

Information Item

Transportation Advisory Board



Meeting Date: April 19, 2023

Topic

Potential 2024 Regional Solicitation Changes

To: Transportation Advisory Board

From: Metropolitan Transportation Staff

Increasing the Weight of Safety and Safety-Related Criteria and Scoring Measures

This section presents an analysis of the impact of increasing Safety scoring in the Regional Solicitation. The impetus for considering these options is a nearly unanimous opinion from technical and policy committee members that more emphasis should be placed on Safety for the 2024 Regional Solicitation.

Three options were developed by TAC Funding & Programming: No change, adding 100 points, and adding 300 points. Table 1 below summarizes the impact of adding 100 and 300 points, respectively to safety-related criteria across all application categories. The 100-point option results in adding 6%-8% to the safety-related criteria and the 300-point option results in adding 15%-20% to the safety-related criteria. It should be noted that some application categories do not have a direct safety criterion. In these cases, 100 and 300 points have been added to criteria that represent safety. For example in the Transit Expansion application category, points have been added to the Multimodal criterion as this represents investment in facilities that increase the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists accessing transit.

In addition, Attachments 1 and 2 show the impact of the 100- and 300-point Safety criteria increases with the proportional decreases to all the other criteria weighting (with crossed-out percentages representing the current criteria weighting and the red underlined percentage indicating the new weighting).

Table 1: Impact of 100- and 300-Point Safety Increases

Category	Criterion	Current Criteria Weight	100-Pt Increase to Safety Criteria Weight	300-Pt Increase to Safety Criteria Weight
Traffic Mgmt Tech	Safety	18%	25%	36%
Spot Mob/Safe	Safety	30%	36%	45%
Strat Cap	Safety	14%	21%	32%
Roadway Recon/Mod	Safety	16%	23%	34%
Bridge	Multimodal	9%	17%	29%
<i>Transit Expansion</i>	<i>Multimodal</i>	9%	17%	29%
<i>Transit Modernization</i>	<i>Transit Improvements</i>	18%	25%	36%
TDM	Congestion/Air Qual	27%	33%	43%
Multiuse Trail / Bike	Safety/Deficiencies	23%	29%	39%
Pedestrian Facilities	Safety/Deficiencies	27%	33%	43%
Safe Routes to School	Safety/Deficiencies	23%	29%	39%

The bullets below describe how the Safety criteria point increases would be distributed across specific scoring measure(s) within each application category.

- **Traffic Management Technologies category:** Points added 50% to Crashes Reduced measure and 50% to Safety Issues in Project Area measure.
- **Roadway Spot Mobility and Safety, Strategic Capacity, and Reconstruction/Modernization categories:** Points added 50% to Crashes Reduced measure and 50% Pedestrian Crash Reduction measure.¹
- **Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities, Pedestrian Facilities and Safe Routes to School categories:** Points added 50% to Barriers Overcome measure and 50% to Deficiencies Corrected measure.
- **Bridges and Transit Expansion categories:** All points added to the Multimodal Elements and Connections measures.
- **Transit Modernization category:** *All points added to the Project Improvements for Transit Users measure.*
- **Travel Demand Management category:** All points added to the Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Reduction measure.

In the above bullets and table, the Transit categories are italicized because the Transit Planning Technical Work Group would prefer not to add points to any measure and TAC expressed agreement, along with comfort with having differing point totals across the application categories. The Bridges and Travel Demand Management (TDM) categories do not have direct safety measures, but TAC members expressed comfort with including the above measures in the increase. TAC members expressed preference towards using a 100-point increase, as opposed to 300 points. This is because the impact to measure weighting in the 300-point scenario is very large and something that impactful should be a part of the reevaluation process.

Table 2 seeks to indicate how these scoring changes might have impacted project selection in the 2022 Solicitation.

Table 2: Impact of 100- and 300-Point Safety Increases on the 2020 Regional Solicitation

Category	Total Apps	# Funded	# Apps that Change Rank added 100 pts	# Apps funded in place of another 100 pts	# Apps that Change Rank added 300 pts	# Apps funded in place of another 300 pts
Traffic Mgmt Tech	4	3	0	0	0	0
Spot Mob/Safe	10	6	0	0	4	1
Strat Cap.	11	4	2	0	7	1
Roadway Recon/Mod	31	18	17	1	21	1
Bridge	5	5	0	N/A*	0	N/A*
Transit Expansion	7	6	0	0	2	0
Transit Modernization	6	5	0	N/A*	0	N/A*
TDM	7	5	2	0	6	1
Multiuse Trail / Bike	49	18	29	1	45	2
Pedestrian Facilities	10	10	0	N/A*	0	N/A*
Safe Routes to School	10	10	3	N/A*	7	N/A*

* Because the Transit Modernization category funded all but the fifth-ranked project out of six, no funding line was considered. Funding lines are also not considered for the Bridges, Pedestrian Facilities, and Safe Routes to School categories because all projects were funded.

¹ Following a comment at TAC, the Funding & Programming Committee will weigh a 50/50 split versus a proportionate increase in the Crashes Reduced and Pedestrian Crash Reduction measures.

Breaking Ties – Staff Recommendation

Historically, TAB has been unwilling to “break” ties (i.e., fund one out of two projects with the same total score within a funding category). This can lead to suboptimal outcomes such as underfunding or overfunding an application category or not addressing geographic balance. TAB and Technical Committee members have expressed willingness to allow tie breakers. Two suggested options are shown below:

Option 1:

Scoring committees should use a tiebreaker to sort the ranking of two or more projects with the same score. For the 2024 Regional Solicitation, ties will be broken within funding categories by favoring the higher-scoring project in the safety-related measure shown below.

- a) *Traffic Management Technologies (6A), Spot Mobility and Safety (4B), Strategic Capacity (6A), and Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization (6A): **Crashes Reduced***
- b) *Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement: **Distance to Nearest Parallel Bridge** (Measure 1A)*
- c) *Transit Expansion (4) and Transit Modernization (5): **Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements and Connections***
- d) *Travel Demand Management: **Project Innovations & Geographic Expansion** (Measure 5)*
- e) *Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities, Pedestrian Facilities and Safe Routes to School: **Deficiencies Corrected / Safety Problems Addressed** (Measure 4B)*

Any ties that remain after this will favor (step 1) the lower federal amount of funding requested and (step 2 if step 1 results in a tie) the lower total amount of funding for the proposed project.

Option 2 (Following 4/4/2023 TAC Meeting):

Scoring committees should use a tiebreaker to sort the ranking of two or more projects with the same score. For the 2024 Regional Solicitation, ties will be broken within funding categories by favoring the higher-scoring project in the highest-value scoring measure. If that score is tied, the tiebreaker will move down to the next-highest-value measure until there is no tie.

Federal Maximum Awards – No Staff Recommendation

Since 2014, category maximum awards have not increased with inflation. At its March 16, 2023, meeting, the Funding & Programming Committee discussed increasing funding maximum amounts along with the fact that increased amounts would lead to funding fewer projects. Given that some categories have had more recent increases, it may not be necessary for every category to have the same proportionate increase.

Table 3 shows inflation on each funding maximum at 5% per year to 2024 (the year to be used for project cost estimations in the 2024 Regional Solicitation).

Staff explored the likely number of projects that would be funded with the following federal funding maximums:

- Strategic Capacity (\$12M; currently \$10M)
- Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization (\$10M; currently \$7M)
- Multiuse Trails and Bike Facilities (\$7M; currently \$5.5M)
- Pedestrian Facilities (\$3M; currently \$2M)
- Safe Routes to School (\$2M; currently \$1M)

This increase in the maximums would have resulted in 8-12 fewer projects being funded.

Staff is presenting this for informational purposes with no recommendation and is seeking feedback and preferred direction from members.



Table 3: 5% Inflation (First Year at Current Maximum Highlighted in Yellow)

	2014 Max	2024 Value	2016 Max	2024 Value	2018 Max	2024 Value	2020 Max	2024 Value	2022 Max	2024 Value
Roadways										
System Management/TMT	\$7M	\$11,402,262	\$7M	\$9,849,703	\$7M	\$9,380,669	\$3.5M	\$4,254,272	\$3.5M	\$3,858,750
Spot Mobility/Safety	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$3.5M	\$4,254,272	\$3.5M	\$3,858,750
Strategic Capacity	\$7M	\$11,402,262	\$7M	\$9,849,703	\$7M	\$9,380,669	\$10M	\$12,155,063	\$10M	\$11,025,000
Reconstruction/Modernization	\$7M	\$11,402,262	\$7M	\$9,849,703	\$7M	\$9,380,669	\$7M	\$8,508,544	\$7M	\$7,717,500
Bridge	\$7M	\$11,402,262	\$7M	\$9,849,703	\$7M	\$9,380,669	\$7M	\$8,508,544	\$7M	\$7,717,500
Transit										
Transit Expansion	\$7M	\$11,402,262	\$7M	\$9,849,703	\$7M	\$9,380,669	\$7M	\$8,508,544	\$7M	\$7,717,500
Transit Modernization	\$7M	\$11,402,262	\$7M	\$9,849,703	\$7M	\$9,380,669	\$7M	\$8,508,544	\$7M	\$7,717,500
ABRT	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$25M	\$30,387,656	\$25M	\$27,562,500
TDM	-	-	\$0.3M	\$422,130	\$0.5M	\$670,048	\$0.5M	\$607,753	\$0.5M	\$551,250
Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities										
Multiuse Trails / Bicycle	\$5.5M	\$8,958,920	\$5.5M	\$7,739,052	\$5.5M	\$7,370,526	\$5.5M	\$6,685,284	\$5.5M	\$6,063,750
Pedestrian Facilities	\$1M	\$1,628,895	\$1M	\$1,407,100	\$1M	\$1,340,096	\$1M	\$1,215,506	\$2M	\$2,205,000
Safe Routes to School	\$1M	\$1,628,895	\$1M	\$1,407,100	\$1M	\$1,340,096	\$1M	\$1,215,506	\$1M	\$1,102,500



ATTACHMENT 1: DRAFT CRITERIA WEIGHTING - ADDING 100 POINTS

Criteria	Traffic Mgmt. Tech.	Spot Mobility & Safety	Strategic Capacity	Roadway Recon / Mod	Roadway Bridges	Transit Exp	Transit Mod.	TDM	Multi-Use Trails & Bike Facility	Ped. Facility	Safe Routes to School
Role in the Regional System	16 <u>15</u> %	10%*	19 <u>18</u> %	10 <u>9</u> %	18 <u>16</u> %	9 <u>8</u> %	9 <u>8</u> %	18 <u>17</u> %	18 <u>17</u> %	14 <u>13</u> %	--
Usage	11 <u>10</u> %	--	16 <u>15</u> %	16 <u>15</u> %	12 <u>11</u> %	32 <u>29</u> %	30 <u>27</u> %	9 <u>8</u> %	18 <u>17</u> %	14 <u>13</u> %	23 <u>21</u> %
Safety	18 <u>25</u> %	30 <u>36</u> %	14 <u>21</u> %	16 <u>23</u> %	--	--	--	--	23 <u>29</u> %	27 <u>33</u> %	23 <u>29</u> %
Congestion /Air Quality	18 <u>17</u> %	25 <u>23</u> %	14 <u>13</u> %	7%*	--	18 <u>17</u> %	5 <u>4</u> %	27 <u>33</u> %	--	--	--
Infrastructure Age	7 <u>6</u> %	--	4 <u>3</u> %	16 <u>15</u> %	36 <u>33</u> %	--	--	--	--	--	--
Equity and Housing Performance	9 <u>8</u> %	9 <u>8</u> %	9 <u>8</u> %	9 <u>8</u> %	9 <u>8</u> %	18 <u>17</u> %	16 <u>15</u> %	14 <u>13</u> %	11 <u>10</u> %	11 <u>10</u> %	11 <u>10</u> %
Multimodal Facilities	5 <u>4</u> %	9 <u>8</u> %	9 <u>8</u> %	10 <u>9</u> %	9 <u>17</u> %	9 <u>17</u> %	9 <u>8</u> %	--	9 <u>8</u> %	14 <u>13</u> %	--
Risk Assessment	7 <u>6</u> %	7 <u>6</u> %	7 <u>6</u> %	7 <u>6</u> %	7 <u>6</u> %	5 <u>4</u> %	5 <u>4</u> %	5 <u>4</u> %	12 <u>11</u> %	12 <u>11</u> %	12 <u>11</u> %
Relationship Between SRTS Elements	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	23 <u>21</u> %
Transit Improvements	--	--	--	--	--	--	18 <u>25</u> %	--	--	--	--
TDM Innovation	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	18 <u>17</u> %	--	--	--
Cost Effectiveness	9 <u>8</u> %	9 <u>8</u> %	9 <u>8</u> %	9 <u>8</u> %	9 <u>8</u> %	9 <u>8</u> %	9 <u>8</u> %	9 <u>8</u> %	9 <u>8</u> %	9 <u>8</u> %	9 <u>8</u> %
Total Points 1,190	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200

***Some criteria show no change due to rounding to the nearest integer.**

ATTACHMENT 1A: ROADWAY MEASURES

Criteria and Measures	Traffic Mgmt	Spot Mob.	Strat Cap.	Recon/Mod	Bridge
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	175	115	210	105	195
Distance to the nearest parallel bridge					100
Congestion, Adjacent Congestion, or PA Intersection Conversion Study Priorities		70	80		
Functional Classification of project	50				
Connection to Total Jobs, Manu/Dist. Jobs, and Post-Secondary Students			50	65	30
Integration within existing traffic management systems	50				
Highway Truck Corridor Tiers	50	45	80	40	65
Coordination with other agencies	25				
Usage	125		175	175	130
Current daily person throughput	85		110	110	100
Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume	40		65	65	30
Equity and Housing Performance	100	100	100	100	100
Engagements	30	30	30	30	30
Benefits and Impacts to Disadvantaged Populations	40	40	40	40	40
Affordable Housing Access	30	30	30	30	30
Infrastructure Age/Condition	75		40	175	400
Date of construction			40	50	
Upgrades to obsolete equipment	75				
Geometric, structural, or infrastructure deficiencies				125	
Bridge Sufficiency Rating					300
Load-Posting					100
Congestion Reduction/Air Quality	200	275	150	80	
Vehicle delay reduced		200	100	50	
Congested roadway (V/C Ratio)	150				
Kg of emissions reduced		75	50	30	
Emissions and congestion benefits of project	50				
Safety	200 300	335 435	150 250	180 280	
Crashes reduced	50 100	235 285	120 170	150 200	
Safety issues in project area	150 200				
Pedestrian Crash Reduction (Proactive)		100 150	30 80	30 80	
Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections	50	100	100	110	100 200
Transit, bicycle, pedestrian, elements and connections	50	100	100	110	100 200
Risk Assessment	75	75	75	75	75
Risk Assessment Form	75	75	75	75	75
Cost Effectiveness	100	100	100	100	100
Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total project cost)	100	100	100	100	100
Total	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100

ATTACHMENT 1B: TRANSIT MEASURES

Criteria and Measures	Transit Expansion	Transit Modernization
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	100	100
Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions	50	50
Average number of weekday transit trips connected to the project	50	50
Usage	350	325
Existing Riders		325
New Annual Riders	350	
Equity and Housing Performance	200	175
Engagements	60	50
Benefits and Impacts to Disadvantaged Populations	80	75
Affordable Housing Access	60	50
Emissions Reduction	200	50
Total emissions reduced	200	50
Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections	100 200	100
Bicycle and pedestrian elements of the project and connections	100 200	100
Risk Assessment	50	50
Risk Assessment Form	50	50
Service and Customer Improvements		200 300
Project improvement for transit users		200 300
Cost Effectiveness	100	100
Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total annual project cost)	100	100
Total	1,100	1,100

ATTACHMENT 1C: TDM MEASURES

Criteria and Measures	Points
1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	200
Ability to capitalize on existing regional transportation facilities and resources	200
2. Usage	100
Users	100
3. Equity and Housing Performance	150
Engagements	45
Benefits and Impacts to Disadvantaged Populations	60
Affordable Housing Access	45
4. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality	300 400
Congested roadways in project area	150
VMT reduced	150 250
5. Innovation	200
Project innovations and geographic expansion	200
6. Risk Assessment	50
Technical capacity of applicant's organization	25
Continuation of project after initial federal funds are expended	25
7. Cost Effectiveness	100
Cost effectiveness (total project cost/total points awarded)	100
Total	1,100

ATTACHMENT 1D: BIKE / PEDESTRIAN MEASURES

Criteria and Measures	Multiuse Trails / Bike	Pedestrian	SRTS
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	200	150	
Identify location of project relative to Regional Bicycle Transportation Network	200		
Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions		150	
Potential Usage	200	150	250
Existing population and employment within 1 mile	200		
Existing population within ½ mile		150	
Average share of student population that bikes, walks, or uses transit			170
Student population within school's walkshed			80
Equity and Housing Performance	120	120	120
Engagements	36	36	36
Benefits and Impacts to Disadvantaged Populations	48	48	48
Affordable Housing Access	36	36	36
Deficiencies and Safety	250350	300400	250350
Barriers overcome or gaps filled	100 150	120 170	100 150
Deficiencies corrected or safety problem addressed	150 200	180 230	150 200
Multimodal Facilities and Existing Connections	100	150	
Transit or pedestrian elements of the project and existing connections	100	150	
Risk Assessment/Public Engagement	130	130	130
Risk Assessment Form	130	130	85
Public Engagement			45
Relationship between Safe Routes to School Program Elements			250
Describe how project addresses 6 Es of SRTS Program			150
Completion of Safe Routes to School Plan			100
Cost Effectiveness	100	100	100
Measure A-Cost effectiveness (Total project cost/total points awarded)	100	100	100
Total	1,1001,200	1,1001,200	1,1001,200

ATTACHMENT 2: DRAFT CRITERIA WEIGHTING - ADDING 300 POINTS

Criteria	Traffic Mgmt. Tech.	Spot Mobility & Safety	Strategic Capacity	Roadway Recon / Mod	Roadway Bridges	Transit Exp	Transit Mod.	TDM	Multi-Use Trails & Bike Facility	Ped. Facility	Safe Routes to School
Role in the Regional System	16 13%	10 8%	19 15%	10 8%	18 14%	9 7%	9 7%	18 15%	18 14%	14 11%	--
Usage	11 9%	--	16 13%	16 13%	12 9%	32 25%	30 23%	9 7%	18 14%	14 11%	23 18%
Safety	18 36%	30 45%	14 32%	16 34%	--	--	--	--	23 39%	27 43%	23 39%
Congestion /Air Quality	18 14%	25 20%	14 11%	7 6%	--	18 14%	5 4%	27 43%	--	--	--
Infrastructure Age	7 5%	--	4 3%	16 13%	36 29%	--	--	--	--	--	--
Equity and Housing Performance	9 7%	9 7%	9 7%	9 7%	9 7%	18 14%	16 13%	14 11%	11 9%	11 9%	11 9%
Multimodal Facilities	5 4%	9 7%	9 7%	10 8%	9 29%	9 29%	9 7%	--	9 7%	14 11%	--
Risk Assessment	7 6%	7 5%	7 5%	7 5%	7 5%	5 4%	5 4%	5 4%	12 9%	12 9%	12 9%
Relationship Between SRTS Elements	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	23 18%
Transit Improvements	--	--	--	--	--	--	18 36%	--	--	--	--
TDM Innovation	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	18 14%	--	--	--
Cost Effectiveness	9 7%	9 7%	9 7%	9 7%	9 7%	9 7%	9 7%	9 7%	9 7%	9 7%	9 7%
Total Points 1,100	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400

ATTACHMENT 2A: ROADWAY MEASURES

Criteria and Measures	Traffic Mgmt	Spot Mob.	Strat Cap.	Recon/Mod	Bridge
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	175	115	210	105	195
Distance to the nearest parallel bridge					100
Congestion, Adjacent Congestion, or PA Intersection Conversion Study Priorities		70	80		
Functional Classification of project	50				
Connection to Total Jobs, Manu/Dist. Jobs, and Post-Secondary Students			50	65	30
Integration within existing traffic management systems	50				
Highway Truck Corridor Tiers	50	45	80	40	65
Coordination with other agencies	25				
Usage	125		175	175	130
Current daily person throughput	85		110	110	100
Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume	40		65	65	30
Equity and Housing Performance	100	100	100	100	100
Engagements	30	30	30	30	30
Benefits and Impacts to Disadvantaged Populations	40	40	40	40	40
Affordable Housing Access	30	30	30	30	30
Infrastructure Age/Condition	75		40	175	400
Date of construction			40	50	
Upgrades to obsolete equipment	75				
Geometric, structural, or infrastructure deficiencies				125	
Bridge Sufficiency Rating					300
Load-Posting					100
Congestion Reduction/Air Quality	200	275	150	80	
Vehicle delay reduced		200	100	50	
Congested roadway (V/C Ratio)	150				
Kg of emissions reduced		75	50	30	
Emissions and congestion benefits of project	50				
Safety	200 500	335 635	150 450	180 480	
Crashes reduced	50 200	235 335	120 270	150 300	
Safety issues in project area	150 300				
Pedestrian Crash Reduction (Proactive)		100 300	30 180	30 180	
Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections	50	100	100	110	100 400
Transit, bicycle, pedestrian, elements and connections	50	100	100	110	100 400
Risk Assessment	75	75	75	75	75
Risk Assessment Form	75	75	75	75	75
Cost Effectiveness	100	100	100	100	100
Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total project cost)	100	100	100	100	100
Total	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100

ATTACHMENT 2B: TRANSIT MEASURES

Criteria and Measures	Transit Expansion	Transit Modernization
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	100	100
Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions	50	50
Average number of weekday transit trips connected to the project	50	50
Usage	350	325
Existing Riders		325
New Annual Riders	350	
Equity and Housing Performance	200	175
Engagements	60	50
Benefits and Impacts to Disadvantaged Populations	80	75
Affordable Housing Access	60	50
Emissions Reduction	200	50
Total emissions reduced	200	50
Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections	100 200	100
Bicycle and pedestrian elements of the project and connections	100 200	100
Risk Assessment	50	50
Risk Assessment Form	50	50
Service and Customer Improvements		200 500
Project improvement for transit users		200 500
Cost Effectiveness	100	100
Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total annual project cost)	100	100
Total	1,100	1,100

ATTACHMENT 2C: TDM MEASURES

Criteria and Measures	Points
1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	200
Ability to capitalize on existing regional transportation facilities and resources	200
2. Usage	100
Users	100
3. Equity and Housing Performance	150
Engagements	45
Benefits and Impacts to Disadvantaged Populations	60
Affordable Housing Access	45
4. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality	300 600
Congested roadways in project area	150
VMT reduced	150 450
5. Innovation	200
Project innovations and geographic expansion	200
6. Risk Assessment	50
Technical capacity of applicant's organization	25
Continuation of project after initial federal funds are expended	25
7. Cost Effectiveness	100
Cost effectiveness (total project cost/total points awarded)	100
Total	1,100

ATTACHMENT 2D: BIKE / PEDESTRIAN MEASURES

Criteria and Measures	Multiuse Trails / Bike	Pedestrian	SRTS
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	200	150	
Identify location of project relative to Regional Bicycle Transportation Network	200		
Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions		150	
Potential Usage	200	150	250
Existing population and employment within 1 mile	200		
Existing population within ½ mile		150	
Average share of student population that bikes, walks, or uses transit			170
Student population within school's walkshed			80
Equity and Housing Performance	120	120	120
Engagements	36	36	36
Benefits and Impacts to Disadvantaged Populations	48	48	48
Affordable Housing Access	36	36	36
Deficiencies and Safety	250550	300600	250550
Barriers overcome or gaps filled	100 250	120 270	100 250
Deficiencies corrected or safety problem addressed	150 300	180 330	150 300
Multimodal Facilities and Existing Connections	100	150	
Transit or pedestrian elements of the project and existing connections	100	150	
Risk Assessment/Public Engagement	130	130	130
Risk Assessment Form	130	130	85
Public Engagement			45
Relationship between Safe Routes to School Program Elements			250
Describe how project addresses 6 Es of SRTS Program			150
Completion of Safe Routes to School Plan			100
Cost Effectiveness	100	100	100
Measure A-Cost effectiveness (Total project cost/total points awarded)	100	100	100
Total	1,1001,200	1,1001,200	1,1001,200