

Indianapolis MPO

Transportation Improvement Program  
Project Selection Criteria

May, 2018

The Indianapolis MPO receives and administers an annual allocation of federal funds totaling roughly \$47 million from four funding programs (CMAQ, HSIP, TAP and STBG). Because the needs of the region exceed the annual allocation received, the MPO has developed a process to assist in the selection of projects that will utilize these funds. STBG, CMAQ, HSIP and TAP all have separate selection criteria; however, they all reflect the policies herein.

The process for selecting projects has been used for many years and was revised several times, the last time for STP (now STBG) in 2009, CMAQ in 2012, HSIP in 2013 and TAP in 2015. Because of changing federal and state policies and procedures, and the length of time since a comprehensive review of the selection process had been conducted, the MPO staff formed a sub-committee in September of 2017 to reexamine the existing criteria and recommend appropriate changes. The sub-committee included the following members:

Anna Gremling, IMPO  
Steve Cunningham, IMPO  
Kristyn Sanchez, IMPO  
James Rinehart, IMPO  
Ryan Cannon, Town of Avon  
Jeff Hill, City of Fishers  
Brad Davis, Hamilton County  
Bill Hall, United Consulting  
John Marron, IndyGo  
Mark Richards, City of Franklin  
Melody Park, City of Indianapolis

Over the course of several months and numerous meetings, the sub-committee first reevaluated the general policy guidelines under which the selection process operates and then developed the revised selection criteria. The revised criteria were presented to the full IRTC for review and comment in April 2018 and adopted by both the Technical and Policy committees in May of 2018.

The Selection Criteria adhere to the Policy Guidelines as revised and shown below:

- **POLICY GUIDELINE 1** – The proposed program should emphasize preservation or enhancement of the existing transportation system (Goal 7 of the Long-Range Transportation Plan). Emphasis should be placed on preservation rather than expansion and the distribution of the MPO’s Annual Allocation will reflect as much as possible, the resource allocation goals of the LRTP.
- **POLICY GUIDELINE 2** – The Indianapolis Regional Transportation Improvement Program (IRTIP) should follow the priority established in the LRTP in implementing projects of regional significance. Although program equity is a key component of the IRTIP, no sub-allocation of federal funds will be affected to replace the project

staging and priorities established in the LRTP to advance the overall interrelated regional interests.

- **POLICY GUIDELINE 3** – Proposed projects within the region that have a proven potential to enhance economic development, stimulate the economy, and assist in job creation should be given additional consideration for inclusion in the program. Projects that have the potential to positively impact the quality of life for the area’s residents should be considered in the development of the program. Projects should:
  - Be consistent and not in conflict with local and/or county comprehensive plans (i.e. the project implements a solution or addresses a problem identified in the plan)
  - Provide improvements to air quality (improvement is consistent with the CMAQ eligibility requirements)
  - Provide aesthetic improvements where appropriate (provision of landscaping or another scenic beautification)
  - Provide access to major generators (including multi-modal and intra-modal facilities, cultural and recreational sites)
  
- **POLICY GUIDELINE 5** – Due to continued growth of the urban area and limited funding availability, STBG funds are restricted to the construction and construction engineering phases only.

The Indianapolis MPO issues an annual call for projects (CFP) each fall requesting applications for project funding in all four funding categories. Generally, and specifically for STBG, the MPO attempts to fund projects in such a way as to reflect the resource allocation goals of the LRTP (i.e. the total annual allocation available in any given year, roadway expansion and new roadway construction projects combined, should constitute roughly 26%). Because many project types are eligible for multiple funding programs, the MPO considers the entire allocation available to assess how the resource allocation goals are reflected in the project selection.

The revised selection criteria will be used by the MPO in project selection and prioritization as funds become available for programming. This selection criteria provides a sound basis for evaluating the relative importance of projects and is intended to be used as a guide in the selection and prioritization of eligible projects. The selection criteria for each funding category are include as follows:

## STBG SELECTION CRITERIA

Adopted May 2018

The Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) has the most flexibility among all Federal-aid highway programs.

Examples of eligible projects through the Indianapolis MPO include:

- Existing Roadway Widening
- New Roadway Construction
- Roadway Reconstruction, Rehabilitation, and Resurfacing
- Bridge Replacement
- Bridge Rehabilitation
- Intersection Improvements
- Transit Enhancement Capital Projects

## A. Existing Roadway Widening (100 points possible)

A major reconstruction to provide added travel lanes.

	CRITERION	MEASURES	SCORE	
1	FEDERAL FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION	Other Principal Arterial or higher	15	
		Minor Arterial	10	
		Major Collector	5	
2	EXISTING OPERATIONS (Level of Service - LOS) *	LOS = F	20	
		LOS = E	15	
		LOS = D	8	
		LOS = C or higher	0	
3	EXISTING AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC VOLUME * (Average of Corridor Segments)	ADT x .0006	Enter score:	
			(Max: 25 pts.)	
4	LONG RANGE PLAN PRIORITY TIME PERIOD	1 <sup>st</sup> time period	25	
		2 <sup>nd</sup> time period	20	
		3 <sup>rd</sup> time period	10	
		Illustrative project	5	
5	Application is the next phase of an IMPO committed/funded added capacity project.	YES	10	
		NO	0	
6	PROJECT IS LOCATED ON THE FREIGHT NETWORK as designated by the IMPO's Plan.	YES	5	
		NO	0	

### TOTAL POINTS for EXISTING ROADWAY WIDENING PROJECT

\*Documentation must be uploaded to MiTIP to substantiate the scores.

#### **2045 LRTP Performance Measures Addressed:**

**Move:** Improves regional connectivity of the roadway system; Creates a connected network of bike/ped routes by expanding existing facilities and closing gaps; Develops mobility strategies that address system performance and congested transportation segments.

**Prosper:** Increases opportunities for residents to reduce transportation costs; Improves transit access to higher education/training centers; Improves job access; Improves reliability, capacity, and competitiveness for regional freight.

**Make Safe:** Preserves or enhances the pavement conditions of the roadway network.

**Sustain:** Protects the natural environment through careful consideration of transportation impacts on projects.

## B. New Roadway Construction (100 points possible)

Roadways that are built on new alignment.

	CRITERION	MEASURES	SCORE	
1	PROJECTED AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC VOLUME* (Average of Segments for Corridors in 2045)	ADT x .0007	Enter score:	
			(Max: 30 pts)	
2	LONG RANGE PLAN PRIORITY TIME PERIOD	1 <sup>st</sup> time period	25	
		2 <sup>nd</sup> time period	20	
		3 <sup>rd</sup> time period	10	
		Illustrative project	5	
3	PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION*	Other Principal Arterial (OPA) or higher	25	
		Minor Arterial (MA)	20	
		Major Collector (MC)	10	
4	CORRIDOR CONNECTIVITY	Fills gap between two OPAs	15	
		Fills gap between an OPA and a MA or MC	10	
		Fills gap between two MAs	5	
		No regional corridor connectivity	0	
5	PROJECT IS LOCATED ON THE FREIGHT NETWORK as designated by the IMPO's Plan.	Yes	5	
		No	0	

**TOTAL POINTS for NEW ROADWAY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT** \_\_\_\_\_

\* Documentation must be uploaded to MiTIP to substantiate the scores.

### **2045 LRTP Performance Measures Addressed:**

**Move:** Improves regional connectivity of the roadway system; Creates a connected network of bike/ped routes by expanding existing facilities and closing gaps; Develops mobility strategies that address system performance and congested transportation segments.

**Prosper:** Increases opportunities for residents to reduce transportation costs; Improves transit access to higher education/training centers; Improves job access; Improves reliability, capacity, and competitiveness for regional freight.

**Make Safe:** Preserves or enhances the pavement conditions of the roadway network.

**C. Roadway Reconstruction/Rehabilitation/Resurfacing**  
(100 points possible)

Roadway enhancements that improve and extend the existing pavement structure’s service life.

	CRITERION	MEASURES	SCORE	
1	FEDERAL FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION	Other Principal Arterial or higher	15	
		Minor Arterial	10	
		Major Collector	5	
		Minor Collector	2	
2	EXISTING PAVEMENT CONDITION INDEX / PASER *	PCI = 1 to 40 or PASER = 1 to 3	40	
		PCI = 41 to 55 or PASER = 4 to 5	30	
		PCI = 56 to 70 or PASER = 6 to 7	20	
3	PROJECT IS LOCATED ON A FREIGHT NETWORK as designated by the IMPO’s Plan.	Yes	5	
		No	0	
4	EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES (ADT)* (Average of Segments for Corridors)	ADT x .0008	Enter score:	
			(Max: 40 pts)	

**TOTAL POINTS for ROAD RECONSTRUCTION/REHABILITATION/RESURFACING PROJECT \_\_\_\_\_**

\* Documentation must be uploaded to MiTIP to substantiate the scores.

**2045 LRTP Performance Measures Addressed:**

**Move:** Improves regional connectivity of the roadway system; Creates a connected network of bike/ped routes by expanding existing facilities and closing gaps.

**Prosper:** Increases opportunities for residents to reduce transportation costs; Improves transit access to higher education/training centers; Improves job access; Improves reliability, capacity, and competitiveness for regional freight.

**Make Safe:** Preserves or enhances the pavement conditions of the roadway network.

**Sustain:** Protects the natural environment through careful consideration of transportation impacts on projects.



## D. Bridge Replacement (100 points possible)

Total replacement of a structurally deficient or functionally obsolete bridge with a new facility.

	CRITERION	MEASURES	SCORE	
1	SUFFICIENCY RATING *	29.99 or less	40	
		30.00 to 49.99	=40 - (rating-30) Enter score:	
		50.00 or higher	0	
2	STRUCTURALLY DEFICIENT / FUNCTIONALLY OBSOLETE *	Structurally Deficient	25	
		Functionally Obsolete	15	
		Neither S.D. nor F.O.	0	
3	FEDERAL FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION	Other Principal Arterial or higher	10	
		Minor Arterial	8	
		Major Collector	6	
		Minor Collector	3	
		not on system	0	
4	EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES (ADT)* (Average of Segments for Corridors)	ADT x .0005	Enter score:	
			(Max: 20 pts)	
5	PROJECT IS LOCATED ON THE FREIGHT NETWORK as designated by the IMPO's Plan.	Yes	5	
		No	0	

**TOTAL POINTS for BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROJECT** \_\_\_\_\_

Note: The use of STBG funds can be used on both on-system and off-system bridges within the urbanized area only since Bridge (BR) funds are not available within the urbanized area.

\* Documentation must be uploaded to MiTIP to substantiate the scores.

### **2045 LRTP Performance Measures Addressed:**

**Move:** Improves regional connectivity of the roadway system; Creates a connected network of bike/ped routes by expanding existing facilities and closing gaps.

**Prosper:** Improves reliability, capacity, and competitiveness for regional freight.

**Make Safe:** Preserves or enhances the condition of on- and off-system bridges.

**Sustain:** Protects the natural environment through careful consideration of transportation impacts on projects.

## E. Bridge Rehabilitation (100 points possible)

Actions or strategies to prevent, delay, or reduce bridge deterioration; restore the function of existing bridges, and extend bridge life.

	CRITERION	MEASURES	SCORE	
1	SUFFICIENCY RATING *	49.99 or less	40	
		50.00 to 79.99	=40 - (rating-50) Enter score:	
		80.00 or higher	0	
2	STRUCTURALLY DEFICIENT / FUNCTIONALLY OBSOLETE *	Structurally Deficient	25	
		Functionally Obsolete	15	
		Neither S.D. nor F.O.	0	
3	FEDERAL FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION	Other Principal Arterial or higher	10	
		Minor Arterial	8	
		Major Collector	6	
		Minor Collector	3	
		not on system	0	
4	EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES (ADT)* (Average of Segments for Corridors)	ADT x .0005	Enter Score:	
			(Max: 20 pts.)	
5	PROJECT IS LOCATED ON THE FREIGHT NETWORK as designated by the IMPO's Plan.	YES	5	
		NO	0	

**TOTAL POINTS for BRIDGE REHABILITATION PROJECT** \_\_\_\_\_

**Note: The use of STBG funds can be used on both on-system and off-system bridges within the urbanized area only since Bridge (BR) funds are not available within the urbanized area.**

**\* Documentation must be uploaded to MiTIP to substantiate the scores.**

### **2045 LRTP Performance Measures Addressed:**

**Move:** Improves regional connectivity of the roadway system; Creates a connected network of bike/ped routes by expanding existing facilities and closing gaps.

**Prosper:** Improves reliability, capacity, and competitiveness for regional freight.

**Make Safe:** Preserves or enhances the condition of on- and off-system bridges.

**Sustain:** Protects the natural environment through careful consideration of transportation impacts on projects.

## F. Intersection Improvement (100 points possible)

Various strategies including geometric design changes and/or traffic control device applications to improve safety concerns, and relieve congestion.

	CRITERION	MEASURES	SCORE	
1	EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES (ADT)* (sum of entering volumes on all approach legs)	ADT x .0008	Enter score:	
			(Max: 35 pts)	
2	ACCIDENT RATES (Last 3 years; number of accidents / million vehicles; avg. of intersection groups)	Rate > 2.5	15	
		Rate > = 2.0	10	
		Rate > = 1.5	5	
		Rate < 1.5	0	
3	EXISTING LOS* (overall for groups)	LOS = F	25	
		LOS = E	20	
		LOS = D	15	
4	FEDERAL FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION (Highest classified)	Other Principal Arterial or higher	15	
		Minor Arterial	10	
		Major Collector	5	
		Minor Collector	3	
5	Included in the MPO's 2016 Top 50 Intersection Study	Yes	5	
		No	0	
6	Project is located on a FREIGHT NETWORK as designated by the IMPO's Plan.	Yes	5	
		No	0	

**TOTAL POINTS for INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT PROJECT** \_\_\_\_\_

\* Documentation must be uploaded to MiTIP to substantiate the scores.

### **2045 LRTP Performance Measures Addressed:**

**Move:** Improves regional connectivity of the roadway system; Creates a connected network of bike/ped routes by expanding existing facilities and closing gaps; Develops mobility strategies that address system performance and congested transportation segments.

**Prosper:** Improves reliability, capacity, and competitiveness for regional freight.

**Make Safe:** Supports projects and policies that reduce the number and rate of serious injuries and fatalities for all modes.

**Sustain:** Protects the natural environment through careful consideration of transportation impacts on projects.

## G. Transit Enhancement Capital Projects (100 points possible)

Projects or project elements that are designed to enhance mass transportation service or use and are physically or functionally related to transit facilities.

	CRITERION	MEASURES	SCORE	
<b>1</b>	EXPAND / MAINTAIN TRANSIT SERVICE ACCESSIBILITY (Select one)	Capital asset replacement (e.g. bus, shelter)- see 3a	40	
		Expands existing service -see 3b	40	
		Improves existing service – see3c	40	
<b>2</b>	IMPLEMENTS ELEMENTS FROM LOCAL OR REGIONAL TRANSIT PLAN (Select one)	Subarea, district, neighborhood, or streetscape plan	5	
		LPA adopted plan (comp plan, capital plan, etc)	15	
		Human Coordinated Services Plan	15	
		County Transit Plan	25	
		Long Range Transportation Plan	25	
<b>3a</b>	CAPITAL ASSET REPLACEMENT CRITERIA (Check all that apply)	Age and condition of asset to be replaced	25	
		Low/No Emission	10	
<b>3b</b>	EXPANDS EXISTING SERVICE CRITERIA (Check all that apply)	Adds Shelters/Benches	10	
		Improved condition of transportation network (bike/ped/roadway)	15	
		New multi-modal amenities/connections (e.g., bike rack, adjacent to trail)	10	
<b>3c</b>	IMPROVES EXISTING SERVICE CRITERIA (Check all that apply)	Improves/upgrades existing bus stop	5	
		Improved condition of transportation network (sidewalk/bikeway/ shared path/roadway)	10	
		Speed and reliability improvements (transit signal priority, dedicated facilities, reduced dwell times, etc.)	20	

**TOTAL POINTS for TRANSIT ENHANCEMENT PROJECT \_\_\_\_\_**

**\* Documentation must be uploaded to MiTIP to substantiate the scores.**

2045 LRTP Performance Measures Addressed:

**Move:** Supports transit initiatives to improve service quality, access to, and reliability of transit.

**Prosper:** Increases opportunities for residents to reduce transportation costs; Assures investments are applied equitably without disproportionately affecting disadvantaged populations; Improves transit access to higher education/training centers by transit; Improves job access.

**Make Safe:** Preserves or enhances the quality and condition of transit resources.

**Sustain:** Protects the natural environment through careful consideration of transportation impacts on projects; Supports project that improve air quality; Improves access to grocery stores from bicycle, pedestrian, and transit options.

CMAQ SELECTION CRITERIA

Adopted December 2012  
Technical Revisions May 2018

The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program identifies transportation projects and programs that will relieve congestion, improve air quality, and reduce transportation-related emissions. Because federal law requires the timely implementation of transportation control measures in air quality plans, the highest priority for funding under the CMAQ Program is implementation of such measures. Major emphasis is placed upon projects that support alternative modes of transportation, provide congestion relief measures, provide non-polluting transit vehicles and equipment, and provide new technologies or improvements geared toward providing a more efficient and safer transportation system.

Examples of eligible projects/programs include:

- pedestrian/bicycle facilities
- traffic management/monitoring/congestion relief strategies
- transit (new system/service expansion or operations)
- alternative fuel projects (including vehicle refueling infrastructure, clean fuel fleet programs and conversions)
- vehicle inspection and maintenance (I/M) programs
- intermodal freight
- telework/telecommuting programs
- travel demand management
- public education and outreach activities
- rideshare programs
- other transportation projects with air quality benefits

Note that construction projects that add new roadway capacity for single-occupancy vehicles are not eligible to use CMAQ funds.

Air quality analyses is conducted by MPO staff by reviewing emission reductions for the projects screened and performing the emissions calculations. The results of this analysis will be scored for each project application on the project selection criteria worksheet using the criteria of the total grams removed and the cost per ton of emissions removed as a result of the implementation of the project or program. Projects are scored and ranked by the MPO staff.

## PROJECT SCORING PROCESS

### I. Total Emissions Reduction (40 Point Maximum)

*Factor: Projected Annual Reduction in Emissions (grams)*

\_\_\_\_\_ VOC's  
\_\_\_\_\_ NoX  
\_\_\_\_\_ PM 2.5  
\_\_\_\_\_ **Total Annual Reduction (grams)**

**Scoring:** Rank projects in descending order of total grams removed. Award points based upon this ranking (i.e., project with highest total emissions reduction receives the maximum of 40 points; the next highest receives 39 points, etc.).

### II. Project Cost Effectiveness (15 Point Maximum)

*Factor: Projected Cost per Ton per Year*

\_\_\_\_\_ Total Grams per Year (from above)  
\_\_\_\_\_ Tons per Year (Divide Grams by 746,484)  
\_\_\_\_\_ Total Project Cost (from application)  
\_\_\_\_\_ Project's Useful Life (Years)  
\_\_\_\_\_ Cost per Year of Useful Life (Divide Total Cost by Useful Life)  
\_\_\_\_\_ Cost per Ton per Year of Useful Life (Divide Cost per Year of Useful Life by Tons per year)

**Scoring:** Rank projects in ascending order of cost per Ton of emissions removed. Award points based upon this ranking (i.e., project with lowest cost per ton receives the maximum of 15 points; the next highest receives 14 points, etc.).

## 2045 LRTP Performance Measures Addressed

**Move:** Create a connected network of bikeways and pedestrian routes by expanding existing facilities; Support transit initiatives to improve service quality, access to, and reliability of transit; Develop mobility strategies that address system performance and congested transportation segments.

**Prosper:** Improve job access.

**Make Safe:** Preserve or enhance the quality and condition of transit resources.

**Sustain:** Protect the natural environment through careful consideration of transportation impacts on projects; Support projects that improve air quality; Improve access to grocery stores from bicycle, pedestrian, and transit options.

HSIP SELECTION CRITERIA

Adopted June 2013  
Technical Revisions May 2018



The overall purpose of this program is to achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads through the implementation of infrastructure-related highway safety improvements. All HSIP applications must address at least one of the emphasis areas described in the [Indiana Strategic Highway Safety Plan](#) as well as meet the minimum standards of [INDOT’s Highway Safety Improvement Program Local Project Selection Guide](#).

All HSIP applications receive points based on their Primary Road Functional Class:

- Other Principal Arterial .....5
- Minor Arterial .....4
- Major Collector .....3
- Minor Collector .....2
- Local.....1

If the application is for a Low Cost Systematic Countermeasure, 45 points are added to the functional class to complete the application score.

- Add FHWA recommended High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) to spot locations
- Add centerline and/or edgeline rumble stripes (pavement marking over rumble) to rural public roads with a speed limit 50mph or higher
- Conduct inventory of traffic signs and upgrade warning & regulatory signs to meet MUTCD retroreflectivity requirements
- Improve the visibility of curves by upgrading curve warning signs and markings
- Improve visibility of intersections by adding lighting
- Improve visibility of unsignalized intersections by installing upgraded/new warning devices
- Install black backing plates with retroreflective border on all signal heads
- Install guardrails or median barrier at locations where none existed before
- Install median cable barrier system on divided roads with grass median
- Install new centerline or edgeline pavement marking on unmarked roadways
- Install new pedestrian crosswalk warning signs, flashing beacons, special pavement marking and refuge areas
- Install or upgrade passive or new active warning device at railroad crossings
- Install or upgrade pedestrian curb ramps and refuge areas at areas of high conflict between pedestrians and vehicles
- Make changes to yellow interval signal timing or interconnect to improve safety
- Remove or shield permanent roadside safety obstructions
- Upgrade guardrail end treatment to current standards
- Upgrade traffic signals to a minimum of one signal head per travel lane

Applications for all other project types including single location “Hot Spot” safety improvements must be based on a Road Safety Audit Report plus a Cost/Benefit analysis in addition to the functional classification score.

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Measure</u>	<u>Points</u>
Crash Cost Index (ICC)		
•	>2.51.....	10
•	2.01-2.50 .....	8
•	1.51-2.00 .....	6
•	1.01-1.50 .....	4
•	.50-1.00 .....	2
•	<.50.....	0
Crash Frequency Index (ICF)		
•	>2.51.....	10
•	2.01-2.50 .....	8
•	1.51-2.00 .....	6
•	1.01-1.50 .....	4
•	.50-1.00 .....	2
•	<.50.....	0
Expected Project Impact on Safety (CRF)		
•	>50%.....	25
•	30-50%.....	15
•	20-30%.....	10
•	10-20%.....	5
•	<10%.....	0
Benefit Cost (B/C) – NOTE: Projects with a B/C less than 1 do not meet Program Minimum Requirements		
•	>10.01.....	25
•	5.01-10.00 .....	15
•	2.01-5.00 .....	10
•	1.01-2.00 .....	5

**Appendix: 2045 LRTP Performance Measures Addressed**

**Move:** Improve regional connectivity of the roadway system.

**Prosper:** N/A

**Make Safe:** Support projects and policies that reduce the number and rate of serious injuries and fatalities for all modes.

**Sustain:** N/A

TAP SELECTION CRITERIA

Adopted May 23, 2018

The Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) encompasses a variety of smaller-scale transportation projects such as pedestrian and bicycle facilities, recreational trails, safe routes to school projects, community improvements such as historic preservation and vegetation management, and environmental mitigation related to storm-water and habitat connectivity.

All smaller-scale transportation projects submitted through the Indianapolis MPO's call for projects will be scored with the TAP selection criteria noted on the following pages. Projects will be ranked by score, after a thorough review by MPO staff, and awarded funds (as available) based on the bicycle and pedestrian enhancement sub-allocation in STBG and TAP.

All projects recommended to receive TAP funding will be submitted to INDOT and FHWA for an eligibility review.

**If TAP is selected as a funding category, show the following dropdown question:**

Is this project application seeking TAP, SRTS Infrastructure, or SRTS Non-Infrastructure funding?

- TAP
- SRTS Infrastructure
- SRTS Non-Infrastructure

**If they selected TAP, add the questions below:**

**Project Maintenance**

A dedicated long-term maintenance plan MOU or dedicated funding source outside of the LPA's annual budget is uploaded with the project application .....  10 points

The project will be maintained through the LPA's annual budget.....  0 points

**Connection to Existing Plans**

The project is included in an existing plan that was publically vetted such as comprehensive, land use, transportation, historic, cultural, tourism, economic development, recreation, parks, etc.....  10 points

The project is included in a draft plan that is being publically vetted and will be approved within the next year .....  5 points

The project is included in a private plan (i.e. university, hospital, etc.) with limited public vetting .....  2 points

The project is not in a plan, but has had public input within the past year .....  2 points

The project is not in a plan and it has not had public input within the past year .....  0 points

**Benefit of Project**

The project will link to an existing regional network that connects to another jurisdiction. ....  10 points

The project meets community needs with the potential to expand the project limit in a new phase ...  5 points

The project will reach a small/single group who will use or be served by the project .....  0 points

---

**What project type is your application?**

- Bicycle, Pedestrian, Trail, and Multi-Use Facilities
- Preservation of Abandoned Railroad Corridor
- Historic Preservation and Rehabilitation of Historic Transportation Facilities
- Construction of Turnouts, Overlooks and Viewing Areas
- Control and Removal of Outdoor Advertising
- Environmental Mitigation to Address Water Pollution Due to Highway Runoff or Reduce Vehicle-Caused Wildlife Mortality While Maintaining Habitat Connectivity

**Dependent on the project type selected in the question above, the following set of questions would appear only for the project type selected.**

## **Bicycle, Pedestrian, Trail, and Multi-Use Facilities Project Type Application & Scoring Sheet**

### **Project Application Length**

- > 2 miles.....  15 points
- 1.5 – 1.99 miles.....  12 points
- 1.0 – 1.49 miles.....  9 points
- 0.5 – 0.99 miles.....  6 point
- < .49 miles.....  3 points

### **Project Application Width**

- 12+ feet.....  10 points
- 10-11 feet .....  8 points
- 8-9 feet .....  6 points
- 6-7 feet .....  4 point
- < 6 feet.....  2 points

### **Project Application Safety Features (select all that apply – max 15 pts.)**

- Physical separation of facility where crossing a highway (over/underpass).....  10 points
- Physical separation of modes in heavily traveled areas (paint/bollards/landscaping/off-street path/etc.)  
.....  10 points
- Special on-street facilities (bike lane, bike box, etc.) .....  5 points
- Pedestrian Crossing Countdown Signals .....  5 points
- Special paving or treatment (besides continental crosswalk) to indicate roadway crossings .....  2 points
- Protected pedestrian crossing phase (scramble or other) .....  2 points

### **Facility is an extension of an existing bikeway, trail, or multi-use facility and/or the next phase of an existing programmed IRTIP project.**

- Yes .....  10 points
- No .....  0 points

### **Facility connects multiple bike and/or pedestrian destinations (i.e. high density [10+ units/acre] residential, commercial, office districts, and/or mixed use districts.**

- Yes .....  10 points
- No .....  0 points

**Facility connects to a stop or station on a fixed transit route**

Yes .....  5 points

No .....  0 points

**This project is in the IMPO’s Regional Bikeways or Pedestrian Plan.**

Yes .....  5 points

No .....  0 points

**2045 LRTP Performance Measures Addressed:**

**Move:** Create a connected network of bikeways and pedestrian routes by expanding existing facilities.

**Prosper:** Increase opportunities for residents to reduce transportation costs; Improve job access.

**Make Safe:** Support projects and policies that reduce the number and rate of serious injuries and fatalities for all modes.

**Sustain:** Improve access to grocery stores from bicycle, pedestrian, and transit options.

**Preservation of Abandoned Railroad Corridor Project Type Application & Scoring Sheet**

**Acquired Property Type**

Public Land (already acquired) .....  25 points

Public Land (property to be acquired by government agency) .....  10 points

Permanent Public Easement on Private Land .....  5 points

Lease on Private Land .....  0

**Project Application Length**

≤ 5 miles.....  3 points

≤ 6 miles.....  6 points

≤ 8 miles.....  10 points

≤ 10 miles.....  13 points

≤ 12 miles.....  16 points

≤ 15 miles.....  19 points

≤ 20 miles.....  22 points

> 20 miles.....  25 points

**This project is an extension of an existing trail**

Yes .....  10 points

No .....  0 points

**This project is supported within a regional plan(s)**

Yes .....  5 points

No .....  0 points



**This project would contribute to the protection of threatened or endangered species habitat or preserve, or includes the preservation or restoration of native vegetation to provide a wildlife migration corridor**

Yes .....  5 points

No .....  0 points

**2045 LRTP Performance Measures Addressed:**

**Move:** Create a connected network of bikeways and pedestrian routes by expanding existing facilities.

**Prosper:** N/A

**Make Safe:** N/A

**Sustain:** Protect the natural environment through careful consideration of transportation impacts on projects.

**Historic Preservation and Rehabilitation of Historic Transportation Facilities  
Project Type Application & Score Sheet**

**Date of National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) listing or eligibility determination by IDNR-DHPA is included in project description.**

Included .....  15 points

Not Included .....  0 points

**Does the proposed project comply with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Properties?**

Yes .....  15 points

No .....  0 points

**Is the Structure/Object/Facility an endangered historic resource in a seriously deteriorated condition or threatened by demolition?**

Extremely Endangered .....  10 points

Endangered .....  5 points

Potentially Endangered .....  2 point

Not endangered at all.....  0 points

**Is the Structure/Object/Facility an outstanding example of a rare historic transportation resource that is rapidly disappearing from the Indiana landscape?**

Extremely Rare .....  10 points

Somewhat Rare .....  5 points

Common .....  0 points

**Is the project an important part of a community/local historic preservation initiative that also meets with the IDNR-DHPA's goals and priorities?**

Strong community/grassroots project and meets DHPA's goals and priorities .....  8 points

Some community initiative and meets DHPA's goals and priorities .....  4 points

Has no community support/does not meet DHPA's goals and priorities.....  0 points

**Is the project supported as part of a current or future heritage/cultural tourism project?**

A heritage/cultural tourism project is listed  4 points

No heritage/cultural tourism project is listed  0 points

**Does this project maintain accessibility by the public/improve the ability of the public to appreciate the historic significance of the property and ensure operation of the resource in a manner that is consistent with its historic character?**

Yes .....  8 points

No .....  0 points

**2045 LRTP Performance Measures Addressed:**

**Move:** N/A

**Prosper:** N/A

**Make Safe:** N/A

**Sustain:** N/A

**Construction of Turnouts, Overlooks and Viewing Areas Project Type Application & Scoring Sheet**

**Is the project associated with a designated state or national byway? (Letter of support must accompany application)**

Yes .....  15 points

No .....  0 points

**Does the project include (or based on) a professionally designed interpretive plan?**

Yes, plan is complete or application is asking for completion of a plan .....  15 points

Plan is currently in progress .....  10 points

No professional plan intended .....  0 points

**Will the project provide a quality visitor experience? (select all that apply)**

ADA accessible.....  5 points

Safe .....  5 points

Well interpreted .....  5 points

Authentic .....  5 points  
Project will be open or service will be available on a regular basis (operating hours are adequate)  5 points

**A marketing plan has been developed for the project and is uploaded with the application.**

Yes .....  15 points  
No .....  0 points

**2045 LRTP Performance Measures Addressed:**

**Move:** N/A  
**Prosper:** N/A  
**Make Safe:** N/A  
**Sustain:** N/A

**Control and Removal of Outdoor Advertising Project Type Application & Scoring Sheet**

**Removal Plan**

Boards are located on or in viewshed of national or state designated byway .....  25 points  
Boards are located adjacent to, or in viewshed of, a state park, preserve, forest, or Historic Site  15 points  
Board removal is a part of the community’s economic development plan .....  5 points

**Timing**

Boards will be removed within a year’s time .....  25 points  
Boards will be phased out over time .....  10 points

**Enforcement**

Provisions are made to keep boards out of described area in perpetuity through city or county zoning ordinance  
Yes  20 points  
No  0 points

**2045 LRTP Performance Measures Addressed:**

**Move:** N/A  
**Prosper:** N/A  
**Make Safe:** N/A  
**Sustain:** N/A

# Environmental Mitigation to Address (1) Water Pollution Due to Highway Runoff or (2) Reduce Vehicle-Caused Wildlife Mortality While Maintaining Habitat Connectivity Project Type Application & Scoring Sheet

## Acquisition

- Land has been acquired for the project .....  20 points
- Land acquisition will be required .....  0 point

## Development

- Assurance that natural site features, such as natural wetlands, will not be adversely impacted  20 points
- Assurance that functionality, i.e., pollutant removal capabilities or reduction in wildlife mortality, will be addressed in design .....  15 points
- Assurance that design features will be incorporated that will maximize performance .....  10 points
- Assurance of availability of long-term maintenance capability .....  7 points

### Has applicant formally contacted appropriate agencies to determine whether there would be any regulatory impediments to initiation of the proposed project?

- Yes .....  10 points
- No .....  0 points

### Have formal contacts been made with appropriate local entities, such as the drainage board, to assure that there is no governmental opposition to the proposed project?

- Yes .....  5 points
- No .....  0 points

### Are there individual persons or organizations that would oppose the project?

- Yes .....  0 points
- No .....  5 points

### Are there relevant local non-governmental organizations that formally support the project?

- Yes .....  5 points
- No .....  0 points

### Does the project utilize technology endorsed by relevant state and/or federal policies?

- Yes .....  5 points
- No .....  0 points

## 2045 LRTP Performance Measures Addressed:

**Move:** N/A

**Prosper:** N/A

**Make Safe:** N/A

**Sustain:** Protect the natural environment through careful consideration of transportation impacts.

If they selected SRTS Infrastructure or SRTS Non-Infrastructure, add the following questions:

**Section 1: School Walking and Bicycling Policies and Education**

**1. This school district:**

- Actively/officially encourages walking or biking to school.....  5 points
- Generally supports walking or biking to school .....  4 points
- Neither supports nor discourages walking or biking.....  1 points
- Discourages walking or biking to school .....  0 points
- Prohibits walking to school.....  0 points
- Prohibits biking to school .....  0 points

**2. Walking & Bicycling Safety Training:**

- Is provided by the school
  - no less than once per year .....  5 points
  - regularly, but less than once per year.....  3 points
  - not at all.....  0 points
- Is offered to:
  - All students / all grade levels.....  5 points
  - at least half of students / grade levels .....  3 points
  - less than half of students / grade levels.....  1 points
- Is provided:
  - During school hours.....  5 points
  - Outside of school hours.....  3 points

**Section 2: Demonstration of Need**

**Are K-8 children exposed to any particular risks because of their current walking or biking routes to school? Please include photos to illustrate particular issues in your supplemental material upload.**

K-8 children are exposed to high safety risks because of their current walking or biking routes to school  3 points

K-8 children are exposed to medium safety risks because of their current walking or biking routes to school  2 points

K-8 children are exposed to low safety risks because of their current walking or biking routes to school  1 points

**Is there any evidence of these safety concerns?** (for example, injury reports, etc.) (7 points possible)

- Yes, there are injury reports. 7 points
- No, but there have been parent complaints. 4 points
- There is no evidence of safety concerns. 0 points

**Are there any particular health concerns for K-8 children at the school that prompted this SRTS application?**

- Yes .....  3 points
- No .....  0 points

**Is there any evidence of these health concerns?**

- Yes .....  4 points
- No .....  0 points

**What percentage of the total school enrollment of each participating school qualifies for free or reduced cost lunches?**

- 75-100%.....  3 points
- 50-74%.....  1 points
- 0-49%.....  0 points

**Have any of the safety or health concerns been identified by partners (i.e. a city council or town board, local planning agency, parents and teachers, department of public works, county health department, school nurses, police department, school PTA, local bicycling or trails group, etc.)**

- Yes .....  5 points
- No .....  0 points

**Has other funding been requested or secured from other local or state agencies or sources for related improvements, including education, planning, enforcement, encouragement, infrastructure engineering, walking or bicycling facility construction?**

- Yes .....  5 points
- No .....  0 points

### Section 3: Detailed Project Information

**This project will (check all that apply):**

- a. Create shorter or more direct walking or bicycling routes.....
- b. Increase connectivity of walking or biking routes to and from school by filling gaps or extending facilities .....
- c. Separate children from motor vehicles along their routes to school .....
- d. Improve children’s ability to safely cross streets on the way to and from school .....

- e. Improve children’s ability to safely bicycle to and from school .....
- f. Improve existing pedestrian walkways .....
- g. Improve existing bicycle facilities or shared use paths .....
- h. Improve the visibility of children for motorists by restricting obstacles, improving sight lines, etc.....
- i. Reduce the number of motor vehicles carrying students to and from school .....
- j. Reduce the number of school buses transporting children short distances to school .....
- k. Promote and enforce safe driving by motorists with traffic calming treatments or warning devices.....
- l. Provide secure bicycle parking for students at schools.....

**How does this the proposed project specifically address the safety and health concerns described in Section 2 of this application?**

- This application addresses all noted concerns .....  3 points
- This application addresses some noted concerns .....  1 points
- This application does not address the noted concerns.....  0 points

**How does the proposed project improve pedestrian/bicycle traffic safety at or near the project site to reduce the likelihood of injuries and fatalities among children?**

- This application proposes physical separation for pedestrian/bicycle traffic safety...  3 points
- This application proposes pedestrian crossing signals and special paving to indicate a crosswalk for pedestrian/bicycle traffic safety... 2 points
- This application proposes does not improve pedestrian/bicycle traffic safety near the project site.... 0 points

**Does the proposed project address change to the physical health of the students at the school?**

- Yes .....  3 points
- No .....  0 points

**Will the participating school work with parents to reduce driving of their children to school?**

- Yes .....  2 points
- No .....  0 points

**Are the proposed improvements the best, most cost effective solutions to the problem?**

- Yes .....  3 points
- No .....  0 points

**Were other options, infrastructure or non-infrastructure, considered as solutions to the problem?**

Yes .....  3 points

No .....  0 points

**Do the proposed solutions improve traffic safety for secondary (other than the children in grades K-8) users of the pedestrian or bicycling facility as well?**

Yes .....  3 points

No .....  0 points

**Has this school/project site already completed a SRTS Plan or a School Travel Plan?**

Yes .....  5 points

No .....  0 points

***If yes, was the proposed project listed in the plan?***

Yes .....  5 points

No .....  0 points

**Does your community have a pedestrian plan or bicycle plan?**

Yes .....  5

No .....  0

***If yes, are the proposed improvements compatible with and supported by the bicycle or pedestrian plan?***

Yes .....  5 points

No .....  0 points

**Does your school have a School Wellness Policy?**

Yes, and the improvements and activities proposed in this application support the adopted "physical activity" components of the wellness policy .....  5 points

No .....  0 points

## Section 4: Cost Estimate

**Local funding for the project or activity will be:**

a. 31-50% of the total project cost.....  10 points

b. 21-30% of the total project cost.....  5 points

c. No more than 20% of the total project cost (the minimum).....  0 points



Targeted Performance Measures by the 2018 Scoring Criteria Update											
* A federal performance measure assigned to this category		STBG -Road Widening	STBG - New Roadway	STBG - 3R	STBG - Bridge Replace	STBG - Bridge Rehab	STBG - Intersection	STBG - Transit	HSIP	CMAQ	TAP
Move	Improve Regional Connectivity	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
	Connect Bikeways/Ped Routes	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
	Support Transit Initiatives							X			
	* Performance & Congestion	X	X				X			X	
Prosper	Reduce Transportation Costs	X	X	X				X			X
	Assure Equitable Investment							X			
	Improve Transit Access	X	X	X				X			
	Improve Job Access	X	X	X				X		X	
	* Improve Regional Freight Network	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	
Make Safe	* Reduce Fatalities for All Modes						X		X		X
	* Preserve and Enhance On and Off-System Bridges				X	X					
	* Preserve and Enhance Transit Resources							X		X	
	* Preserve and Enhance Pavement	X	X	X					X	X	
Sustain	Protect Natural Environment	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	* Support Air Quality Improvement							X		X	X
	Improve Bike/Ped and Transit Access to Grocery Stores							X		X	X