

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

Meeting Minutes
November 4, 2015

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Brad Birge, City of Saratoga Springs
Frank Bonafide, NYS Department of Transportation- Region 1
Melissa Cherubino, City of Cohoes
Darrell Duncan, Albany County
Ross Farrell, Capital District Transportation Authority
Steve Feeney, Schenectady County, Vice Chair
Rocky Ferraro, Capital District Regional Planning Commission
Michael Franchini, Capital District Transportation Committee,
Secretary
Stephen Iachetta, Albany County Airport Authority, Chair
Andrew Kreshik, City of Troy
Randy Milano, City of Albany
Charles Moore, City of Rensselaer
Paul Reuss, Village of Menands
Tom Richardson, City of Mechanicville
Laura Robertson, Town of Niskayuna
Jeremy Smith, City of Watervliet
Joseph Teliska, representing Wayne Bonesteel, Rensselaer County
Michael Valentine, Saratoga County
Christopher Wallin, City of Schenectady
Brett Williams, representing Joseph Moloughney, NYS Thruway Authority

STAFF AND OTHERS

David Ardman, UIT/ Crawford Associates
Thomas Baird, Barton & Loguidice
Chris Bauer, Capital District Transportation Committee
Jennifer Ceponis, Capital District Transportation Committee
Robert Cherry, NYS Department of Transportation- Region 1
Bryan Cross, NYS Department of Transportation- Region 1
Christopher Desany, Capital District Transportation Authority
Robert Hansen, Creighton Manning
Karen Hulihan, NYS Department of Transportation- Region 1
Tom Johnson, TR Johnson Engineering
Dave Jukins, Capital District Transportation Committee
Robert Leslie, Town of Bethlehem
Fred Mastroianni, Greenman-Pedersen Inc.
Christina Minkler, CHA Companies
Sandy Misiewicz, Capital District Transportation Committee
Chris O'Neill, Capital District Transportation Committee
Glenn Posca, Capital District Transportation Committee
John Scavo, Town of Clifton Park
Evan Seyboth, NYS Department of Transportation- Region 1
Ed Snyder, Greenman-Pedersen Inc.
Tony Tozzi, Town of Malta
Greg Wichser, NYS Department of Transportation- Region 1
Edward Wolke, Capital District Transportation Authority

INTRODUCTION AND VISITORS' ISSUES

Steve Iachetta opened the meeting at approximately 9:35 AM.

Members requested that a scanned copy of the mail out be sent by e-mail in order to allow more time for review of materials. Mike Franchini agreed to do this.

There were no visitors' issues.

ADMINISTRATION

Previous Meeting Minutes - October 7, 2015

Members approved the October 7, 2015 minutes.

PRESENTATION - I-90 ELECTRIC VEHICLE PLAN

Jen Ceponis reported on this plan, sponsored by NYSERDA and NYSDOT. Capital District Clean Communities participated in the plan development with guidance from Energetics Inc. The Plan included the Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, Utica, and Mohawk Valley regions. The purpose of the plan was to support adoption of electric vehicles (EVs); to coordinate and optimize infrastructure investments; to educate decision makers and key stakeholders; and to increase awareness. EV charging infrastructure was inventoried.

Recommendations for priority locations for new Level 2 charging stations were developed with a focus on commuter destinations. Recommendations for DC Fast Charging Stations priority locations were developed with a focus on intercity travelers. Recommendations were developed for addressing the challenge of installing charging in an urban setting.

Chris Wallin commented that the City of Schenectady has installed a municipally owned charging station for municipal vehicles. Andrew Kreshik asked what the lifespan of electric vehicles and their barriers is. Jen responded that the technology is changing rapidly and it is hard to plan for how long vehicle batteries will last; in response fleet leasing for municipalities is being promoted. Bob Hansen suggested integrating carsharing with electric vehicles. Jen explained that plug-in hybrid electrics are ideal for carsharing, because the car needs to always be ready for the next user, which might not always happen if an all-electric vehicle needs to be recharged. In response to a question, Jen said that *Plugshare* is a crowd source app that allows drivers to find the nearest EV charging station. The US Department of Energy also developed an Alternative Fuel Station Locator website and app that finds the nearest alternative fuel station, including EV charging stations.

ACTION ITEMS

2013-18 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENTS

SA282 (1759.85) Malta "Share the Road" Signage

A handout was distributed summarizing information from the previous meeting about the status of projects subject to the incentive to start PE. Tony Tozzi explained that because of many planning activities going on in the Town of Malta, initiation of PE for this project has been delayed, but it is now a priority. The Town desires to procure and expend the cost of the preliminary design of this project with Town funds rather than federal funds. There is no increase in federal funds requested. Mike Valentine asked if the summary in the handout accurately reflected this. Mike Franchini said that the numbers are consistent. A motion was made to approve the amendment as presented, under the condition that future amendments would not be accepted. This motion was approved by members. In subsequent discussion it was recommended that the Malta project should be treated the same as the other five projects in this category whose amendments were approved at the October Planning Committee. A motion was made to revise the previous approved motion by approving the amendment as proposed without a condition for future amendments. The revised motion was approved by members.

A464 (1757.32) Helderberg Hudson Rail Trail: Phase 1

Ed Snyder explained that this project is constructing a 3.2 mile trail from Delaware Avenue to South Pearl Street on a former CP Rail right of way. Construction began in March 2015. The County is seeking a TIP amendment to address the effects of a wall and slope failure that resulted from the flood of the Normans Kill in the spring. The affected section is an embankment which is 80 feet long and 30 feet tall. The most cost effective treatment to protect the integrity of the trail is estimated to cost \$425,000. Because the project is \$300,000 under budget, an additional funding of \$125,000 is requested. Mike Franchini said that normally this change would be handled administratively, but a TIP amendment is required because CMAQ funding is not available, and a different fund source must be selected.

Rob Leslie commented that the trail is already very well used, and the Town and others are exploring ways to extend the trail to the west to Voorheesville. Several people commented on the unusual format of the amendment documentation. Mike Franchini explained that this was based on urgency and accepted by staff. It does not affect the substance of the amendment nor does it set a precedent. Frank Bonafide explained that he will try to obtain CMAQ funding administratively, but if he is not successful, another funding source will be needed. This amendment is needed to use STP flex funds if CMAQ funds cannot be obtained.

Karen Hulihan explained that an offset is not needed since this is in the realm of an order on contract or low bid adjustments which occur outside of the TIP. Joe Teliska commented that he had to come with \$1.2 million in offsets because of an issue with SHPO, and because of

his concern for offsets he would abstain in voting for this amendment. Frank Bonafide said that even with this amendment passing, he would ask one more time for CMAQ funds to cover the increase. Members approved the amendment, with Joe Teliska abstaining.

NEW MERIT EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR TIP PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

Mike Franchini distributed a handout about the Nashville TIP merit evaluation process and referred to the mail out materials on this topic. Steve Iachetta said that the merit evaluation criteria were discussed at the April Planning Committee meeting. Mike Franchini explained that the merit evaluation criteria are focused on creating a direct link to the New Visions Plan, since the TIP is required to be consistent with the New Visions Plan. The merit points describe non-quantifiable benefits, and care was taken to avoid double counting. The merit evaluation process is transparent and easy to understand. It will replace the filters and priority networks. The B/C ratio would still be a very important part of the total score for each project. The new process is intended to incentivize New Visions features. Mike referred to the Nashville evaluation process described in the handout, which has been used successfully for ten years.

Chris O'Neill explained that staff tested the proposed merit evaluation scoring on a set of 15 previously evaluated projects, documented in a handout that was distributed. The exercise demonstrated that the criteria were very clear, objective and easy to use. The test projects were selected to represent a range of projects. The Washington Western BRT project achieved the highest merit point score, with 31 merit points. This indicates that although a score of 67 merit points is theoretically possible, in practice it would be very rare to exceed 31 merit points. This is proportional to the maximum B/C ratio score of 33 points. The average merit point score in the test was 13 points. On average, the B/C ratio represented 50% of the total score (among non-transit projects). The process is intended to compare like projects to like projects. For example, most resurfacing projects would have relatively low merit scores and would compete against other resurfacing projects.

Mike Franchini explained that, as with the current project evaluation methodology, the Committee will have discretion to select projects by considering other factors. He said that because B/C will still be used, projects on higher volume facilities will continue to have an advantage. In regard to rural projects, Mike noted that there are fewer rural roads that are federal aid eligible, but all bridges are eligible for federal aid. Andrew Kreshik pointed out that environmental justice encompasses rural areas.

Frank Bonafide said that he has concerns with the proposed merit evaluation process. Although the intent is excellent, he said that a fair playing field is needed and the proposed system may disadvantage NYSDOT projects. Preservation of State highways is an important goal, and it is often not feasible to incorporate complete streets features. Mike Franchini said that for State highways which are not limited

access, low cost complete streets features can be considered. In addition, the B/C ratio score will give State projects an advantage.

Frank Bonafide said that he is proposing setting aside a share of TIP funding for State projects and a share of TIP funding for local projects. He said there is a disagreement with CDTC staff on this. CDTC staff is recommending a process where State projects compete head to head with local projects. Mike Franchini said that because federal law says that the TIP process is cooperative, programming decisions should be made at the CDTC table, not at the staff level. He commented that local roads are also in bad shape and have needs, and it is also hard to implement complete streets features on city streets.

Frank Bonafide presented a power point which showed the condition of State highways and bridges, and compared historic spending of federal aid funds on State projects and local projects. He said that based on deck area of deficient bridges, State bridges represent a much larger need than local bridges. He said that there are more fair and poor miles of State roads than for local roads. Mike Franchini said that the number of deficient bridges should be considered in defining needs.

Frank Bonafide presented a proposal that \$9 million per year be set aside for local roads only. Mike Franchini expressed the opinion that this would set a bad precedent. He said that \$9 million per year is substantially less than in the last TIP. Mike Franchini distributed a hand out that showed funding options for the TIP. Mike said that one option is to set aside 50% of funding for NYSDOT projects, and then to program the remaining balance with NYSDOT and local projects competing.

After considerable discussion, members commented that because the options are complex, additional time was needed to review them and also to ask for input from their Policy Board members. Members did not reach a consensus. A special meeting was scheduled for November 18 to focus on the TIP funding and programming options. Members asked staff to prepare a clear description of options to be included in a mail out one week in advance of the meeting. Action on the proposed merit evaluation system was tabled until further discussion of the TIP funding and programming process can be completed.

2016-2017 LINKAGE PROGRAM SOLICITATION

Mike Franchini explained that the proposed Linkage Program solicitation is very similar to last year, except that two projects will be selected rather than three, and there is a new requirement that a consultant should be selected within one year. Other required milestones are included. Members approved the Linkage solicitation.

2014-15 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM (UPWP) AMENDMENT

Mike Franchini explained that this is a small amendment to transfer funds from CDRPC staff to a CDRPC consultant for interactive mapping. Members approved the amendment.

UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM

Progress Report for the period April 1, 2015 - September 30, 2015

Mike Franchini explained that the progress report in the mail out is required every six months. Members approved the progress report.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:40 PM. The next Planning Committee meeting is scheduled for November 18, 2015.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael V. Franchini
Secretary

Sample of CDTCTIP Projects

	Bike/Ped		Bridges		ITS		Pavement			Safety		Transit		
	Sitterly RD Bike/Ped	Duanesburg Churches RD	NY 67 Bridge Mechanicville	Zim Smith Bridge	Geyser Road ITS	Madison Ave ITS	Albany Shaker Road Pavement	Burden Lake Road Pavement	Lower State St/Washingt on Ave Pavement	NY 85 Pavement	21st Street Safety	Alb Co High Risk Rural Roads	CDTA Saratoga Bus Facility	Washington /Western BRT
Merit Points	15	15	1	14	6	19	24	5	23	7	16	4	7	31
B/C Adjusted score	7	21	3	14	21	3	9	33	17	7	3	7	1	3
Total	22	36	4	28	27	22	33	38	22	30	14	19	11	34
B/C as a percentage	32%	58%	75%	50%	78%	14%	27%	87%	77%	23%	16%	64%	13%	9%

Average Projects: B/C average is 45%

Non-Transit Projects: B/C average is 50%

Pavement Projects: B/C average is 59%

Bridge and Pavement Projects combined B/C average is: 63%

Average Merit Point score was 13 points

Highest Merit Points was 31 points for Washington Western BRT

Highest B/C is 33 points

Total Annual \$M Funds for All Fund Sources							
For 2016-21 CDTC TIP							
Line Number	Funding Item	Operation	Amount	DOT Calculation	Comments		
1	Region One	given	76.7	76.7	Unmatched, including annualized carryover		
2	Bridge Insp (all bridges)	Subtract	5.6	5.6			
3	Sub-Total		71.1	71.1			
4	CDTC %	Multiply	0.6	0.6	Previously varied by fund source - 57% to 78%		
5	Sub-Total		42.66	42.66			
6	State Maint	Subtract	18	21.6	\$30M for R1 times CDTC share of 60% \$36M x 60% = \$21.6		
7	Sub-Total		24.66	21			
8	State & Local Bridge Replacement Set-Aside	Subtract	5	5	20% Beyond Preservation, rounded up average for 5 years, 2/3 state, 1/3 local	Use should be based on evaluation of candidates. 22% yields \$4.6M ~ round to \$5M	
9	Sub-Total		19.66	16	unmatched		
10	Approximate federal share	Divide	0.8	0.8	With HSIP could be maybe 82 or 83%		
11	Total for Solicitation		24.575	20	matched	Need to reduce by those projects already on TIP	
	The Total for Solicitation is matched funds from all sources for all other projects both and off the state system. Doesn't include local set-asides, front-loading, or swap of NHPP to STP Off System Bridges to fund \$8M local bridge replacements.				Approved Local setasides will further reduce the amount available for solicitation. Fund swaps are at the discretion of NYSDOT		

**Proposed Schedule Changes to Projects
Subject to Incentive to Start PE
Not Obligating PE by 9/30/15**

At the August 2015 Planning Committee meeting, a list of projects subject to the incentive to start preliminary engineering (PE) was discussed. At that time, the Planning Committee decided to take up the matter at its October 2015 meeting. Recently, CDTC staff received information from NYSDOT Region One which indicated which projects did not have PE funds obligated by 9/30/15 (the end of the 2014-15 FFY). For some projects, PE is underway by local forces, not requiring obligation. Such projects are considered to have met the deadline. The implementers of projects that did not meet the deadline were contacted by CDTC staff, informed of the situation and invited to submit amendment requests for schedule changes. Projects for which a schedule change was requested are shown below. Amendment letters from the implementers follow.

Projects with Requests for Rollover of PE Funds

<u>TIP Project</u>	<u>Sponsor</u>	<u>Phase</u>	<u>Fund Source</u>	<u>Current Year</u>	<u>Proposed Year</u>	<u>Amount</u>
A552, Black Bridge	Green Isl.	P	STP-Flex	14-15	15-16	0.035
Rail Trail Connection,		D	STP-Flex	14-15	15-16	0.034
Green Island		C	STP-Flex	15-16	15-16	0.375
SA280, Geyser Road/Spa	Sar Spr.	P	STP-Flex	14-15	15-16	0.015
State Park Traffic		D	STP-Flex	14-15	15-16	0.010
Signal Improvement		C	STP-Flex	14-15	16-17	0.160
SA281, Sitterly Road	Halfmoon	P	STP-Flex	14-15	15-16	0.010
Corridor, ITS	Clifton Pk	D	STP-Flex	14-15	15-16	0.007
Improvements		C	STP-Flex	15-16	16-17	0.115
SA282, Malta "Share	Malta	D	STP-Flex	14-15	15-16	0.003
the Road" Signage		C	STP-Flex	15-16	15-16	0.012
SA283, Sitterly Road	Halfmoon	P	STP-Urb	14-15	15-16	0.035
Mill & Fill		D	STP-Urb	14-15	15-16	0.030
		C	STP-Urb	15-16	15-16	0.360
S223, Schenectady City	City	P	STP-Urb	14-15	15-16	0.093
Pavement Preservation		D	STP-Urb	14-15	15-16	0.087
(includes former S224)		C	STP-Urb	15-16	15-16	1.050

**Status of Projects Subject To
Incentive to Start PE**

In order to encourage project implementation and completion, at the October 2, 2013 Planning Committee meeting CDTC staff introduced a proposal for all future TIP projects that would require preliminary engineering (PE) funds be obligated in the federal fiscal year (FFY) in which they are programmed.

The following points clarify some of the reasoning behind this proposal:

- 1) The expectation is that once PE funds are obligated, the project would be progressed.
- 2) It is also anticipated that it is not a burden on the sponsor to obligate PE funds in the FFY in which they are programmed, or the sponsor would have requested those funds in a different FFY. Therefore, sponsors should take care to make sure the PE funds are programmed in the appropriate FFY.
- 3) If federal funds are obligated and the project is not advanced sufficiently in the next ten years, the sponsor could be required to pay back the federal-aid as per FHWA guidelines.

Projects that did not meet this requirement would either be removed from the TIP or moved to the next FFY by Planning Committee action. As a result of the October Planning Committee discussion, this requirement was added to the Project Justification Package (PJP) for the TIP project solicitation in December 2013.

Projects added to the TIP since December 2013 are subject to this requirement. A list of those projects can be found in the August 2015 Planning Committee package mailed out prior to the meeting.

At the August Planning Committee meeting, we again discussed this "Incentive to Start PE" requirement. Unfortunately at this time, those projects and project sponsors that had not yet obligated PE funds could not request a TIP amendment to move the PE phase into the next FFY before the end of the current FFY on September 30th, because the next Planning Committee meeting was scheduled in October.

In order to deal with this dilemma, CDTC and NYS DOT staff met to develop potential courses of action for the October 2015 Planning Committee meeting. In October the Planning Committee could take one or several of the following actions:

1. Approve all or some TIP amendment requests that move the project PE phase from FFY 2014-2015 to FFY 2015-2016.
2. Require that PE be obligated in less than one year, e.g. within the next 6 months. If this is not approved, the original incentive would apply and sponsors would have one year to obligate PE funds.

3. Include additional incentives (requirements) for projects and project sponsors that do not obligated PE funds by the new deadline. These additional incentives could be applied separately or in any combination. Examples include:
 - a. Project sponsors who do not meet their PE fund deadlines would not be awarded federal funds for any new projects until all existing PE funds that were not obligated in the FFY in which they were programmed, are obligated.
 - b. Project sponsors who do not meet their PE fund deadlines would receive a negative value (e.g. -1) in a new “Project Delivery” category in the new project merit evaluation system.
 - c. Project sponsors who do not meet their original PE fund deadlines would receive only one extension. That is, if the project receiving an extension does not have PE funds obligated within the extension, that project is removed from the TIP with no option for another extension.
4. Do nothing and the existing incentive goes into effect. Projects whose PE funds were programmed in FFY 2014-2015 that did not obligate PE funds in FFY 2014-2015, would be removed from the TIP, and the federal funds returned to their sources.
5. Other options developed during the Planning Committee meeting.

These “Incentive to Start PE” requirements will apply to both NYS DOT projects and to local projects for which the project sponsor has agreed to design the project with its own staff. Instead of obligating PE funds, these project sponsors must have a completed and approved design report in the FFY in which PE funds are programmed.

Regarding the above options, CDTC staff recommends that the Planning Committee take actions #1 and #3 additional incentives a. & b.

Nashville Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
2035 Regional Transportation Plan | Project Evaluation Criteria

Endorsed by MPO Executive Board on March 17, 2010

EVALUATION CRITERIA	SCORE
TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS	100
SYSTEM PRESERVATION & ENHANCEMENT	15
Project Improves Existing Route	+
Project Upgrades Route to Context Sensitive/ Prescribed Design Standards	+
Project Addresses Major Maintenance (e.g., bridge repair, etc.)	+
Project Integrates ITS Technology	+
Project Has Sustainable Operations/ Ongoing Maintenance Support	+
QUALITY GROWTH, SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT, & ECONOMIC PROSPERITY	15
Project Supports Quality Growth Principles	
Project Improves Accessibility and/or Connectivity to Existing Development	+
Project Located in Preferred Growth Area	+
Project Supports Infill/ Redevelopment	+
Project Incorporates Streetscaping/ Enhancements	+
Project Located Near Mixed-Use, High Density Areas	+
Project is Consistent with Desired Urban Design/ Form-Based Codes	+
Project Corrects Poor Storm water Flow/ Drainage	+
Project Improves Utility Location	+
Project Contributes to Grid Development/ Roadway Network Connectivity	+
Project Supports Existing or Planned Economic Development	
Project Located Near Existing Jobs	+
Project Located In High Job Growth Areas	+
Project Improves Multi-Modal Access to Jobs and Retail	+
Project Provides Improved/ New Access to Planned Growth Area	+
Project Endorsed by Local Chamber of Commerce	+
MULTI-MODAL OPTIONS	15
Project is Located within a Strategic Multi-Modal Corridor	
Route Includes Existing Transit Service	+
Route Includes Planned Transit Service	+
Route Includes Existing Pedestrian/ Bicycle Facilities	+
Route Includes Planned Pedestrian/ Bicycle Facilities	+
Project Incorporates Multi-Modal Solutions	
Project Improves Modal Conflict (e.g., traffic signals, grade separation, dedicated lanes)	+
Project Includes Transit Accommodations (e.g., pullouts, shelters, dedicated lanes, signal priority)	+
Project Includes Pedestrian Amenities (e.g., benches, bulb outs, pedestrian refuges, etc.)	+
Project Includes Sidewalk Improvements (bonus for b+p priority)	+
Project Includes Bicycle Facility Improvements (bonus for b+p priority)	+
Project Makes a Connection to another Modal Facility	+
Project Includes Carpool Lane	+
CONGESTION MANAGEMENT	10
Project Addresses Corridor Congestion	
Top Priority - Appropriately Addresses MPO Base Year Congestion	+
Second Priority - Appropriately Addresses MPO 2015 Congestion	+
Third Priority - Appropriately Addresses MPO 2025 Congestion	+
Fourth Priority - Appropriately Addresses MPO 2035 Congestion	+
Appropriately Addresses Congestion as Identified by Other Study or Observation	+
Project Incorporates Congestion Management Strategies	
Geometrical Improvement	+
Grade Separation or Dedicated Travel Lanes for Individual Modes	+
Improvements to Access Management	+
ITS/ Signalization Improvement	+
Improvements to Turning Movements	+
Improves Parallel Facility/ Contributes to Alternative Routing	+
Provides Additional Non-Motorized Mode Capacity	+
Transit Capacity	+
Signage/ Wayfinding	+
Other Improvement	+
SAFETY & SECURITY	10
Project Addresses a High Crash Location	
Local High Crash Intersection	+
Local High Crash Corridor	+

EVALUATION CRITERIA	SCORE
MPO High Crash Intersection	+
MPO High Crash Corridor	+
State High Crash Corridor	+
Project Incorporates Safety Improvement Strategies	
Geometrical Improvement for Vehicular Safety	+
Geometrical Improvement for Bicycle or Pedestrian Safety	+
ITS/ Signalization Improvement	+
Signage/ Wayfinding	+
Bicycle or Pedestrian Facility Accommodations	+
Bicycle or Pedestrian Signage or Markings	+
Traffic Calming Techniques Appropriate to Facility Function	+
Other Improvement with Rationale to How the Project Improves Safety	+
Additional Safety & Security Elements	
Project Increases Safe Travel to Nearby School (within 3 Miles)	+
Project Addresses Security/ Emergency Responsiveness	+
FREIGHT & GOODS MOVEMENT	10
Route has Significant Truck Movements	+
Route is Anticipated to have Significant Truck Movements	+
Route Serves Major Shipping/ Distribution Center	+
Route will Serve Planned Major Shipping/ Distribution Center	+
Route Serves Intermodal Center (e.g., rail yard, port, etc.)	+
Project Improves a Designated Truck Route	+
Project Addresses Existing Freight/ Passenger Conflict	+
Project Provides Separation in Freight/ Passenger Movements (e.g., grade separation)	+
Project Design Accommodates Anticipated Freight Flows	+
Project Strategically Restricts Freight Movement for Safety or Congestion Management	+
Project Impedes Efficient Delivery of Goods	-
HEALTH & ENVIRONMENT	10
Project Improves Health & Environment	
Project Provides Increased Accessibility for Low-Income & Minority Communities	+
Project Corrects ADA Non-Compliance	+
Project Provides Transportation Choices for the Disabled	+
Project Provides Transportation Choices for Aging Population	+
Project Provides Transportation Choices in Health Impact Areas	+
Project Promotes Physical Activity	+
Project Reduces VHT/ VMT	+
Project Reduces Vehicle Emissions	+
Project Has Potential Consequences for Health & Environment	
Project Located Close to Natural Resources/ Environmental Constraints	-
Project Located Close to Socio-Cultural Resources	-
PROJECT HISTORY	10
Project Has Documented Local Support	
Local Governing Body Resolution of Support	+
Identified as Top Local Priority	+
Project Has Detailed Planning & Engineering Efforts	
Detailed Planning Report Conducted (e.g., TPR, IJS, AA, etc.)	+
Preliminary Engineering & Design Conducted	+
Project Has Documented Funding Support	
Project is on the federal-aid system	+
High Level of Local Participation (20+ percent of funding)	+
Local Funds Programmed/ Budgeted	+
State Funds Programmed/ Budgeted	+
Previously Included in MPO TIP or LRTP	+
CONSISTENCY WITH PLANS	5
Local Comprehensive Plan Transportation Priority	+
Local/ Regional Transit Plan Priority	+
Local/ Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan Priority	+
ITS Architecture/ Master Plan Priority	+
Strategic Highway Safety Plan Priority	+
Other Official Planning Instrument	+