Selection Process
For
Surface Transportation Program (STP) - Urban Projects

I. Introduction

The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21), signed into law in 2012, is the current federal transportation law, providing the policy and funding framework for state and metropolitan area transportation planning and project programming of federal funds. Under the metropolitan planning provisions of MAP-21, the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB), as the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Madison Urban Area, is responsible for developing, in cooperation with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT), Metro Transit and other transit operators, a long-range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison metropolitan area. The Madison Area TPB's current RTP, adopted in March 2012, is the *2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County* (http://www.madisonareampo.org/planning/documents/RTPFINAL_Web.pdf).

The TIP is a coordinated listing of multi-modal transportation improvement projects programmed or budgeted for implementation during the next five-year period.[1] All projects within the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area involving federal funding or that are regionally significant (e.g., a new interchange) must be included in the TIP. For coordination and public information purposes, the Madison Area TPB also attempts to include other significant projects (e.g., roadway projects located on the regionally classified network) even if only state and/or local funding is being used. Projects in the TIP must be either specifically included in the RTP – in the case of major capacity expansion projects (e.g., added travel lanes, bus rapid transit) – or consistent with the goals, policy objectives, and general recommendations in the plan.

WisDOT and Metro Transit select the projects for the federal program funds that they control. For WisDOT this includes programs that fund state highway projects (e.g., National Highway Performance Program) and programs that fund local projects which WisDOT administers (e.g., Local Bridge, Highway Safety Improvement Program). These projects are submitted to the MPO for inclusion in the TIP. The MPO determines their consistency with the RTP and approves them as part of the TIP process.

As a large MPO (urbanized area population over 200,000), the Madison Area TPB receives its own allocation of funding under two Federal aid highway programs: Surface Transportation Program (STP) – Urban and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). The MPO scores and selects projects for funding under these two programs using a set of approved screening and scoring criteria. Eligible applicants are Dane County and local units of government.

The STP – Urban program is by far the largest of these two programs. The Madison Area TPB's average annual allocation for the 2016-2020 program cycle is $6.86 million. Most of the MPO's funding has historically been used for local arterial street (re)construction projects, but STP – Urban funding can be used for a wide variety of capital projects such as transit vehicles and bicycle/pedestrian projects and programs such as the MPO's Ridesharing Etc. program.

[1] The U.S. Department of Transportation considers the fifth year as informational.

II. 2015 STP – Urban Program Policy and Scoring Criteria Revisions

The MPO conducted a comprehensive review and revision of its STP – Urban program policies and project scoring criteria in 2014-2015. This was the first comprehensive review since the program policies and scoring criteria were first developed and adopted in the mid-1990s.

The new project scoring criteria provide more detailed information to applicants on how projects will be scored and provide more guidance in scoring projects. Changes were made to better align the criteria with the MPO's goals and policy objectives in the RTP. Using a consistent framework of scoring categories, different criteria were developed tailored to the major types of potential projects (roadway, transit, bicycle/pedestrian, intelligent transportations systems or ITS). The scoring category weighting is nearly identical for the roadway and transit infrastructure projects, but varies for some of the scoring categories for transit vehicle, bicycle/pedestrian, and ITS projects to reflect the relevance and significance of each category for those types of projects.

The scoring system scale is the same for all projects, regardless of project type, with all capable of earning up to 100 points. This will permit a general comparison of the strength of the different applications. However, because the criteria are different for the different types of projects the scoring system is not designed to permit a direct comparison of the scores for the different types of projects. The projects will only be ranked within the each project category. The decision on the mix of projects to fund will be based on the MPO's STP – Urban Program objectives outlined in Section IV below.

The following sections of this document outline the Madison Area TPB's STP – Urban program objectives and policies, process for selecting projects, and project screening and scoring criteria for evaluating project applications.

III. Regional Transportation Plan and MAP-21 Goals

The following are the goals for the regional transportation system identified in the RTP:

Balanced System – provides a range of transportation options and takes advantage of the inherent efficiencies of each mode.

Accessible – serves all areas of the region and all residents and visitors.

Efficient – maximizes mobility provided by existing and new facilities through systems and demand management strategies.

Safe – designed, built, and operated to minimize risk of harm to persons and property, allows persons to feel confident and secure in and around all modes of travel.

Reliable – minimizes and alerts persons to unexpected travel delays.

Equitable – provides an equitable level of service and benefits between and among population groups (including low-income, minority, and elderly and persons with disabilities) and ensures equity over generations.

Interconnected – provides for ease of transfer between the different modes of travel.

Environmentally responsible – preserves and restores environmental and ecological systems and minimizes energy consumption to the extent feasible.

Supportive of compact, efficient patterns of development – integrates transportation and land use planning in support of transportation efficient development that maximizes travel, housing, and employment choices.

Promotes economic development and prosperity of the region – provides convenient travel for all persons and supports the efficient movement of goods.

Fosters community and neighborhood health and vitality - context sensitive and adaptable and addresses negative impacts of traffic, particularly in residential areas.

Economically viable and financially stable – cost efficient and financial feasible with sufficient ongoing financial support for operations and maintenance.

MAP-21 specifies the following national performance goals:

- Achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads.
- Maintain the highway infrastructure asset system in a state of good repair
- Achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the National Highway System
- Improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system
- Improve the national freight network, strengthen the ability of rural communities to access national and international trade markets, and support regional economic development
- Enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting and enhancing the natural environment
- Reduce project costs, promote jobs and the economy, and expedite the movement of people and goods by accelerating project completion through eliminating delays in the project development and delivery process, including reducing regulatory burdens and improving agencies' work practices

IV. STP-Urban Program Objectives and Policies

A. Objectives

The Madison Area TPB will accept applications for most types of eligible projects under the STP program. However, in an effort to maximize federal funding to the region and balance the needs of the different modes of transportation, the availability of alternative federal sources of funding for certain types of projects (e.g., Transportation Alternatives Program for bicycle/pedestrian projects, Highway Safety Improvement Program for certain safety projects, and FTA transit formula programs for transit projects) will be considered in making project funding decisions.

The specific Madison Area TPB objectives for the STP-Urban program are to:

1) Fund the highest priority projects that will help achieve the goals and policy objectives for the RTP as outlined in the *2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update: Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County*, including sub-element plans, and the national performance goals specified in MAP-21.

2) Evaluate candidate projects fairly, using appropriate criteria reflective of these goals and policy objectives, which are consistently applied.

3) Use performance-based standards to evaluate projects, where feasible.

4) Utilize STP-Urban funds for projects with the highest need considering availability of other federal and state funding sources.

5) Maximize the amount of discretionary federal and state funding to the Madison metropolitan area, including NHPP and STP-Flexible funds for roadway projects and Transportation Alternatives Program funds for bicycle/pedestrian bicycle projects.

6) Utilize STP-Urban funds on projects that have demonstrated local support and commitment and will be ready to proceed when scheduled for construction.

7) Utilize STP-Urban funds generally on larger-sized projects with significant beneficial impacts to the regional transportation system to ensure efficient utilization of both local and state administrative resources given the extensive requirements for federally funded projects.

8) While recognizing the above objective, also strive to achieve equity in funding of projects over time from a geographic standpoint. In part to achieve this objective, the MPO will seek to utilize on average up to 10% of its funding allocation on smaller, lower cost projects over time (see Project Funding under Section B below).

B. Policies

Eligible Project Categories

The Madison Area TPB will accept applications for most types of projects eligible for funding under the STP program, as listed below:

1. Construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, and operational improvements for roadways functionally classified as arterials or collectors, and bridges on roadways of all functional classifications, including improvements necessary to accommodate other modes of transportation and drainage systems for roadway runoff.
2. Capital costs for transit projects.
3. Construction of new multi-use paths and/or grade separated bicycle/pedestrian crossings of major barriers.
4. Roadway and transit safety infrastructure improvements, including projects related to intersections that have disproportionately high crash rates and/or high levels of congestion.
5. Capital and operating costs for traffic monitoring, management, and control facilities and programs.
6. Infrastructure-based intelligent transportation systems (ITS) capital improvements.
7. Surface transportation planning programs.
8. Transportation demand management (TDM) programs, including rideshare/carpool programs and establishment and provision of transportation services by Transportation Management Associations.

Federally eligible projects for which the Madison Area TPB will not utilize its STP-Urban funds include reconstruction of existing multi-use paths, recreational trails, independent sidewalk projects (e.g., to comply with ADA), and most “transportation enhancement” activities, including environmental mitigation, historic preservation, and scenic beautification (see 23 U.S.C. Section 133 (b) for the complete list of eligible project activities under federal law).

Eligible Cost Categories:

The following are eligible costs for roadway projects under federal law and Madison Area TPB policy:

1. Street/roadway construction*
2. Drainage systems needed to carry storm water runoff from street/roadway**
3. Sidewalks***
4. Multi-use path in corridor (where appropriate)
5. Transit facilities (e.g., bus pad, bus pull-out, bench or shelter, park-and-ride lot)
6. Standard streetscape items (lighting, colored crosswalks, etc.)
7. Signs and signals (where warrants are met)
8. Standard landscaping items (street trees, plants, etc.)

* The needs of bicyclists and pedestrians must be considered for all roadway projects per federal, state, and MPO policy.
** Expansion of storm water system for future/planned development is not an eligible cost, but the local unit of government can fund the difference with 100% local funds.
*** Local units of government may only assess for the local match.

Utilities (e.g., water, sewer) are not an eligible roadway project cost per federal law. Real estate acquisition, engineering/design, and compensable utility relocation are eligible costs per federal law, but not eligible under Madison Area TPB policy in order to stretch the limited available federal funding. An exception for design is the required WisDOT design review.

Minimum/Maximum Project Cost Amounts

In order to ensure efficient utilization of state and local administrative resources given the significant additional requirements for federal projects and to fund projects with significant beneficial impacts, the Madison Area TPB will apply the following total project cost minimums to STP-Urban projects:

- Roadway Infrastructure Projects: $600,000
- Transit and Independent Pedestrian/Bicycle Infrastructure Projects: $300,000
- Transit Vehicle, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), and other Capital Purchase Projects: $125,000
- Non-Infrastructure Projects (e.g., TDM programs): $75,000

There is no maximum project cost amount, but segmentation of projects over $10 million is strongly encouraged.

Project Funding

Per long-standing policy, the City of Madison's pedestrian/bicycle safety education program and the Madison Area TPB Rideshare/TDM program will continue to receive an "off-the-top" allocation of total STP-Urban funding. The allocations for these programs will be based on a 3% annual inflationary increase from 2015 levels. No "off-the-top" allocation of funding will be provided for any other project at this time.

No set percentage or sub-allocation of funds will be directed toward particular types of projects (e.g., roadway preservation vs. capacity expansion or roadway vs. transit) in order to maintain

maximum flexibility to fund the highest priority projects taking into account all other project funding sources.

Beginning with new projects approved and programmed as part of the 2016-2020 program cycle, the MPO will seek to allocate up to 10% of the available funds for projects with a total cost of no more than $1.2 million. The actual amount of funding allocated for small, lower cost projects will vary with each program cycle and will depend upon required funding for the high priority large projects and the number and strength of small project applications.

The Madison Area TPB will utilize the project scores and ranking by project type and size as the primary basis for awarding project funding. Final decisions on the award of funding, including the distribution of funding between the different project types, will be based on the MPO's STP-Urban program objectives outlined above.

Cost Share

In order to stretch the limited STP-Urban funding available over a greater number of projects, the MPO has required a 50% local cost share for projects programmed since 2010. Under new local program policy guidance adopted by WisDOT designed to comply with federal fiscal constraint requirements, the Madison Area TPB will no longer be able to maintain a "reserve or contingency" fund and will have less flexibility to increase funding for approved projects that increase in cost from the initial estimate. In order to mitigate the risk of cost increases and provide additional support for priority projects, the MPO will provide 60% federal funding with a 40% minimum local cost share for new projects programmed as part of the 2016-2020 program cycle and future cycles. This applies to all projects costing $600,000 or more. The standard minimum 20% local cost share will be applied for small non-infrastructure projects not exceeding $300,000. A sliding scale for cost share will be used for projects costing between $300,000 and $600,000 as outlined below.

Formula for computing the federal share:

P = Federal participation percentage (round to zero decimal places)
X = Project cost

Total Project Cost	Federal Share (Percentage)
< $300,000	80%
$300,000 - $600,000	P = 80-((X-300,000)/15,000))
> $600,000	60%

Project Management

Once projects are initially approved by the MPO, the projects will be scheduled through a collaborative process that includes input from the local project sponsor and WisDOT, which manages the statewide STP – Urban program. Subsequent schedule changes must be approved by the MPO and WisDOT per WisDOT's Local Program Guidelines. WisDOT SW Region's STP – Urban Program Manager will work with local project sponsors through the project development process to ensure that projects stay on schedule for construction, or in the event of delays or unforeseen circumstances, to make adjustments to the schedule well ahead of construction. Any schedule change must be approved by the MPO and WisDOT. If a project sponsor is not meeting

the schedule for delivering a project, the MPO reserves the authority to withdraw approval of STP – Urban funding for the project in order to maximize the MPO's allocation of current and future allocations of funding and/or avoid the risk of losing funding under WisDOT's program guidance. In the event the MPO deletes an STP – Urban project under these circumstances, the MPO will follow its procedures for major amendments to the TIP, which calls for notice and a 30-day public comment period and hearing before the MPO Policy Board.

V. Process

Beginning in 2015, MPO staff will solicit applications for STP Urban program projects biennially in the spring of odd numbered years. A five-year program of projects will be maintained. In spring 2015 the MPO will solicit for the 2016-2020 program cycle. This will allow the MPO and local project sponsors the opportunity to review and adjust the already scheduled first three years of the program (2016-2018) as needed, and add another two years of approved projects to the schedule (2019 and 2020).

Project applications are generally due in June. MPO staff scores and ranks the projects by project type according to the criteria outlined below, and make a recommendation on the projects to be funded. Funding is allocated to projects based on the cost share policy outlined above. The actual cost share for each project will depend upon the cost of all programmed projects and the MPO's funding allocation. Per WisDOT policy[2], all available funding must be programmed in each program cycle. Funding may not be reserved for cost increases or carried over from one program cycle to another. In cases where there is not sufficient funding to cover the full federal cost share per MPO policy, the local project sponsor may agree to contribute greater than the minimum local cost share but in no case can the federal cost share be less than 50% when the project is first approved and brought into the program.

The MPO's Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) and Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) review the MPO staff's scoring of projects and recommendation regarding projects to be funded. The committees make an initial recommendation on the program of projects to the MPO Policy Board. The MPO Policy Board reviews and approves the preliminary program of projects, with any changes, for inclusion in the draft TIP distributed for public review and comment. Following the public review process, the TCC and CAC make a final recommendation on the STP-Urban projects and funding to the MPO Policy Board. The MPO Policy Board reviews and approves the TIP, including the STP-Urban projects, for submittal to WisDOT for approval and inclusion in the Statewide TIP.

VI. Project Selection Criteria

Two types of criteria are used in the STP Urban project selection process: (a) screening criteria; and (b) scoring criteria.
Screening criteria are first used to ensure that the proposed projects meet eligibility requirements, are consistent with the adopted *2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update*, have local policy body commitment, and have a reasonable expectation of being implemented in the schedule outlined or at a minimum the required time frame. Per WisDOT sunset policy, projects must be constructed and in final acceptance within six and a half years from the start of the year following project approval. For example, 2015-2020 program cycle projects must be constructed by June 30, 2022.

[2] WisDOT administers the STP funding program statewide for all MPOs and smaller urban areas.

Scoring criteria are use to evaluate the merits of the projects. The scoring criteria have designed to incorporate the goals and policy objectives of the *2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update* and goals of MAP-21. Performance-based criteria have been used to the extent feasible while providing necessary flexibility in the evaluation of projects.

A. Project Application Screening Criteria

Consistency with the MPO's RTP and Compliance with State Complete Streets Law and Title VI/Environmental Justice Requirements

1. All projects must be included in or consistent with the *2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County*, including the *Congestion Management Process (CMP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area*, *Regional Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Strategic Plan*, and other separate mode-specific elements of the plan such as the five-year Transit Development Plan and the Bicycle Transportation Plan.

2. All major roadway and transit capacity expansion projects must be listed by reference in the financially constrained *2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update*.

3. All roadway projects must at a minimum comply with the requirements of the State of Wisconsin's Pedestrian and Bicycle Accommodations law and associated rules in effect on the date of this document. The law requires the provision of bicycle and pedestrian facilities for projects receiving state or federal funds, with certain limited exemptions. See Section 84.01(35) of the Wisconsin Statutes and Chapter Trans 75 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code.

4. For bus purchase projects, the transit agency shall maintain a maximum spare ratio of 20% of vehicles operated in peak or maximum fixed-route service after acquisition of the new buses. Any new buses resulting in that ratio being exceeded would not be eligible for funding.

5. Projects shall not create significant adverse human health, environmental, social, or economic impacts on Title VI/environmental justice population groups or fail to avoid those impacts that could be avoided or mitigate unavoidable impacts on these groups.

Local Policy Body Commitment

The project must have the approval of the local policy body and a demonstrated commitment of financial resources to provide the required local funds for design and right of way (if needed) and local matching funds for construction in the schedule outlined. The commitment may be demonstrated by inclusion of the project in an approved capital budget plan or by local resolution approving the project application and committing local funds for the project.

Timely Implementation

In order to be considered for funding, projects must be fully scoped and applicants must demonstrate that the project has a high likelihood of being implemented within the proposed schedule. The WisDOT document at the following link, along with other factors such as the need for right of way acquisition, rail crossings, potential environmental issues, and the need for

detailed traffic operations analysis, will be used as a general guide in determining whether or not the project is likely to be able to be implemented within the proposed schedule: http://www.dot.wisconsin.gov/localgov/highways/docs/definitions.pdf.

According to this WisDOT guidance document, applicants should plan for up to two (2) years for design for simple resurfacing and pavement replacement projects and 4-5 years for reconstruction projects depending upon the scope and cost.

Financial Requirements

All projects must include reasonable, accurate cost estimates that are supported by an itemized project budget, which should be attached to the application. For resources to aid in developing roadway project cost estimates, see local tools developed by WisDOT at the following link: http://www.dot.wisconsin.gov/localgov/highways/tools.htm.

Larger projects with construction proposed to be done in phases over multiple years must have a reasonable project phasing schedule. All sources of funding in addition to the requested STP-Urban funds should be identified.

B. Project Scoring Criteria

The following tables provide the scoring criteria for the different potential major types of projects (roadway, transit vehicle purchase, transit infrastructure, bicycle/pedestrian, and ITS). The scoring categories for the different project criteria are identical or nearly identical. The percentage weight given to each category is nearly identical for the roadway and transit infrastructure projects, but varies for some categories for the bicycle/pedestrian, transit vehicle purchase, and ITS projects to reflect the importance of the categories for those types of projects. See the following table which lists the project scoring categories and total points assigned to them for each of the project types. The maximum total score for all projects is 100 points.

Scoring Categories and Maximum Points Used for
STP Urban Project Evaluation Criteria by Project Type

	Scoring Category	Project Type				
		Roadway	Bike/ Ped	Transit (Buses)	Transit (Infrastr.)	ITS
1	Importance to Regional Transportation System	20	20	-	20	20
2	System Preservation	15	5	25	15	5
3	Congestion Mitigation & TSM	12	5	15	10	15
4	Safety Enhancement	10	20	10	10	18
5	Enhancement of Multi-modal Options/Service	8	20	10	10	10
6	Supports Transportation Efficient Land Use, Livability, and Economic Prosperity	10	4	5	10	7
7	Environment	8	8	13	8	8
8	Environmental Justice and Health Equity	7	8	12	7	7
9	Cost/Benefit	10	10	10	10	10
	Total	100	100	100	100	100

1. Importance to Regional Transportation System – 20 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
• Roadway Functional Class: The Madison Area TPB Functional Classification System map assigns the following functional classifications to roadways within the urban area: Principal Arterial, Minor Arterial, and Collector. The functional classification defines the role the roadway plays (mobility, connectivity, accessibility) in serving travel needs through the regional network. See link to map below. http://www.madisonareampo.org/maps/documents/FunctionalClassesDaneCountyCurrentRds.pdf	1 – 5	Principal Arterial: 5 Points Minor Arterial: 3 Points Collector: 1 Point
• Traffic Volume: The Annual Average Weekday Traffic volume (AAWT) of the functionally classified roadway. [Note: If only Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) volume available, an adjustment will be made to convert to AAWT.]	1 – 4	>25,000 AAWT: 4 Points; 18,000 – 25,000 AAWT: 3 points 12,000 – 18,000 AAWT: 2 Points; < 12,000 AAWT: 1 Point
• Length of Route: The entire route's length in relation to the scale of the regional roadway system.	1 – 3	>5 Miles: 3 Points 2 – 5 Miles: 2 Points <2 Miles: 1 Point
• System Continuity: The ability of a project to complete a key roadway system corridor or fill a gap, providing improved connectivity/mobility at a regional as well as local scale. • Availability/Spacing of Alternate Routes: Availability and spacing of alternate routes within the general corridor.	0 – 3	Completes key corridor; lack of good parallel arterial routes: 3 Points Completes corridor; adequate parallel routes: 2 Points Completes large segment of corridor; good parallel routes: 1 Point Completes only small part of a corridor; good parallel routes: 0 Points
• Transit Route: The project is located on a mainline bus route. [Note: Year-round public service only. Excludes school routes. Buses that use corridor but do not make stops are counted as 25% of a bus.]	0 – 3	4+ peak, 2+ off-peak, 2+ weekends: 3 Points 2+ peak, 1+ off-peak/weekend: 2 Points Weekday peak period service only: 1 Point Not on bus route: 0 Points
• Freight Route: The project is located on a freight route designated by the state or local ordinance. See link to map below. http://www.madisonareampo.org/maps/documents/TruckingCcompanies_2011_Page.pdf [Note: "Key" locations are those serving industrial parks and other locations with relatively high truck volumes.]	0 – 2	Freight Route: 2 Points if key location, 1 point otherwise Non-Freight Route: 0 Points

2. System Preservation – 15 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
Pavement Condition: The current weighted average (by segment length) pavement condition for the candidate roadway project. [Note: Calculation: (The PASER rating for segment "s") * (length of segment "s" / total project length) for all segments. Sum all figures to obtain a weighted PASER rating average.]	0 – 12	See table below.

Rating/Points Table	
Avg. PASER Rating	Points
1 - 3	12
4 - 5	11 – 9
6 - 7	10 – 6
8 - 10	0

Criteria	Points	Scoring Guidelines
Condition of Other Roadway Infrastructure: • Whether the project repairs, improves (e.g., brings up to design standard), replaces or provides (1) sidewalks/and or curb ramps, (2) curb and gutter and/or (3) storm water facilities.	0 – 3	Project incorporates all three types of infrastructure improvements: 3 Points Project incorporates two types of infrastructure improvements: 2 Points Project incorporates one type of infrastructure improvement: 1 Point

3. Congestion Mitigation & Transportation System Management (TSM) – 12 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
Congestion Mitigation/TSM • Level of existing traffic congestion and extent to which the project improves travel times or traffic flow conditions by (a) providing additional motor vehicle capacity; and/or (b) providing transit and/or non-motorized facility improvements, increasing the attractiveness of those modes of transportation. • The extent to which the project reduces intersection delay through improved traffic signal operations (better coordination and/or signal equipment upgrades, including responsive signal controls) and/or through intersection design changes (e.g., addition or lengthening of turn bays). • The project provides or improves an alternative or parallel route to an existing congested roadway or intersection, thereby improving the operational performance/efficiency of that congested facility. • The project improves roadway access management (e.g., addition of a median) in a manner that significantly improves the capacity of the roadway.	0 – 12	(See tables below, which show the points that will be awarded based on the existing traffic congestion and the extent to which the project will reduce congestion/ improve traffic operations.)

Estimated Planning Level Arterial/Collector Roadway Design Capacity	
Roadway Facility Type	Design Capacity (vehicles per 24 hours)
Two Lane	16,000
Four Lane Undivided	23,000
Four Lane Divided	32,000

Source – WisDOT. "Capacity" is Level of Service D for signalized urban street. Calculations based on *TRB 2010 Highway Capacity Manual.*

V/C Ratio Points Table for Corridor Projects	
V/C Ratio	Points
<0.65	0
0.65 – 0.79	1 – 5
0.8 – 0.99	3 – 8
1.0 – 1.19	5 – 10
>1.2	7 – 12

LOS Points Table for Intersection Projects		
Control Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Points
≤20	A – B	0
>20-35	C	1 – 5
>35-55	D	3 – 8
>55-80	E	5 – 10
>80	F	7 – 12

4. Safety Enhancement – 10 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
Crash Rate • The crash rate relative to the recent 5-year average Madison urban area crash rate for an urban street.	0 – 4	Crash rate is > 20% higher than the Madison urban area average: 3 – 4 Points Crash rate is within 20% of the Madison urban area average: 1 – 2 Points Crash rate is >20% lower than the Madison urban area average, or no crash history: 0 Points
Potential Crash Reduction Impact of the Proposed Roadway Improvement(s) • Extent to which the project addresses documented safety concerns and the estimated impact the improvement(s) will have in reducing motorist, bicyclist, and/or pedestrian crashes based on crash modification factor (CMF) of the countermeasure(s). [Note: See http://www.cmfclearinghouse.org/. The CMF Clearinghouse presents both CMFs and CRFs, or Crash Reduction Factors. The difference is that CRF provides an estimate of the percentage reduction in crashes, while CMF is a multiplicative factor used to compute the expected number of crashes after implementing a given improvement. Mathematically, CMF = 1 - (CRF/100). In the future, the MPO hopes to create a table of the top most common countermeasures and the CMFs that will be used for them. Examples include: add a median; remove or relocate access points; modify intersection skew angle; add raised median w/ crosswalk; and add a bike lane.]	0 – 6	High CMF: 5- 6 Points Medium CMF: 3 - 4 Points Low CMF: 1 - 2 Points Project does not include a safety countermeasure: 0 Points

5. Enhancement of Multi-Modal Options – 8 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
Pedestrian Facilities • Extent to which the project repairs, improves (e.g., brings up to or beyond the minimum design standard), replaces, or provides new (1) sidewalks and/or curb ramps, (2) pedestrian street crossing facilities (e.g., pedestrian refuge islands, mid-block crossing), and/or (3) traffic signals (e.g., pedestrian countdown, HAWK beacon, RRFB beacon).	0 – 3	Project incorporates all three types of improvements: 3 Points Project incorporates two types of improvements: 2 Points Project incorporates one type of improvement: 1 Point Project incorporates no pedestrian facility improvements: 0 Points
Bicycle Facilities • Extent to which the project repairs, improves (e.g., brings up to or beyond the minimum design standard), replaces, or provides new on-street and/or off-street bicycle facilities.	0 – 3	Project provides on-street bike facility exceeding design standards, premium facility, or off-street facility (in addition to on-street, e.g., separated crossing or side path where appropriate): 3 Points Project provides on-street bike facility meeting design standards or a non-bike facility improvement (e.g., wide curb lane, sharrows): 1 – 2 Points No additional/replacement or improved accommodations for bicyclists: 0 Points
Transit Facilities/Route • The project includes a bus lane or other transit improvements (e.g., bus queue jump at intersection, transit signal priority) and/or amenities (e.g., bus stop improvements) to improve transit travel time, reliability, and/or attractiveness. • The project is located on a bus route and will improve transit as well as motor vehicle operations.	0 – 2	Project accommodates and provides significant benefits to transit (e.g., bus lanes or other priority treatment): 2 Points Project is located on a bus route and provides some benefits (e.g., improved traffic flow or enhanced bus stops): 1 Point Project is not located on a bus route: 0 Points

6. Supports Transportation Efficient Land Use, Livability, and Economic Prosperity – 10 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
Consistency with Regional and Local Land Use Policies/Plans • The project is consistent with regional land use policies and the community's comprehensive plan. • The project is consistent with a local economic development/revitalization plan.	0 – 5	Maximum points are achieved if project is fully consistent with both regional policies and all applicable local land use/economic development plans.
Supports Regional Center, Mixed-Use Center, and/or Redevelopment Area • The project is located within or serves an existing or planned mixed-use or regional employment/activity center. [Note: See map of existing and planned centers based primarily on employment, page 23 of the Regional Transportation Plan 2035 Update. Map of mixed-use centers to be prepared.] • The project is located within or serves and improves multi-modal accessibility and connectivity to a targeted infill/redevelopment area, such as a Tax Incremental District (TID). [Targeted infill/redevelopment areas will be based on local plans.]	0 – 3	Project serves an existing regional mixed-use or employment center or redevelopment area: 3 Points Project serves an existing local mixed-use or employment center: 2 Points Project serves a planned regional or mixed-use center: 1 Points Project does not serve an existing or planned mixed-use or employment center: 0 Points
Project Design • The project incorporates context sensitive design that considers not only access for alternative modes of transportation, but also the environmental, scenic, aesthetic, historic, community, and preservation impacts of the street project.	0 – 2	Fully supports land use/design context and vision for the corridor/area and all modes: 2 Points Generally supportive of context and all modes: 1 Points Inconsistent with context; pedestrian intolerant: 0 Points

7. Environment– 8 Points Total		
Criteria		**Scoring Guidelines**
Use of Alternative Modes • Extent to which project enhancements to alternative transportation options are likely to be used based on existing and estimated future transit ridership and bicycling and walking levels, and extent to which this is likely to result in a shift to these modes and reduced vehicle trips/VMT.	0 – 4	High transit, bicycling, walking levels which project will increase: 3 - 4 Points High levels, but modest impact from project; Moderate existing or projected levels which project will increase: 1 - 2 Points Very low projected use: 0 Points
Minimizes Environmental Impact Through Design and/or Mitigation Measures • The project adequately addresses environmental impacts (e.g., impacts to air/water quality, open space, historic structures, animal habitats, etc.) and will include mitigation and restoration measures, when necessary. • The project improves the environment or minimizes the environmental impact of the facility above and beyond current design standards (i.e., use of recycled materials, LED roadway and/or traffic signal lights, innovative storm water treatment, use of native vegetation, air quality benefit, etc.).	0 – 4	Maximum points for projects that minimize environmental impacts through design and/or mitigation measures.

8. Environmental Justice and Public Health– 7 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
Environmental Justice • The project is located within or directly benefits a MPO-defined environmental justice area, providing improved multi-modal access/mobility and/or otherwise improving the area's livability. [Note: See maps in Attachment D – Environmental Justice Analysis of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).]	0 – 4	Maximum points will be awarded for projects located in and directly benefiting an EJ area.
Public Health/Health Equity • The project provides public health benefits (e.g., provides community/social space or improved access to parks/open space, improves access to health care or other services, healthy food resources, etc., provides opportunities for physical activity, improves safety, etc.). • The public health benefits of the project positively affect residents in areas with health outcome disparities. [Note: See map at the following link of areas with high or moderate rates of asthma, childhood obesity, and/or adult diabetes. http://www.madisonareampo.org/planning/documents/Health_Metrics.pdf]	0 – 3	Maximum points awarded to projects that provide significant public health benefits to areas where residents have health outcome disparities.

9. Cost Benefit – 10 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
Cost/benefit ratio • This criterion takes into account the overall benefits of the project based on the other criteria as compared to the cost of the project on a per lane mile basis.	0 – 7	Maximum points for high/moderate scoring projects (based on other criteria) with moderate/low relative cost per mile.
Cost Efficiency/Leverage of Additional Funding • Extent to which the project maximizes use of limited financial resources to ensure the continued productivity of the existing transportation system. • The project demonstrates public, private partner, and/or municipal commitment (beyond the required local match), which adds value, reduces costs, and/or leverages additional funding from past or for future project phases and/or complementary transportation system improvements. • The project is coordinated with a separate funded project resulting in a cost savings or efficiencies.	0 – 3	Maximum points for projects that achieve cost efficiencies and/or leverage additional funding or improvements.

1. Importance to Regional Bikeway System – 20 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
Bikeway Functional Class: • The bikeway network has been classified into primary, secondary, and local routes according to the function they serve or are planned to serve within the overall network. Primary routes are typically high volume, direct, longer distances routes that are comfortable for the majority of bicyclists and serve major destinations. Secondary routes fill in the gaps between primary bikeways and provide neighborhood access. They typically consist of lower use routes. Local routes provide access to the secondary and primary network. Projects must be located on the primary or secondary route system to be eligible for funding. See link to the currently planned future functional class map in the Bicycle Transportation Plan below. http://www.madisonareampo.org/planning/documents/BicycleFunctionalClass_CountyWide_11_17_future_DaneCo.pdf	7 or 10	Primary Route: 10 Points Secondary Route: 7 Points
System Connectivity and Continuity • The project provides a missing link in the bikeway system connecting a neighborhood, employers, or other services to a route or facility that already exists. • The project provides a new bicycle/pedestrian link where other reasonably direct, suitable route alternatives do not currently exist, eliminating a major barrier. • The project extends an existing bicycle/pedestrian facility, facilitating increased usage.	0 – 10	Maximum points for projects that provide a missing or new bikeway system link, eliminating a major barrier and providing key connections to other parts of the bikeway network.

2. Safety Enhancement – 20 Points Total		
Criteria		**Scoring Guidelines**
• The project is located in a corridor or area with a history of bicycle/pedestrian crashes, and the project addresses the safety problem(s) or issue(s). • The project addresses a documented hazardous condition that discourages bicyclists from using the facility or corridor.	0 – 10	Maximum points for projects that address an existing major safety problem based on number of crashes relative to use and/or a documented safety issue.
• The project provides an off-street facility in a corridor without a safe on-street alternative that is suitable for less experienced, skilled bicyclists.	0 – 10	Maximum points for projects providing an off-street facility in a corridor without an adequate alternative, preventing people from using it.

3. Enhancement of Bicyclist/Pedestrian Mobility – 20 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
Population Served • The project serves a large number of people based on population within 0.5 to 1 mile of the facility, location of the facility within the overall bikeway network, and location within the region and community.	0 – 9	Maximum points for projects with a large population within a relatively short distance of the facility or likely to make use of the facility due to its location.
Destinations Served • The project increases bicycling and walking access to jobs, services, schools, shopping, parks/recreational facilities, and/or entertainment.	0 – 9	Maximum points for projects providing access to regional or local mixed-use or employment/activity centers, community facilities, and services.
Transit Connection • The project provides connections to transit stops and/or connectivity for users to/from public transportation.	0 – 2	

4. Congestion Mitigation – 5 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
• The project will increase the attractiveness of bicycle/pedestrian travel in a corridor or area with significant existing peak period traffic congestion. • The project will improve access to transit stops in a corridor or area with significant existing peak period traffic congestion.	0 - 5	

5. System Preservation – 5 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
Facility Maintenance: • The project sponsor has a bicycle facility pavement condition monitoring and maintenance program. • The project sponsor has a winter bike facility maintenance program and the facility will be maintained year round.	0 - 5	

6. Supports Livability/Quality of Life – 4 Points Total		
Criterion	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
• The project provides bicycling and walking opportunities in areas of natural, cultural, or historic interest, enhancing use of the facility for recreational as well as transportation purposes.	0 – 4	Maximum points for projects that utilize natural etc. areas, providing high quality recreational opportunities

7. Environment– 8 Points Total		
Criterion		**Scoring Guidelines**
Use of Alternative Modes • Extent to which the project will result in an increase in bicycling, walking, and transit trips for transportation purposes, resulting in reduced motor vehicle trips/VMT.	0 – 7	

8. Environmental Justice and Public Health – 8 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
Environmental Justice • The project is located within or improves bicycle/pedestrian/ transit access/mobility for a MPO-defined environmental justice area. [Note: See maps in Attachment D – Environmental Justice Analysis of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).]	0 – 4	Maximum points will be awarded for projects located in and directly benefiting an EJ area.
Public Health • The project improves bicycle/pedestrian/transit access to parks/open space, health care or other services, healthy food resources, etc.	0 – 2	Maximum points awarded to projects that will provide improved access to healthy food resources, health care, and active recreation opportunities.
Health Equity • The project is located in or serves an area with health outcome disparities. [Note: See map of areas with high or moderate rates of asthma, childhood obesity, and/or adult diabetes at the following link: http://www.madisonareampo.org/planning/documents/Health_Metrics.pdf]	0 – 2	Maximum points for projects that provide benefits to areas where residents have health outcome disparities.

9. Cost Benefit – 10 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
Cost/benefit ratio • This criterion takes into account the overall benefits of the project based on the other criteria as compared to the cost of the project.	0 – 7	Maximum points for high/moderate scoring projects (based on other criteria) with moderate/low relative cost per mile.
Cost Efficiency/Leverage of Additional Funding • Extent to which the project maximizes use of limited financial resources to ensure the continued productivity of the existing transportation system. • The project demonstrates public, private partner, and/or municipal commitment (beyond the required local match), which adds value, reduces costs, and/or leverages additional funding from past or for future project phases and/or complementary transportation system improvements. • The project is coordinated with a separate funded project resulting in a cost savings or efficiencies.	0 – 3	Maximum points for projects that achieve cost efficiencies and/or leverage additional funding or improvements.

1. Importance to Regional Transportation System – 0 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
(NOT APPLICABLE FOR VEHICLE PROJECTS)		

2. System Preservation – 25 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
• The average age of buses to be retired at the time of anticipated delivery of the new buses. In the case of buses to be used for service expansion, the average age of the buses planned for retirement that would need to remain in service if the service expansion were implemented without the additional buses. [Note: According to FTA policy, the useful life of a standard, heavy-duty 40-foot bus is 12 years or 500,000 miles. Because Metro moves the oldest buses to peak period only service, the age of the bus is the critical determinant of useful life.]	0 – 25	<u>Average Age of Buses</u> 18+ years: 25 Points 17 years : 20 Pts 16 years: 15 Pts 15 years: 10 Pts 14 years: 5 Pts 13 years or less: 0 Points

3. Congestion Mitigation & Transportation System Management (TSM) – 15 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
<u>Congestion Mitigation/TSM</u> • The new buses will enable the addition of transit capacity (through larger buses or additional bus trips) in corridor(s) where transit demand routinely approaches or exceeds capacity during peak periods. [Note: Overcrowded corridors will be identified based on extra bus deployment, passenger loading data (if available), and other qualitative information. See also MPO's Congestion Management Process report.]	0 – 15	Maximum points for projects that result in greatly increased transit capacity in corridors with significant transit capacity issues.

4. Safety Enhancement – 10 Points Total		
Criteria		**Scoring Guidelines**
<u>Safety Enhancements Related to Transit Vehicle Crashes</u> • The extent to which the buses will incorporate safety technology (e.g., object detection or collision warning systems) demonstrated to reduce transit vehicle crashes and the crash reduction potential of that technology compared to the technology on the buses to be replaced.	0 – 7	Points for projects that incorporate the most current, cost-effective safety technology for buses to avoid collisions that is not present on or as effective as that on the buses to be replaced.
<u>Safety/Security Enhancements for Passengers</u> • Extent to which the buses will incorporate new or replacement technology/vehicle features that improve passenger safety and security (e.g., cameras, wheelchair securement) compared to buses to be replaced.	0 – 3	Points for projects that significantly improve passenger safety and security on vehicles through new or improved technology/vehicle features not present on buses to be replaced.

5. Enhancement of Multi-Modal Options/Service – 10 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
Transit Connections • The buses improve connections between transit and other modes of transportation (e.g., bike racks or on board bicycle storage, etc.).	0 or 2	Buses include bike racks or storage capability: 2 Points Buses do not include bike storage capability: 0 Points
Transit Service/Vehicle Features • The buses will be used to expand the service area, thereby increasing the accessibility of the transit system. • The buses will be used to provide new or improved service to park-and-ride facilities or locations, the Dane County airport, or intercity bus stops/facility. • The buses include features that enhance the attractiveness of transit (e.g. larger doors, branding) and are appropriate for the service for which they will be used.	0 – 8	Maximum points awarded for projects that result in increased service in high demand corridors or areas.

6. Supports Transportation Efficient Land Use, Livability, and Economic Prosperity – 5 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
Areas Served • The buses will be used to provide existing or new/additional service to transit-supportive development in terms of density and design, providing/improving access to jobs, schools, services, and/or shopping areas.	0 – 5	Maximum points awarded for projects resulting in new/additional service to existing transit-supportive development.

7. Environment– 13 Points Total		
Criteria		**Scoring Guidelines**
Existing/Projected Use of Transit • Extent to which the bus purchase project will result in increased transit ridership and reduced vehicle trips/VMT through enabling provision of new route service, increased service levels on existing routes, and/or otherwise increasing transit use.	0 – 4	High current/projected transit ridership levels on routes or corridors the vehicles will serve, which project will increase: 3-4 Points High ridership levels, but modest impact from project; Moderate existing or projected ridership levels which project will increase: 1-2 Points Very low projected ridership and project won't significantly increase: 0 Points
Minimizes Environmental Impact Through Vehicle Technology • Extent to which buses to be purchased will minimize fuel use/emissions.	0 – 9	Zero emission vehicles: 9 Points Hybrid/Alternate fuel: 7 Points Other fuel saving/emission reducing technologies: 3-6 Points No available technologies: 0 Points

8. Environmental Justice and Health Equity – 12 Points Total		
Criterion	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
Environmental Justice • The buses will be used for existing or new/improved transit service that directly benefits or serves an MPO-defined environmental justice area. [Note: See maps in Attachment D – Environmental Justice Analysis of the TIP.]	0 – 8	Maximum points will be awarded for buses to be used for new or improved service directly benefiting EJ area(s). Some points for buses to be used for existing service benefiting EJ area(s).
Health Equity • The buses will be used for existing or new/improved transit service that directly benefits or serves area(s) with health outcome disparities. [Note: See map at the following link of areas with high or moderate rates of asthma, childhood obesity, and/or adult diabetes. http://www.madisonareampo.org/planning/documents/Health_Metrics.pdf]	0 – 4	Maximum points will be awarded for buses to be used for new or improved service directly benefiting area(s) where residents have health outcome disparities. Some points for buses to be used for existing service benefiting these area(s).

9. Cost Benefit – 10 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
Cost/benefit ratio • This criterion takes into account the overall benefits of the project based on the other criteria as compared to the cost of the project.	0 – 7	Maximum points for high/moderate scoring projects with moderate/low relative cost.
Cost Efficiency/Leverage of Additional Funding • Extent to which the project maximizes use of limited financial resources to ensure the continued productivity of the existing transportation system. • The project demonstrates public, private partner, and/or municipal commitment (beyond the required local match), which adds value, reduces costs, and/or leverages additional funding from past or for future project phases and/or complementary transportation system improvements. • The project is coordinated with a separate funded project resulting in a cost savings or efficiencies (e.g., makes use of existing bus purchase contract).	0 – 3	Maximum points for projects that achieve cost efficiencies and/or leverage additional funding or improvements.

Transit Infrastructure Projects STP Urban Projects Evaluation Criteria & Scoring Guidelines
(excluding Bus Purchases)

1. Importance to Regional Transportation System – 20 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring**
Category of Bus Route(s) Served • Metro's fixed routes can be categorized according to the function they serve within the overall transit system. "Core" routes operate in high volume corridors through the central area and form the backbone of the system; "commuter" routes serve major employer centers, adding service frequency during commute periods and often providing faster service; "peripheral" routes connect outlying areas to the transfer points; and "circulator" routes serve short trips within activity centers or between nearby neighborhoods and the centers.	1 – 5	Project affects multiple core routes and commuter routes: 5 Points Project affects 1-2 core routes and/or circulator routes: 3-4 Points Project affects only peripheral routes: 1 Point
Transit Level of Service • Number of daily bus trips (peak and off-peak) affected by the project (both current and anticipated future, if new service planned).	1 – 7	10+ buses/hour during weekday peak, 5+ off-peak, and 2+ weekends: 7 Points 6+ buses peak, 3+ off-peak, and 2+ weekends: 6 Points 4+ peak, 2+ off-peak, 1+ weekends: 5 Points 2+ peak, 1+ off-peak/weekend: 3-4 Points Weekday peak period service only: 1-2 Points
Passenger Boardings • Number of passenger boardings per day on all route(s) affected by the project (both current and anticipated future boardings, if new service planned).	0 – 8	>8,000: 8 Points 1 Point per 1,000(rounded) up to 8,000 < 1,000: 0 Points

2. System Preservation – 15 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring**
• The project will help maintain the reliability of transit service or address facility maintenance or expansion needs (e.g., bus queue jump(s), bus shelter replacement, transfer center or PNR lot construction/expansion). • The project will preserve the viability of existing transit facilities.	0 – 15	Maximum points awarded for projects that significantly improve transit reliability/schedule adherence and/or replace, improve, or expand facilities that are past their useful life, in disrepair, under capacity, and/or do not meet current design standards.

3. Congestion Mitigation & Transportation System Management (TSM) – 10 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring**
Congestion Mitigation/TSM • Level of existing traffic congestion in the affected corridor(s) and the extent to which the project mitigates that congestion by enhancing the attractiveness of transit service. • Capacity issues with facilities or service(s) and the extent to which the project addresses the issue(s) by expanding the capacity or operational efficiency of them. • The project improves the operational performance/efficiency of existing transit route(s) in congested corridors (e.g., decrease in travel times, increase in on-time performance). Examples include transit runningway improvements, consolidation and/or relocation of bus stops, and construction of bus bulb-outs. • The project implements ITS strategies that improve the operational efficiency and/or attractiveness of transit service. Examples include transit signal priority, dynamic message signs that display real-time bus schedule information, fare collection systems, passenger counting systems, and other data and reporting mechanisms that make or can be used to make the transit system more efficient.	0 – 10	Maximum points for projects in congested corridors that increase the attractiveness of transit by providing facilities, amenities, or information and/or improving the operational performance (travel time, schedule adherence) of transit service.

4. Safety Enhancement – 10 Points Total		
Criteria		**Scoring**
Safety Enhancements Related to Transit Vehicle Crashes • The extent to which the project identifies and addresses safety issues related to transit vehicle crashes.	0 – 7	Maximum points for projects that implement transit vehicle collision avoidance countermeasures proven effective based on testing and/or experience.
Safety Enhancements for Passengers • Extent to which the project addresses passenger safety or security concerns (e.g., moving bus stops, adding cameras to transit facilities).	0 – 3	Maximum points for project that significantly improve passenger safety on vehicles or at high ridership locations.

5. Enhancement of Multi-Modal Options/Service – 10 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring**
Transit Connections • The project improves connections between transit and other modes of transportation (e.g., increases opportunities for bicycle storage at major bus stops/stations, park-and-ride lot/facility). • The project enhances transfer station or bus stop facilities/amenities.	0 – 3	Project accommodates and provides significant benefits: 3 Points Project provides some benefits: 2 Points Project provides limited benefits: 1 Point Project does not provide any improvements: 0 Points
Transit Facilities • The project includes transit runningway improvements or other transit improvements (e.g., in-lane bus stops, bus queue jump, transit signal priority) and/or amenities that reduce transit travel times, improve on-time performance, and/or otherwise increase the attractiveness of transit.	0 – 7	Project accommodates and provides significant benefits to transit (e.g., priority treatment): 6-7 Points Project provides some benefits (e.g., enhanced bus stops): 3-5 Points Project provides limited benefits: 1- 2 Points Project does not provide any improvements: 0 Points

6. Supports Transportation Efficient Land Use, Livability, and Economic Prosperity – 10 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring**
Supports Regional Center, Mixed Use Center, and/or Redevelopment Area • The project is located within or serves an existing or planned regional employment/activity center or mixed-use center. [Note: See map of existing and planned centers based primarily on employment, page 23 of the Regional Transportation Plan 2035 Update. Map of mixed-use centers to be prepared.] • The project is located within or serves and improves multi-modal accessibility and connectivity to a targeted infill/redevelopment area, such as a Tax Incremental District (TID). [Targeted infill/redevelopment areas will be based on local plans.]	0 – 7	Project serves an existing regional mixed-use or employment center or redevelopment area: 6-7 Points Project serves an existing local mixed-use or employment center or redevelopment area: 4-5 Points Project serves a developing/planned regional mixed-use or employment center: 3 Points Project serves a developing/planned local mixed use or employment center: 1-2 Points Project does not serve a mixed-use or employment center or redevelopment area: 0 Points
Areas Served/Project Design • The project serves existing and/or planned transit-supportive development in terms of density and design. • Project incorporates context sensitive design (if applicable) (e.g., bus shelters incorporated into buildings).	0 – 3	Maximum points awarded for projects that serve existing transit-oriented development and incorporate context sensitive design.

7. Environment– 8 Points Total		
Criteria		**Scoring**
Existing/Projected Use of Transit • Extent to which project is likely to result in increased transit ridership and reduced vehicle trips/VMT.	0 – 6	High transit levels in corridor(s)/area(s) which project will increase: 4-6 Points High levels, but modest impact from project; Moderate existing or projected levels which project will increase: 1-3 Points; Very low projected use: 0 Points
Minimizes Environmental Impact Through Design and/or Mitigation Measures • The project results in other environmental benefits and/or minimizes the environmental impact of the facility above and beyond current design standards (i.e., use of recycled materials, innovative storm water treatment, use of native vegetation, etc.).	0 – 2	Maximum points for projects that minimize environmental impacts through design and/or mitigation measures.

8. Environmental Justice and Public Health – 7 Points Total		
Criterion	**Points**	**Scoring**
Environmental Justice • The project improves accessibility of the transit system for persons with disabilities through upgrades to existing fixed-route buses or bus stops. • The project is located within or directly benefits an MPO-defined environmental justice (EJ) area and provides improved transit access and mobility, and/or otherwise improves the attractiveness of transit service. [Note: See maps in Attachment D – Environmental Justice Analysis of the TIP.]	0 – 7	Maximum points will be awarded for projects located in and directly benefiting an EJ area.
Public Health/Health Equity • The project provides public health benefits (e.g., provides community/social space or improved access to parks/open space, improves access to health care or other services, healthy food resources, etc., provides opportunities for physical activity, improves safety, etc.). • The benefits of the project positively affect residents in areas with health outcome disparities. [Note: See map at the following link of areas with high or moderate rates of asthma, childhood obesity, and/or adult diabetes. http://www.madisonareampo.org/planning/documents/Health_Metrics.pdf]	0 – 3	Maximum points awarded to projects that provide public health benefits and provide significant benefits to areas where residents have health outcome disparities.

9. Cost Benefit – 10 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring**
Cost/benefit ratio • This criterion takes into account the overall benefits of the project based on the other criteria as compared to the cost of the project.	0 – 7	Maximum points for high/moderate scoring projects with moderate/low relative cost per mile.
Cost Efficiency/Leverage of Additional Funding • Extent to which the project maximizes use of limited financial resources to ensure the continued productivity of the existing transportation system. • The project demonstrates public, private partner, and/or municipal commitment (beyond the required local match), which adds value, reduces costs, and/or leverages additional funding from past or for future project phases and/or complementary transportation system improvements. • The project is coordinated with a separate funded project resulting in a cost savings or efficiencies.	0 – 3	Maximum points for projects that achieve cost efficiencies and/or leverage additional funding or improvements.

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Projects

1. Importance to Regional Transportation System – 20 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
• Roadway Functional Class: Functional class of roadway(s) project is located on or will benefit. The Madison Area TPB Functional Classification System map assigns the following functional classifications to roadways within the urban area: Principal Arterial, Minor Arterial, and Collector. The functional classification defines the role the roadway plays (mobility, connectivity, accessibility) in serving travel needs through the regional network. See link to map below. http://www.madisonareampo.org/maps/documents/FunctionalClassesDaneCountyCurrentRds.pdf	4 – 7	Principal Arterial: 7 Points; Minor Arterial: 4 Points; Collector: 0 Points
• Traffic Volume: The Annual Average Weekday Traffic volume (AAWT) of the roadways served by the project. [Note: If only Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) volume available, an adjustment will be made to convert to AAWT.]	0 – 5	>35,000 AAWT: 5 Points 25,000 – 35,000 AAWT: 4 points 12,000 – 25,000 AAWT: 2 Points; < 12,000 AAWT: 0 Points
• Freight Route: The project is located on or would benefit a designated freight route, or would otherwise improve the reliability of truck or rail movements. [Note: "Key" routes include those serving industrial parks or other locations with higher truck volumes. For routes, see Freight Facilities and Service map in the *2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update* at link below: http://www.madisonareampo.org/maps/documents/TruckingCcompanies_2011_Page.pdf]	0 – 3	Project located on or benefits key freight route location(s): 3 Points Project provides minor improvements to freight system/ freight movements: 1-2 Points. Non-freight route or no freight-related improvements: 0 Points
• Transit Route: The project is located on or will benefit roadway corridors with bus route(s).	0 – 5	6+ buses peak, 3+ off-peak, and 2+ weekends: 5 Points 4+ peak, 2+ off-peak, 1+ weekends: 4 Points 2+ peak, 1+ off-peak/weekend: 2 Points Weekday peak period service only: 1 Point Not on bus route: 0 Points

2. System Preservation –5 Points Total		
Criterion	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
• The project will help preserve the viability of existing transportation infrastructure. • The project improves ability to maintain the roadway (e.g., winter snow/ice clearing) or transit system/vehicles.	0 – 5	

3. Congestion Mitigation & Transportation System Management – 15 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
<u>Congestion Mitigation/TSM</u> • Overall level of existing recurring and non-recurring traffic congestion and extent to which the project mitigates it, improving travel times or traffic flow conditions. [Note: The level of traffic congestion will be measured based on the best data available, including volume-to-capacity ratio (using AAWT and planning level capacities in the regional travel model – see tables in Roadway Projects criteria), intersection Level of Service during the peak periods, and congested travel speeds.] • The project will reduce intersection delay through improved traffic signal operations (better coordination and/or signal equipment upgrades, including responsive signal controls). • The project will reduce congestion caused by incidents and special events through improved traffic control operations, real-time information systems (travel time, transit service, parking availability, etc.), improved incident response/management, or other strategies. • The project will increase the attractiveness of transit, ridesharing, bicycling, and/or walking in congested areas or corridors through enhanced signal operations (e.g., transit signal priority, adding detection for bicyclists, etc.), real-time information systems, or other strategies. • The project will provide data that will assist in identifying and addressing problem congestion areas or intersections for all transportation modes.	0 – 15	Maximum points for projects that significantly mitigate recurring and non-recurring congestion in one or more of the most congested local arterial corridors.

4. Safety Enhancement – 18 Points Total		
Criteria		**Scoring Guidelines**
Crash Rate • The crash rate on the affected roadway corridors relative to the recent 5-year average Dane County crash rate for an urban street.	0 – 5	Crash rate significantly higher than the Dane County average: 4 – 5 Points Crash rate around the Dane County average: 1 –3 Points Crash significantly lower than the Dane County average, or no crash history: 0 Points
Potential Crash Reduction Impact of the Proposed Project(s) • Extent to which the project addresses documented safety issues and the estimated impact the project will have in reducing motorist, bicyclist, and/or pedestrian crashes based on previous studies. [Note: See U.S. DOT ITS benefits database with results of studies measuring impacts of implemented ITS projects at the following link: http://www.itsbenefits.its.dot.gov/.] Examples of potential safety benefits of ITS projects related to incidents: o Improves traffic incident management, reducing the threat of secondary crashes. o Helps identify and manage hazardous roadway conditions from weather events or other causes through real-time information systems or other strategies. o Improves emergency management communications by coordinating interagency communication system and real-time traveler information systems for incidents, special events, evacuations, major route closings, re-routings, or other restrictions.	0 – 13	High crash reduction impact: 10-13 Points; Medium impact: 5-9 Points Low impact: 1-4 Points No significant safety benefits: 0 Points

5. Enhancement of Multi-Modal Options – 10 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities • The project includes ITS infrastructure that will increase the convenience and attractiveness of bicycling and walking (e.g., pedestrian signals or warning lights, pedestrian and bicyclist detection devices, etc).	0 – 4	Project accommodates and provides significant benefits to pedestrians and bicyclists: 3-4 Points Project accommodates and provides limited benefits to pedestrian and bicyclists: 2 Points Project accommodates, provides limited benefits to pedestrians only: 1 Points No additional or improved accommodations for pedestrians or bicyclists: 0 Points
Transit Facilities • The project includes ITS infrastructure (e.g., transit signal priority, real time information systems, fare collection systems, etc.) that will improve transit travel time, reliability, and/or attractiveness.	0 – 3	Project accommodates and provides significant benefits to transit (e.g., transit signal priority): 3 Points Project provides some benefits (e.g., fare collection systems): 2 Points Project is located on a bus route and thus benefits transit to limited degree (e.g., improving traffic flow): 1 Point Project is not located on a bus route: 0 Points
Data Collection • The project includes ITS infrastructure that will improve data collection for alternative transportation modes needed for planning and project design purposes.	0 – 3	Project provides significant benefits in terms of archived data: 3 Points Project provides some benefits (e.g., fare collection systems): 2 Points Project is located on a bus route and thus benefits transit to limited degree (e.g., improving traffic flow): 1 Point Project is not located on a bus route: 0 Points

6. Supports Transportation Efficient Land Use, Livability, and Economic Prosperity – 7 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
Supports Regional Center and/or Redevelopment Area • The project is located within or benefits an existing or planned mixed-use or regional employment/activity center. [Note: See map of existing and planned centers based primarily on employment, page 23 of the Regional Transportation Plan 2035 Update. Map of mixed-use centers to be prepared.] • The project is located within or benefits a targeted infill/redevelopment area, such as a Tax Incremental District (TID). [Targeted infill/redevelopment areas will be based on local plans.]	0 – 7	Project serves an existing regional mixed-use center and redevelopment area: 7 Points; Project serves an existing regional center but not a redevelopment area: 6 Points; Project serves an existing mixed-use center/redevelopment area, but not a regional center:5 Points; Project serves a planned regional center: 4 Points; Project serves a planned mixed use center: 3 Point; Project does not serve a regional center or redevelopment area: 0 Points

7. Environment– 8 Points Total		
Criteria		**Scoring Guidelines**
Impact on Use of Alternative Modes • Extent to which project is likely to result in increased transit ridership and bicycling and walking levels and therefore reduced vehicle trips/VMT.	0 – 3	Significant impact on transit, bicycling, and walking levels: 2-3 Points Modest impact: 1 Point No impact: 0 Points
Impact on Fuel Use/Emissions and Goundwater Quality • Extent to which the project will reduce fuel consumption and vehicle emissions through improved traffic flow (e.g., less stop/start conditions) and/or reduced non-recurring congestion caused by incidents and special events. • Extent to which project will reduce salt and other chemical usage for winter maintenance, improving ground water quality and roadside vegetation.	0 – 5	Significant estimated impact on fuel use/vehicle emissions and/or salt/chemical usage based on studies: 4-5 Points Modest impact: 1-3 Points No impact: 0 Points

8. Environmental Justice and Public Health – 7 Points Total		
Criterion	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
Environmental Justice • The project is located within or directly benefits a MPO-defined environmental justice area, providing improved multi-modal access/mobility and/or otherwise improving or maintaining the area's livability. [Note: See maps in Attachment D – Environmental Justice Analysis of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).]	0 – 5	Maximum points will be awarded for projects located in and directly benefiting an EJ area.
Public Health/Health Equity • The project provides public health benefits (e.g., improves safety, enhances active transportation modes, etc.).	0 – 2	

9. Cost Benefit – 10 Points Total		
Criteria	**Points**	**Scoring Guidelines**
Cost/benefit ratio • This criterion takes into account the overall benefits of the project based on the other criteria as compared to the cost of the project.	0 – 7	Maximum points for high/moderate scoring projects with moderate/low relative cost per mile.
Cost Efficiency/Leverage of Additional Funding • Extent to which the project maximizes use of limited financial resources to ensure the continued productivity of the existing transportation system. • The project demonstrates public, private partner, and/or municipal commitment (beyond the required local match), which adds value, reduces costs, and/or leverages additional funding from past or for future project phases and/or complementary transportation system improvements. • The project is coordinated with a separate funded project resulting in cost savings or efficiencies.	0 – 3	Maximum points for projects that achieve cost efficiencies and/or leverage additional funding or improvements.