

Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects Evaluation Criteria

Previous Criteria or COG Proposal

Proposed Criteria

1	Will be part of an existing trail, bicycle or pedestrian network	9%
	<i>Addresses continued system continuity</i>	
2	The project will enhance or extend an existing trail or bicycle facility	
1	The project is a stand alone project not connecting or enhancing an existing facility	

1	Will be part of an existing trail, bicycle or pedestrian network	10%	Comments
	<i>Addresses continued system continuity</i>		
2	The project will enhance or extend an existing trail or bicycle facility		Recommend changes. May want to combine with category 6. Projects receiving points in this category will also receive points in criterion 6.
1	The project is a stand alone project not connecting or enhancing an existing facility		

2	Will provide for enhanced use by a variety of bicyclists and trail patrons	9%
	<i>Improves the access to major services through an improved and expanded bicycle and/or trail system</i>	
2	Directly serves a hospital or major government, office or shopping center	
1	Indirectly serves a hospital or major government, office or shopping center	
0	Does not directly or indirectly serve a hospital or major government, office or shopping center	

2	Will provide for enhanced use by a variety of bicyclists and trail patrons	10%	Comments
	<i>Improves the access to major services through an improved and expanded bicycle and/or trail system</i>		
2	Directly serves a hospital or major government, office or shopping center		No recommended changes.
1	Indirectly serves a hospital or major government, office or shopping center		
0	Does not directly or indirectly serve a hospital or major government, office or shopping center		

3	Will accommodate both trail patrons/bicyclists and pedestrian users	9%
	<i>The project has the ability to accommodate more than one form of alternative transportation</i>	
2	Both bicyclists and pedestrians will use the facility	
1	The project will primarily benefit either bicyclists or pedestrians, but not both	

3	Will accommodate both trail patrons/bicyclists and pedestrian users	10%	Comments
	<i>The project has the ability to accommodate more than one form of alternative transportation</i>		
2	Both bicyclists and pedestrians will use the facility		No recommended changes
1	The project will primarily benefit either bicyclists or pedestrians, but not both		

4	The project bridges an obstacle or provides a more direct route (reducing significant out-of-direction travel)	9%
	<i>The project reduces travel time and distance</i>	
2	Yes	
0	No	

4	The project bridges an obstacle or provides a more direct route (reducing significant out-of-direction travel)	10%	Comments
	<i>The project reduces travel time and distance</i>		
2	Yes		No recommended changes
0	No		

5	Provides connectivity to other modes of travel	9%
	<i>Enhances the regional transportation system connectivity and ability to reduce trips</i>	
2	Yes, the project connects more than three modes of transportation	
1	Yes, the project connects two other modes of transportation	
0	No, the project does not provide for enhanced intermodal connectivity	

5	Provides connectivity to other modes of travel	10%	Comments
	<i>Enhances the regional transportation system connectivity and ability to reduce trips</i>		
2	Yes, the project connects more than three modes of transportation		No recommended changes
1	Yes, the project connects two other modes of transportation		
0	No, the project does not provide for enhanced intermodal connectivity		

6	Is consistent with current plans and policies	9%
	<i>Implements an existing plan or policy</i>	
2	Yes	
0	No	

6	Is consistent with current plans and policies	10%	Comments
	<i>Implements an existing plan or policy</i>		
2	Yes		No recommended changes
0	No		

Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects Evaluation Criteria

Previous Criteria or COG Proposal

7	Funding is available for a local match	9%
	<i>Insures that the project can be funded and sustained over time</i>	
2	A local match greater than 25% of the project cost is available for the project	
1	A local match between 5% and 25% of the project cost is available for the project	
0	A local of at least 5% of the project cost is not available for the project	

8	Improves pedestrian and bicycle user safety	9%
	<i>Improved trail/bicycle user safety</i>	
2	The project includes lighting, drainage, improved visibility, hazard elimination, etc. that will enhance trail/bike safety	
1	The project does not include ancillary improvements that will enhance safety	

9	Supports Blueprint smart growth principles (6 points possible)	27%
	<i>Project furthers implementation of the regional blueprint</i>	
1	Create walkable neighborhoods	
1	Foster distinctive, attractive communities with a strong sense of place	
1	Mix land uses	
1	Preserve open space, farmland, natural beauty, and critical environmental areas	
1	Provide a variety of transportation choices	
1	Enhance the economic vitality of the region	

Proposed Criteria

7	Funding is available for a local match	0%
	<i>Insures that the project can be funded and sustained over time</i>	
2	A local match greater than 25% of the project cost is available for the project	
1	A local match between 5% and 25% of the project cost is available for the project	Recommend eliminating this criterion for the RTP.
0	A local of at least 5% of the project cost is not available for the project	

8	Improves pedestrian and bicycle user safety	10%
	<i>Improved trail/bicycle user safety</i>	
2	The project includes lighting, drainage, improved visibility, hazard elimination, etc. that will enhance trail/bike safety	Change points for projects that do not provide safety improvements to 0.
0	The project does not include ancillary improvements that will enhance safety	

9	Supports Blueprint smart growth principles (6 points possible)	30%
	<i>Project furthers implementation of the regional blueprint</i>	
1	Create walkable neighborhoods	
1	Foster distinctive, attractive communities with a strong sense of place	
1	Mix land uses	No recommended changes
1	Preserve open space, farmland, natural beauty, and critical environmental areas	
1	Provide a variety of transportation choices	
1	Enhance the economic vitality of the region	

22 Total Points

20

Transit Projects Evaluation Criteria

Previous Criteria or COG Proposal

Proposed Criteria

1	<i>Is consistent with current plans and policies</i>	7%
	<i>Implements an existing plan or policy</i>	
2	Yes, is consistent with the RTP and short range transit plan	
1	Yes, is consistent with either the RTP or short range transit plan	
0	No, is not consistent with either RTP or short range transit plan	

1	<i>Is consistent with current plans and policies</i>	Comments	7%
	<i>Implements an existing plan or policy</i>		
2	Yes, is consistent with the RTP and short range transit plan	Need explanation of "consistency with the RTP" since this criteria is to develop a financially constrained list for the RTP. Also need guidelines on what a short range transit plan consists of.	
1	Yes, is consistent with the RTP and short range transit plan		
0	No, is not consistent with either RTP or short range transit plan		

2	<i>Operating costs are funded over time</i>	7%
	<i>Insures that the project can be sustained over time</i>	
2	Yes, funds are contained in an approved budget for project operations	
0	No, Funds are not contained in an approved budget for project operations	

2	<i>Operating costs are funded over time</i>	Comments	7%
	<i>Insures that the project can be sustained over time</i>		
2	Yes, funds are contained in an approved budget for project operations	Coincides with criterion 6.	
0	No, Funds are not contained in an approved budget for project operations		

3	<i>Provides improved access to essential services</i>	7%
	<i>Improves access to major services through an expanded transit system</i>	
2	Directly serves an essential activity center or service	
1	Indirectly serves an essential activity center or service	
0	Does not directly or indirectly serve an essential activity center or service	

3	<i>Provides improved access to essential services</i>	Comments	7%
	<i>Improves access to major services through an expanded transit system</i>		
2	Directly serves an essential activity center or service	No recommended changes	
1	Indirectly serves an essential activity center or service		
0	Does not directly or indirectly serve an essential activity center or service		

4	<i>Project will maintain established productivity standards</i>	10%
	<i>The project can be supported and operated over time</i>	
3	Will exceed established productivity standards	
2	Yes, all productivity standards can be maintained	
1	Two or more productivity standards can be maintained	
0	Productivity standards cannot be maintained by the project	

4	<i>Project will maintain established productivity standards</i>	Comments	10%
	<i>The project can be supported and operated over time</i>		
3	Will exceed established productivity standards	Define productivity standards. Are they consistent among agencies?	
2	Yes, all productivity standards can be maintained		
1	Two or more productivity standards can be maintained		
0	Productivity standards cannot be maintained by the project		

5	<i>Project provides for or promotes intermodal connectivity</i>	7%
	<i>The project enhances the regional transportation system</i>	
2	Yes, the project connects more than three other modes of transportation	
1	Yes, the project connects two other modes of transportation	
0	No, the project does not provide for enhanced intermodal connectivity	

5	<i>Project provides for or promotes intermodal connectivity</i>	Comments	7%
	<i>The project enhances the regional transportation system</i>		
2	Yes, the project connects more than three other modes of transportation	No recommended changes	
1	Yes, the project connects two other modes of transportation		
0	No, the project does not provide for enhanced intermodal connectivity		

6	<i>Fares are sufficient to maintain State required minimums</i>	7%
	<i>The project is supported through a combination of fares and subsidies consistent with State requirements</i>	
2	Yes	
0	No	

6	<i>Fares are sufficient to maintain State required minimums</i>	Comments	7%
	<i>The project is supported through a combination of fares and subsidies consistent with State requirements</i>		
2	Yes	No comments	
0	No		

7	<i>Project serves a transportation disadvantaged population</i>	7%
	<i>Project provides essential services to the transit dependent population</i>	
2	A large transportation disadvantaged population center or community (population greater than 5,000) will be served by the project.	
1	A transportation disadvantaged population center or community (population less than 5,000) will be served by the project.	
0	The project will serve a transportation disadvantaged population center or community.	

7	<i>Project serves a transportation disadvantaged population</i>	Comments	7%
	<i>Project provides essential services to the transit dependent population</i>		
2	A large transportation disadvantaged population center or community (population greater than 5,000) will be served by the project.	Define transportation disadvantaged	
1	A transportation disadvantaged population center or community (population less than 5,000) will be served by the project.		
0	The project will not serve a transportation disadvantaged population center or community.		

Transit Projects Evaluation Criteria

Previous Criteria or COG Proposal

8	Project enhances interagency service coordination	7%
	<i>Enhances regional transportation system connectivity and ability to reduce regional trips</i>	
2	Three transit agencies are participating in the project	
1	Two transit agencies are participating in the project	
0	Project does not involve more than one agency	

Proposed Criteria

8	Project enhances interagency service coordination	7%	Comments
	<i>Enhances regional transportation system connectivity and ability to reduce regional trips</i>		
2	Three transit agencies are participating in the project		No recommended changes
1	Two transit agencies are participating in the project		
0	Project does not involve more than one agency		

9	Project reduces reliance on private automobiles	7%
	<i>Enhances air quality and reduces peak automobile travel</i>	
2	The project involves new or enhanced commuter service	
1	The project involves new or enhanced access to services (medical, government, other essential activity centers)	
0	The project does not involve new or enhanced commuter service or access to essential services	

9	Project reduces reliance on private automobiles	7%	Comments
	<i>Enhances air quality and reduces peak automobile travel</i>		
2	The project involves new or enhanced commuter service		No recommended changes
1	The project involves new or enhanced access to services (medical, government, other essential activity centers)		
0	The project does not involve new or enhanced commuter service or access to essential services		

10	Project will enhance part of an existing transit service	7%
	<i>Addresses continued system continuity</i>	
2	The project will enhance or extend an existing transit facility or service	
0	The project is a stand alone project not connecting or enhancing and existing facility or service	

10	Project will enhance part of an existing transit service	7%	Comments
	<i>Addresses continued system continuity</i>		
2	The project will enhance or extend an existing transit facility or service		No recommended changes
0	The project is a stand alone project not connecting or enhancing and existing facility or service		

11	Project reduces vehicle and/or parking congestion	7%
	<i>Reduces commuter or special event trips</i>	
2	The project involves new or enhanced express transit service along a congested (LOS E or F) corridor	
1	The project involves shuttle service for major events in congested areas such as in the City center	
0	The project will not reduce traffic congestion along a deficient corridor or in a city center	

11	Project reduces vehicle and/or parking congestion	7%	Comments
	<i>Reduces commuter or special event trips</i>		
2	The project involves new or enhanced express transit service along a congested (LOS E or F) corridor		No recommended changes
1	The project involves shuttle service for major events in congested areas such as in the City center		
0	The project will not reduce traffic congestion along a deficient corridor or in a city center		

12	Supports Blueprint smart growth principles	21%
	<i>Project furthers implementation of the regional blueprint</i>	
1	Create walkable neighborhoods	
1	Foster distinctive, attractive communities with a strong sense of place	
1	Mix land uses	
1	Preserve open space, farmland, natural beauty, and critical environmental areas	
1	Provide a variety of transportation choices	
1	Enhance the economic vitality of the region	

12	Supports Blueprint smart growth principles	21%	Comments
	<i>Project furthers implementation of the regional blueprint</i>		
1	Create walkable neighborhoods		It doesn't seem like most transit projects can meet these criteria directly (except maybe the 5th item).
1	Foster distinctive, attractive communities with a strong sense of place		
1	Mix land uses		
1	Preserve open space, farmland, natural beauty, and critical environmental areas		
1	Provide a variety of transportation choices		
1	Enhance the economic vitality of the region		

Road Capital and Operations Projects Evaluation Criteria

Previous Criteria or COG Proposal

Proposed Criteria

1	Cost benefit/usage: (considers Year 2025 traffic)	8%
	<i>A cost/benefit ratio of 1.0 establishes a cost effective improvement project.</i>	
4	Has a Benefit/Cost Ratio of 20.1 or higher	
3	Has a Benefit/Cost Ratio of 10.1 to 20.0.	
2	Has a Benefit/Cost Ratio of 5.1 to 10.0	
1	Has a Benefit/Cost Ratio of 1.0 to 5.0	
0	Has a Benefit/Cost Ratio less than 1.0	

1	Cost per trip served = Project Cost / (ADT X Length X Design Life)	Comments	13%
	<i>A lower cost per trip served is a more cost effective project</i>		
8	In lowest 20% of qualified projects	<p>Cost versus usage should carry greater weight than 4 points out of a possible 48 (8.5%). The previous criteria, even though it was termed a "Benefit/Cost Ratio" was applied to all projects with the variables being the ADT, the length of the project, and the design life. The dollar amount that was previously assigned and originated from the FHWA through VRPA served as a factor for the variables. In a true Benefit /cost analysis, the value of the benefits versus to cost of the project would need to exceed a value of 1.0 in order to be a viable project. For the purposes of the RTP and simply ranking projects, it is my opinion that the value of the benefits is not necessary. The variables of ADT, project length, and project life are, however relevant in determining which projects are the most important. Recommend doubling the points in this category. We may also want to consider standardizing the way the costs of these projects is estimated among the agencies (ie. using the same unit costs for the construction elements or cost per lane mile).</p>	
6	In between the lowest 40% and lowest 20% of qualified projects		
4	In between the lowest 60% and lowest 40% of qualified projects		
2	In between the lowest 80% and lowest 60% of qualified projects		
0	In highest 20% of qualified projects		

2	Improved Level of Service	21%
	<i>Improves existing congestion and delay at the most critical locations</i>	
	URBAN	RURAL
10	F to D	F to C
9	E to D	F to D
8	F to E	F to E
7	F to F w/identified project for traffic signal synchronization, transit service, or bike facilities	E to C
6	F to F but provided enhanced capacity or serves an existing unserved demand for more than 30 minutes in the peak hour	E to D
5	F to F - allows improved lane utilization	D to C
4	F to C	NA
3	E to C	NA
2	D to C	NA
1	C or worse to B	C or worse to B
0	C or worse to A	C or worse to A

2	Improved Level of Service	Comments	26%
	<i>Improves existing congestion and delay at the most critical locations</i>		
	URBAN	RURAL	
16	F to D or better	F to C or better	<p>Improving the LOS to an acceptable level for streets that are at LOS of F or E are the most important in terms of reducing vehicle delay. These are the projects that should receive the most points. The weight of this category (10 out of 48 or 21%) seems like it may be a little low. Recommend increasing the points available.</p> <p>It is presumed that the LOS in the year of construction would be the basis for determining the "existing" and "improved" LOS. If this is the case, it seems determining the appropriate LOS to use as the basis for scoring would require a model run for each year of the proposed RTP. Is this feasible?</p>
14	E to D or better	F to D or better	
12	F to E	F to E	
10	F to F w/identified project for traffic signal synchronization, transit service, or bike facilities	E to C	
9	F to F but provided enhanced capacity or serves an existing unserved demand for more than 30 minutes in the peak hour	E to D	
8	F to F - allows improved lane utilization	D to C	
6	D to C or better	NA	
5	C to B or better	NA	
0	Does not improve LOS	Does not improve LOS	

3	Improves Air Quality	21%
	<i>Reduces nonattainment air Emissions</i>	
10	Project includes synchronization of traffic signals for more than 6 traffic signals and 3 consecutive miles	
9	Project provides a connection over, under, or through an existing circulation barrier such as a freeway, railroad, waterway.	
8	Project includes a new connection to state freeway roadway system or has freeway auxiliary lanes to serve weave or queues	
7	Project includes trail or bike lanes	
6	Project connects roadway by widening bottleneck to connect with two already widened roadway segments	
5	Project is already served by transit at least twice per hour during peak hours	
4	Project has parallel facilities within a mile that operate at LOS F	
3	Project enhances an existing safety deficiency that regularly causes significant delays and congestion.	
2	Project promotes pedestrian walkability	
1	Project relocates an existing bottleneck to a different location	

3	Improves Air Quality	Comments	16%
	<i>Reduces Emissions</i>		
10	Project includes synchronization of traffic signals for more than 6 traffic signals and 3 consecutive miles	<p>Not in favor of assigning 1 point for each. For example, a project along a major corridor that synchronizes a 3-mile stretch of traffic signals does substantially much more to reduce emissions (10 points suggested) than a project that adds sidewalks (suggested 2 points). If these two projects were separate and stand alone, they should not be scored the same.</p> <p>Still considering points awarded to these criteria.</p>	
9	Project provides a connection over, under, or through an existing circulation barrier such as a freeway, railroad, waterway.		
8	Project includes a new connection to state freeway roadway system or has freeway auxiliary lanes to serve weave or queues		
7	Project includes trail or bike lanes		
6	Project connects roadway by widening bottleneck to connect with two already widened roadway segments		
5	Project is already served by transit at least twice per hour during peak hours		
4	Project has parallel facilities within a mile that operate at LOS F		
3	Project enhances an existing safety deficiency that regularly causes significant delays and congestion.		
2	Project promotes pedestrian walkability		
0	Project relocates an existing bottleneck to a different location		

Road Capital and Operations Projects Evaluation Criteria

Previous Criteria or COG Proposal

4	Is Environmentally Sensitive	10%
	<i>The project has the ability to be implemented without significant mitigation costs and environmental assessment.</i>	
5	Environmental Document Completed W/O Overriding Considerations	
4	Categorical Exemption/Exclusion	
3	ND Without Mitigation Measures	
2	ND With Mitigation Measures	
1	EIR/EIS With Mitigation Measures	
0	EIR/EIS With Mitigation Measures and Overriding Considerations	

5	Serves a major employment area(s) (improves the economic well-being)	4%
	<i>Improves the economic well-being of the adjacent area.</i>	
2	Directly serves an Employment Center	
1	Indirectly serves an Employment Center	
0	Does not directly or indirectly serve an Employment Center	

6	Provides improved access to essential services	4%
	<i>Improves the access to major services through an improved and expanded street road system</i>	
2	Directly serves a hospital or major government, office or shopping center	
1	Indirectly serves a hospital or major government, office or shopping center	
0	Does not directly or indirectly serve a hospital or major government, office or shopping center	

7	The entity is able to demonstrate that the project can be sustained over time	4%
	<i>Insures that the project can be sustained over time</i>	
2	Yes	
0	No	

8	Project Improves Safety	10%
	<i>Safety is improved with roadway widening</i>	
5	Improves safety on a high speed roadway greater than 50 MPH (85 percentile) or weave operations (auxiliary lanes)	
4	Improves safety on a moderate speed roadway greater than 35 MPH (85 percentile) or provides synchronization to reduce stop and go	
3	Involves a roadway or intersections with 5 or more correctable accidents	
2	Involves improvements for railroad grade separation or improvement to RR at grade facility	
1	Improves pedestrian or bicycle safety and interaction with vehicles	

9	Supports Other Modes of Transportation	4%
	<i>Adresses multi-modal policies in the RTP</i>	
2	Yes - Project includes the construction of planned trail/bike lanes, sidewalks, transit systems.amenities, or other modal improvements	
1	Yes - Project provides for future planned trail/bike lanes, sidewalks, transit systems.amenities, or other modal improvements within ROW.	
0	No	

Proposed Criteria

4	Environmental Sensitivity		Comments
	<i>The project has the ability to be implemented without significant mitigation costs and environmental assessment.</i>		
3	No obvious environmental issues.		Majority of projects at RTP stage will have no environmental work done. Recommend eliminating this category or making it an all or nothing category that assigns points to all projects that have no obvious environmental issues. Projects that would qualify for points would be those that are consistent with a general plan document that is supported by a program level EIR and do not have obvious environmental issues such as stream alterations, known archaeological sites, right-of-way constraints or are new roadway alignments. This may be difficult for COG staff to score unless they rely on a questionnaire form submitting agencies. Perhaps change to a project readiness category?
0	Potential issues requiring mitigation exist.		

5	Serves a major employment area(s) (improves the economic well-being)		Comments
	<i>Improves the economic well-being of the adjacent area.</i>		
2	Directly serves an Employment Center		COG proposed criteria seems appropriate
1	Indirectly serves an Employment Center		
0	Does not directly or indirectly serve an Employment Center		

6	Provides improved access to essential services		Comments
	<i>Improves the access to major services through an improved and expanded street road system</i>		
2	Directly serves a hospital or major government, office or shopping center		COG proposed criteria seems appropriate
1	Indirectly serves a hospital or major government, office or shopping center		
0	Does not directly or indirectly serve a hospital or major government, office or shopping center		

7	The entity is able to demonstrate that the project can be sustained over time		Comments
	<i>Insures that the project can be sustained over time</i>		
2	Yes		COG proposed criteria seems appropriate. How will it be evaluated? May be a criteria that can be eliminated?
0	No		

8	Project Improves Safety		Comments
	<i>Safety is improved with roadway widening</i>		
5	Improves safety on a high speed roadway greater than 50 MPH (85 percentile) or weave operations (auxiliary lanes)		Consider revisions to points awarded to these categories.
4	Improves safety on a moderate speed roadway greater than 35 MPH (85 percentile) or provides synchronization to reduce stop and go		
3	Involves a roadway or intersections with high accident frequency		
2	Involves improvements for railroad grade separation or improvement to RR at grade facility		
1	Improves pedestrian or bicycle safety and interaction with vehicles		

9	Supports Other Modes of Transportation		Comments
	<i>Adresses multi-modal policies in the RTP</i>		
2	Yes - Project includes the construction of planned trail/bike lanes, sidewalks, transit systems.amenities, or other modal improvements		COG proposed criteria seems appropriate
1	Yes - Project provides for future planned trail/bike lanes, sidewalks, transit systems.amenities, or other modal improvements within ROW.		
0	No		

Road Capital and Operations Projects Evaluation Criteria

Previous Criteria or COG Proposal

Proposed Criteria

10	<i>Supports Blueprint smart growth principles</i>	13%
	<i>Project furthers implementation of the regional blueprint</i>	
1	Create walkable neighborhoods	
1	Foster distinctive, attractive communities with a strong sense of place	
1	Mix land uses	
1	Preserve open space, farmland, natural beauty, and critical environmental areas	
1	Provide a variety of transportation choices	
1	Enhance the economic vitality of the region	

10	<i>Supports Blueprint smart growth principles</i>		Comments	10%
	<i>Project furthers implementation of the regional blueprint</i>			
1	Create walkable neighborhoods		COG proposed criteria seems appropriate	
1	Foster distinctive, attractive communities with a strong sense of place			
1	Mix land uses			
1	Preserve open space, farmland, natural beauty, and critical environmental areas			
1	Provide a variety of transportation choices			
1	Enhance the economic vitality of the region			

11	<i>Estimated Project timing</i>		Comments	8%
	<i>More imminent projects are higher priority than those that are not ready for construction</i>			
5	Project is scheduled for construction within the next 5 years			
4	Project is scheduled for construction within 5 to 10 years			
3	Project is scheduled for construction within 10 to 15 years			
2	Project is scheduled for construction within 15 to 20 years			
1	Project is scheduled for construction within 20 to 25 years			
0	Project is scheduled for construction in more than 25 years			

48 Total Points

61 Total Points