation System Stewardship	– Cost effectiveness (total project cost/total points awarded)

Pedestrian Facilities (Sidewalks, Streetscaping, and ADA)

Prioritizing Criteria	Thrive Outcomes	TPP Goals	Measures
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	– Stewardship – Livability – Prosperity	– Access to Destinations – Align Transportation and Land Use – Competitive Economy	– Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions
Potential Usage	– Livability – Prosperity	– Access to Destinations – Align Transportation and Land Use – Competitive Economy	– Existing populations within ½ mile
Equity and Housing Performance	– Equity – Livability	– Access to Destinations	– Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation – Housing Performance Score
Deficiencies and Safety	– Livability	– Safety and Security – Access to Destinations	– Barriers overcome or gaps filled – Deficiencies corrected or safety problems addressed
Multimodal Facilities and Existing Connections	– Livability – Prosperity	– Access to Destinations – Transportation and Land Use – Healthy Environment – Competitive Economy	– Transit or bicycle elements of the project and connections
Risk Assessment	– Stewardship	– Transportation System Stewardship	– Risk Assessment Form
Cost Effectiveness	– Stewardship	– Transportation System Stewardship	– Cost effectiveness (total project cost/total points awarded)

Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Infrastructure Projects

Prioritizing Criteria	Thrive Outcomes	TPP Goals	Measures
Relationship between Safe Routes to School Program Elements	– Livability – Stewardship	– Transportation System Stewardship – Safety and Security	– Describe how project addresses 5 Es of SRTS program
Potential Usage	– Livability	– Access to Destinations – Healthy Environment	– Average share of student population that bikes or walks – Student population within school's walkshed
Equity and Housing Performance	– Equity – Livability	– Access to Destinations	– Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation – Housing Performance Score
Deficiencies and Safety	– Livability	– Safety and Security – Healthy Environment – Access to Destinations	– Barriers overcome or gaps filled – Deficiencies corrected or safety or security addressed
Public Engagement/ Risk Assessment	– Stewardship	– Transportation System Stewardship	– Public engagement process – Risk Assessment Form
Cost Effectiveness	– Stewardship	– Transportation System Stewardship	– Cost effectiveness (total project cost/total points awarded)

Travel Demand Management (TDM)

Prioritizing Criteria	Thrive Outcomes	TPP Goals	Measures
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	– Livability – Stewardship – Equity – Prosperity	– Stewardship – Competitive Economy – Access to Destinations	– Ability to capitalize on existing regional transportation facilities and resources
Usage	– Livability – Prosperity	– Access to Destinations – Align Transportation and Land Use – Competitive Economy	– Users
Equity and Housing Performance	– Equity – Livability	– Access to Destinations	– Connection to disadvantaged populations and project benefits – Housing Performance Score
Congestion Reduction/Air Quality	– Stewardship – Sustainability	– Healthy Environment	– Congested roadways in project area – VMT reduced
Innovation	– Livability	– Transportation System Stewardship	– Project innovations and geographic expansion
Risk Assessment	– Stewardship	– Transportation System Stewardship	– Technical capacity of applicant's organization – Continuation of project after initial federal funds are expended
Cost Effectiveness	– Stewardship	– Transportation System Stewardship	– Cost effectiveness (total annual project cost/total points awarded)